

**SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT  
Reporter's Transcript of the CPUC/BLM Scoping Meeting  
for Preparation of a Draft EIR/EIS**

Held 4:30 p.m. October 2, 2006  
At El Centro, California

Reported by:  
Irene R. Keating, CSR No. 8143

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Lewis Michaelson - Katz & Associates, Public Facilitator  
Susan Lee - Aspen Environmental Group  
Billie Blanchard - California Public Utilities Commission  
Tom Zale & Lynda Kastoll - Bureau of Land Management

Presentation: pages 3 to 9  
Public Comments begin on page 10  
Q&A begins on page 23

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

Nicole Rothfleisch..... 10  
Richard Van Leeuwen..... 10  
Doug Westmoreland..... 11  
Ed McGrew..... 12  
Marie Barrett..... 12  
John Pierre Menvielle..... 13  
Scott Martin..... 14, 22  
Jeff Martin..... 14  
Denis Trafecanty..... 15, 19  
T. Huss..... 16, 18, 27  
Kelly Fuller..... 17, 20  
V. Doyle..... 18

**Q&A, BY SPEAKER**

Denis Trafecanty..... 23, 24, 25  
Kelly Fuller..... 24, 28  
Scott Martin..... 25, 26

## STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work for a firm called Katz & Associates. I've been asked by the CPUC and BLM to serve as a neutral meeting moderator tonight and at the six other meetings that will be held this week throughout San Diego and Imperial Counties.

Some of you may know that these meetings are being held to satisfy the CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act, and to satisfy the NEPA, National Environmental Policy Act, which is the federal statute to which BLM must comply.

Because some of you may be unfamiliar or familiar with one versus the other, we thought it would be very helpful to just provide an orientation, first to this meeting and then to the process and the project.

So if you could put up the agenda there, I'm going to introduce the panel that we have up here, and then I'll explain a little bit about the purpose of scoping. It's often misunderstood, where we are in the process. Scoping has a very specific purpose to fill at this stage.

Susan Lee, seated to my right, from Aspen, will be giving a description of the proposed project. Then we have Billie Blanchard, seated immediately to my left, representing the California Public Utilities Commission, who is going to talk about that process and the schedule. Then we have both Lynda Kastoll and Tom Zale. Tom Zale will be speaking on behalf of BLM and about their process, and then we'll be going through the EIR/EIS process in somewhat more detail. Susan will cover that.

Two more things: the most important part of this meeting is an opportunity for you to offer comments orally to this panel. I want to emphasize that there is no decision being made tonight. The primary purpose for you being here and for the panel being here is so that they can listen to your comments firsthand. But also, you have the same opportunity anytime during the comment period to provide written comments, either instead of or in addition to oral comments, and they will be given the same consideration as any oral comments.

After we finish going through that public comment period, then we're going to provide for a question-and-answer period, so in case there are any clarifications that you need about the project or about the process, the representatives are here to take care of that. They really do want to hear your comments and to make sure that you're as informed as you want to be and need to be in order to do that.

So I'm going to roll on into the purpose of scoping. Again, to reiterate, it's to inform the public and responsible agencies about an upcoming project for which an EIR/EIS will be prepared. So that's their part here, the panel seated here. That's their opportunity to inform you. And hopefully some of you took advantage of the displays out front before we got underway to get some of your questions answered. It's also to inform you about the process so that you can participate knowledgeably and know the opportunities that you and the public or an agency have to provide input.

Importantly, scoping is an opportunity for you to provide input regarding the potential alternatives to the proposed project and the appropriate scope of issues to be studied in the EIR/EIS. In other words, the document has not been prepared yet.

Just like it says, the word "scoping" means they want to scope out what are the issues that need to be focused on, what are the issues that are important to consider from an environmental standpoint, as

well as what they have already: the Applicant has already provided a proposed project and some alternatives. There may be others that you've thought of that you want to share with them.

Finally, the Scoping Report will be shared and placed on the project website after scoping is completed.

I've already mentioned some of the key players here. It's important to understand, No. 1, the California Public Utilities Commission, they are the lead agency for CEQA. Bureau of Land Management is the lead agency for NEPA. Not here tonight, but we should mention, is San Diego Gas & Electric, referred to as the Applicant. They apply and then it's reviewed by these agencies. Finally, I've referred to them earlier, is Susan from Aspen Environmental Group, who's been hired by the CPUC and BLM to help them.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to Susan Lee to give a description of the proposed project.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Lewis.

I'm going to describe the proposed project fairly briefly because there's a very long description of it in the Notice of Preparation, which I think you all have.

In overview, the proposed project is a 150-mile-long transmission line. That's the major component.

The Imperial Valley component, the parts that are in Imperial County itself, is the 500 kilovolt portion. That would start at the existing Imperial Valley Substation and would end at the new Central East Substation. That's 91 miles long. Then there's about 60 miles of new transmission lines, the 230 kV portion.

The remainder of the Imperial County portion runs along an Imperial Irrigation District right-of-way, and then follows Highway 78 and crosses the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

One other aspect of the project I'm sure you already noticed. There are several maps that are included with the NOP. The first one is a project overview that shows you the entire project itself, but Figure 2 zooms in. Figure 2 focuses on the 500 kV segment, so there's a little more detail there. When we provide the EIR/EIS, we'll have much more detailed maps where you can actually see each tower.

One other component I wanted to point out, and this is described in the NOP on Page 2, is that while the project we're looking at is from SDG&E's application to the CPUC and a separate application to BLM, there is a component of the project that involves the Imperial Irrigation District. There is a Memorandum of Understanding between SDG&E and IID that states that the project between the Imperial Valley Substation and the Narrows Substation (on Figure 1), about ten miles into San Diego County in Anza-Borrego, would ultimately be owned and constructed by IID, and the remainder of the project from there west would be owned and operated by SDG&E.

The goals and the need for this project as presented in the application to the CPUC are divided into three main portions.

The first one is to maintain reliability of the electric service in SDG&E territory. The second one is to promote renewable energy from potential sources in Imperial and San Diego Counties, particularly around the south side of the Salton Sea. The third one is to reduce energy costs.

This next slide shows the objectives of the Sunrise Powerlink. Basically, these objectives track with those three goals in a little more detail. They provide the guide for how SDG&E designed its proposed project. The last two are land-use components that describe the way power lines are generally always designed in terms of avoiding residential areas and minimizing the need to construct in the most dense areas of urban and suburban parts of the county.

I will now turn this over to Billie Blanchard to describe the CPUC process.

MS. BLANCHARD: Good evening. I just want to go over a little bit our processes for the CPUC and to also indicate to you the schedules that we now have.

The CPUC has two review processes that go somewhat in parallel for the application for a CPCN, which is a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. There is the general proceeding for the application. There's two application numbers at this point which have been consolidated into one. There is the environmental review process, which we are all part of, which is the CEQA and NEPA process.

The general proceeding on this application is led by the Assigned Commissioner Dian Grueneich and the Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman. Under the Public Utilities Code Section 1002, the scope of the CPCN process basically is to determine the need for the project, considering community values, recreational and park areas, historic and aesthetic values, and, of course, the review of the environmental impacts under the CEQA.

Right now we have a general proceeding schedule. When SDG&E filed this application originally in December, there was a Pre-Hearing Conference in Ramona that was on January 31st, 2006. There is a second Pre-Hearing Conference and a Public Participation Hearing in Ramona that took place on September 13th. At this time, the ALJ is working on the scoping memo for the general proceeding which outlines all the issues to be addressed and the schedule for the whole proceeding, and that is scheduled to come out sometime in October of 2006. The other parts of the proceeding schedule have yet to be determined, but that will all come out in the scoping memo in the next couple of weeks.

Now, in the environmental review schedule, they originally filed the application in December but without the Proponent's Environment Assessment, which we call the PEA. Then they did file an amended application and the PEA on August 4th, 2006. The Notice of Intent of the EIS was published in the Federal Register on August the 31st. The Notice of Preparation for the EIR went out on September 15th. Public scoping goes from now until October 20th, 2006.

At this point in time, we haven't determined yet the actual schedule for the release of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Final or the certification. There's several issues that we're still trying to address, so at this point we don't have that. However, we hope to have it soon, and when we do, we're going to go ahead and send out a card indicating those dates to the mailing list of all the CEQA and NEPA people. There will be notice through the service list, the scoping memo, and the general proceeding as well.

I'll now turn it to Tom Zale with the BLM.

MR. ZALE: Hi. My name's Tom Zale. I'm with the BLM here in the El Centro field office. Lynda Kastoll and I will be working on this process from the NEPA side.

BLM is involved because SDG&E filed an application for a right-of-way to cross BLM lands. As you can see on the slide, there are 31.4 miles in Imperial County that cross public lands and another 1.3 miles in San Diego County.

Additionally, we've listed the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park there. When the patent was issued for the Park back in the 1930's, it included a reservation for the existing power line right-of-way across the Park, and we're currently reviewing that to determine what BLM's role will be in continuing to administer that right-of-way.

As we mentioned a minute ago, there will be a 90-day public review comment period for this project on the Draft EIR/EIS, and the reason for that is because there is an amendment to the California Desert Area Conservation Plan that would be required because the project as it's currently proposed deviates from designated utility corridors. The other role that BLM will play is to conduct nation-to-nation consultation with interested tribes.

MS. LEE: Okay, I'm going to take over for a while. Susan Lee, Aspen.

One of the most important things that the EIR/EIS does is provide information to the agencies that also have to make decisions on the project or issue permits. There's a long list of agencies as well as tribes, which Tom referred to, that will use this document to identify impacts and decide about permit issuance. We've listed many of them here.

What we're doing with these agencies, in addition to getting scoping comments because we've mailed the NOP to each of them, is meeting with many of these agencies during the scoping period. This afternoon, for example, we met with Imperial County Planning. We're hoping to gather input from each of these local agencies because they have the expertise that we need in order to make sure the EIR/EIS is complete.

The next slide shows the process itself from start to finish, and we've talked through this already. I'm not going to spend much time on it. Billie went through the schedule already.

The main point we wanted to illustrate with this slide is that we're very much in the beginning of the process. We really are here to hear input and creative ideas to make sure that when we prepare this EIR/EIS over the next several months, we have the detailed information that we need. I'm going to describe just a little bit of what's in an EIR/EIS so you understand what you can tell us that will be the most helpful.

This slide is broad overview of the contents of the EIR/EIS. We have a fairly detailed description of the environmental setting. We'll have lists of endangered species that occur, what the land uses are along every mile of the right-of-way, where there may be sensitive receptors. We'll describe environmental impacts of the project itself, and a NEPA requirement, we'll describe the impact of alternative. We'll provide mitigation measures to reduce the impacts that are identified. The purpose of all of this is to give information first to the public, and second, to the decision-makers, the BLM and the CPUC, so when they make a decision as to whether or not to approve the project or whether to approve an alternative, they are doing so with a full disclosure of environmental information.

Here we list more detail in terms of the contents of the environmental report. It will include a detailed Project Description that's based on the information we get from SDG&E is enhanced with data requests where we've asked SDG&E to describe in more detail components of the project so we can do a complete environmental analysis.

The alternatives process is really important and I'll talk about that in just a minute. Again, the EIR includes proposed project and alternatives analysis. Other important topics include cumulative impacts - other projects in the area, indirect impacts, and growth-inducing impacts — the extent that the project may cause growth in the area. CPUC has a process for mitigation monitoring, and if the project is

approved or an alternative is approved, the CPUC will ensure, in coordination with the BLM, that mitigation measures adopted are actually enforced in the field.

This is a list of the types of disciplines that we include in an EIR/EIS. And again, the purpose is to let you know the types of issues that we'd like to hear about. Your comments could relate to any of these issues. The list is also in your handout.

I'm going to talk in more detail about alternatives because for this project in particular, the alternatives are one of the most important issues, as shown by Commissioner Grueneich in the conference a couple weeks ago. She requested that SDG&E look at alternatives that don't pass through Anza-Borrego State Park.

There is a lot of concern about alternatives — routing alternatives, generation alternatives. The analysis will also look at non-wires alternatives, that could be done and still meet most of the project objective. So we're going to have a very extensive and thorough alternatives analysis in this process. And first, on this slide, we'll just describe how that process works.

When people suggest an alternative or when we come up with an alternative, we look at every alternative under three main categories. The first is, does it meet most of the project objectives. I went through that list a little earlier. Second, does the alternative have the ability to reduce impacts or avoid impacts of the proposed project, and third, is it feasible. That's the last big category, can it be built technically and could it be permitted to be built.

This next slide shows us the sources of alternatives and the types of alternatives that we think we'll be looking at at this point. Routing alternatives are obvious. They are different ways you could design an alternative to get from Point A to Point B, either the Imperial Valley Substation ending up at Peñasquitos or other ways that would meet SDG&E objectives. They can be big picture or much smaller scale. They could be alternatives that follow the Southwest Powerlink instead of following the route SDG&E has proposed. They could be very small scale in terms of avoiding a land use, for example, a dairy — and I think we'll be hearing about this today — that's along the route, and the alternative could be designed on a small scale to avoid the impacts to the particular land use. That's what we want to hear about as well.

One of the other things I wanted to mention, as some of you may have heard, there is an alternatives workshop next Friday, on October 13th. This is a workshop that's being held through the CPUC's general proceeding, which Billie mentioned. It's being run by the Administrative Law Judge Weissman and the Assigned Commissioner Grueneich.

The purpose of that is for the formal parties to discuss alternatives, so if you're not a party to the CPUC proceeding, you can't participate in that. But don't feel left out because the information you're providing us here in the scoping process is just as important and gets to us the same way. So we wanted you to know that that exists, and if you are a party, we can give you more information about that, but if you're not, just talk to us at any of these scoping meetings this week.

This next slide just explains what happens after the EIR/EIS is completed. The CPUC needs to vote on the process and decide whether or not it will certify the EIR as being adequate. That's required under CEQA. If the CPUC ultimately decides to approve the project or an alternative, then the decision will include a requirement for mitigation monitoring and it will identify mitigation measures.

One other thing I wanted to point out with respect to the CPUC's process is that CPUC takes alternatives very seriously, and we have worked with the CPUC, and Billie in particular, on many projects

where alternatives are selected by the CPUC and are actually built. They don't need to be designed by engineers.

We had a project where one component was actually designed by a woman who lived across the street and had an idea about the way that project could be better built, and that component of that alternative actually was accepted by the PUC and it's actually been built now. So we're seriously looking for information on alternatives, and really are hoping that you'll give us everything you can think of from big scale to small scale.

The BLM process, Tom talked about a little earlier. Following the Final EIR/EIS, the BLM has a comment period. That doesn't happen under CEQA, but it happens in the NEPA world. There's also a 60-day process where the Governor reviews it. Then the BLM will prepare the recommendation that will approve or deny the project and also address mitigation measures.

Lewis?

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, everyone.

Hopefully, that's given you a good orientation to the whole process, and, in particular, the purpose of this evening. Again, we know that a lot of people have feelings and opinions and some strong feelings about the proposed project, and we understand that that's natural. Please recognize we're at the scoping stage and the types of comments that are going to be most relevant and most useful, it's helpful to you to make the best use of your time and your input.

And just to perhaps reiterate one more time, if you can help identify the location and extent of environmental impacts of the proposed project, that's very helpful to the people preparing the EIR/EIS.

Part of the reason for doing these meetings in so many different locales is that we would hope, for example, that here in El Centro we get local comments, local knowledge, local experience that would be useful to the team. Second, I don't want to reiterate too much, but if there are alternatives that you've thought of, it's extremely useful if you can provide that in your comments.

So I have with me right now nine speaker registration cards. We're going to use a consistent process throughout all of the meetings, in all of the locations, in which we are going to give each person three minutes to offer us their comments. If we are done fairly early in the evening, which it looks like we might be, then we will make it possible for people to come up and make additional comments after that. But out of fairness to every process, whether it's ten people or a hundred people, we want to make sure everyone who showed up and signed up gets their first three minutes in before we would go back.

I have a very, very simple low-tech way of telling you about the three minutes. When you've been speaking for two minutes, I'll hold up my index finger, like this, indicating that you have one minute left, and then when you've reached three minutes, I'll hold up my closed hand, like this, indicating that your three minutes are up, and if you would help us respect that, the process will go much more smoothly. That also means that occasionally while you're speaking, you need to look up at me. That would be very helpful as well.

What I'll do is I'll read the first several names so you'll know the order. That way you don't have to line up at the mic, you can just wait and know when your time is going to come. Both of these mics are on, both of them work, and I don't have any preference, so you can use either one you want, these two up here at the podium.

So with that, the first four names that I have are (and I apologize in advance if I mispronounce anyone's name. I'll try and be as phonetic as I can.) Nicole Rothfleisch, Richard Van Leeuwen, Doug Westmoreland and then Ed McGrew. And if you would begin your comments just with your name for the court reporter.

I should mention that this lovely lady seated down here below me is a court reporter. She is taking verbatim everything that's said here in order to prepare a complete record and make sure we capture all of your comments.

And, again, for those of you who are uncomfortable with public speaking, which all the polls in America say is the majority of us, please don't feel that you're left out if you don't come speak tonight. Written comments are given the same consideration as any oral comments offered, and we encourage you to do that as well.

So, Nicole Rothfleisch, if you would come up first.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

**MS. NICOLE ROTHFLEISCH:** Good evening. Thank you for the turn to be here and comment on this. And, by the way, excellent job on the name pronunciation.

Imperial County Farm Bureau, which I represent, is a voluntary membership based organization comprised of over 800 members, most of which are farmers and ranchers of the Imperial valley.

Farm Bureau has not taken a position on the Sunrise Powerlink Transmission project; however, we are concerned about the location of the 500 kilovolt line. It is our understanding that SDG&E has filed for a preferred route, the so-called eastern route, which would run in close proximity to the Bullfrog Farms dairy. This is problematic for the following reasons:

The County of Imperial along with the Farm Bureau and other organizations has worked diligently over the past decade to attract agricultural industry such as dairies to Imperial County in order to simulate our agriculture economy. We have what's called the dairy attraction committee. That's been active for probably a decade or so. Bullfrog Farms was the first dairy to relocate to the Imperial Valley and has proven to be an incredible asset to our community. Furthermore, the area surrounding Bullfrog Farms has been designated as an area ideal for additional dairies to relocate to. An electrical transmission line of this magnitude would be detrimental to this industry.

The impacts of stray voltage and therefore electricity in general have been well-documented. Studies have shown that it would be necessary for the line to be located a minimum of one mile away from livestock in order to prevent impacts to the health and productivity of the animals. The Van Leeuwens, owners of Bullfrog Farms, have determined, based on studies and real-life experience, that they would lose ten pounds of production per cow per day due to impacts from the electrical line. And I actually have specific figures in here, but I'm going to let Richard address those since he's up next. Basically, a 3200 cow dairy cannot survive a loss of this magnitude. It will surely put them out of business.

It's also our understanding that the proposed route for the line would run through as well as directly adjacent to land in agricultural production. A major problem with this scenario is the hazard that this would cause for agricultural pilots.

It's the recommendation of the Farm Bureau that SDG&E select an alternate route for the Sunrise Powerlink Transmission Line that would not negatively impact agriculture in the Imperial Valley.

The Farm Bureau appreciates the opportunity to comment on the project and looks forward to working with you to find a compromise suitable to all stakeholders involved.

**MR. MICHAELSON:** Richard Van Leeuwen.

**MR. RICHARD VAN LEEUWEN:** Hello. Richard Van Leeuwen, owner of Bullfrog Farms, along with my wife and my mother and father, family partnership. Nicole addressed basically most of the same issues that I want to address, but now you can put a face to us. I do have a letter that can be submitted. I'll kind of read off of it and go from this.

We've owned and operated a family dairy farm at this location since February of 2004. Our concern about this power link is the proximity to the dairy facility.

The earlier proposed routes showed that the power lines were miles away from it. And you've probably seen in the early proposals, they are way out on the west. That looked like the obvious route, so

we really weren't concerned about it. And then the other proposed route went to the east of the dairy, close enough to be concerned about, and then SDG&E's final route was right on top of the dairy, but I'll get to that.

However, SDG&E's final proposed route is shown going over our milking facility and over the cow shade facilities, which is where the cows live and milk; it would be right over it. This concerns us because it's been documented and proven electricity near cattle adversely affects their milk production, reproduction, and the length of their life for the animal, not to mention the health of the 30-plus employees that we have there that work there day in and day out 24 hours a day.

In verbal conversations with SDG&E personnel, we found that SDG&E was using five-year-old maps to decide where the route would be; they were not current. And since then — their maps didn't show the location of the dairy, which makes me wonder what other parts of this project have been overlooked on outdated information.

Our facility itself is still in expansion mode. We have more corrals, more cattle that come in. I have two brothers that hope to build dairies in the same area, adjacent to ours, to relocate our whole family down here.

Okay. And the last note would be what Nicole already talked about. In respect to this part of the Valley, there is a potential to increase the dairy industry. If this power line was within five miles of this section of the Valley, it would be discouraging for dairymen to consider this area for their family farms.

Most dairymen are very familiar with high power lines. Usually dairies are out in remote areas that these power lines go through, and it's been — I know it's been documented, but — but just on personal notes, we've had cattle near these lines, and they don't do as well. And dairymen know this. So if there's power lines in this area, they will not — they'll run. I mean, it's just like somebody screaming wolf. They are going to run from it.

Okay. That's all I have.

MR. MICHAELSON: Our next speaker is ready. It's Doug Westmoreland.

**MR. DOUG WESTMORELAND:** Yeah, Doug Westmoreland, land owner and farmer in the general area of the proposed power line. And basically, three comments:

As to the earlier meetings about the proposed routes for the power line — and they've changed drastically in the past few months, and so it's hard to make comment or know if you're concerned because you don't know where it's going. And even with the maps that we have now, it's hard to tell where it is in relation to my operation.

Another comment is I'd like to see meetings held locally about when a decision is made as to where the power lines will go. And you can see, it's greatly affecting the Imperial Valley, and Ramona is kind of a way to go for the meetings for anybody down here.

Third comment is — and it's already been mentioned, is — I also feed cattle, and I've seen what electricity can do to cattle, and getting dairies into the Imperial Valley is a goal for the Valley, and power lines won't help that, and having a power line go directly over the present area, that's not going to help.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

I'll read ahead the next several speakers so you know who's coming up after Ed McGrew. Marie Barrett, John Pierre Menvielle, Scott Martin and Jeff Martin.

Mr. McGrew?

**MR. ED MCGREW:** Yes. My name is Ed McGrew. I'm a long-time resident of the Valley and currently have a consulting company called NuDairy One. I represent an absentee landowner that has spent over \$25,000 in rezoning and designing or having the preliminary dairy design plan for his property, which is in the vicinity of this proposed line.

About 15 years ago, our county I felt did a very progressive job of zoning the Valley. And along with that was the zoning along the western perimeter of the Valley, a zone for heavy agriculture, which is dairies.

We've touted to dairymen out of the Valley that we have a very conducive and very welcome governmental environment down here for them to relocate. We've also stressed that the west side of the Valley is a place for them to be — slightly cooler, a little more air movement, and particularly, it's 12 to 13 miles away from any populated areas. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to know that dairies do have certain odors, certain dust, and maybe flies for that matter.

I've personally been in contact with three other dairymen from out of the Valley that are seriously looking at the Valley — that's in addition to the Bullfrog brothers — who are interested in relocating here, and we're focusing on that entire area, the very area west of Imperial, along that perimeter, to be the preferred area for these dairies. And as a matter of fact, I hate to even call these fellows and tell them these hearings are going on because I worry now that just this cloud hanging over us is going to be terribly detrimental.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Marie Barrett.

**MS. MARIE BARRETT:** Good afternoon. My name is Marie Barrett, and I am representing the conservation committee of the San Diego/Imperial County Chapter of the California Native Plant Society.

After reviewing the Sunrise Powerline SDG&E application to the PUC with attention to native plant conservation, our representatives have drawn the following conclusions, which I will summarize:

One, SDG&E failed to include in their list of goals that any major development must meet the Federal Endangered Species Act by respecting the integrity of multiple species conservation plans.

Two, we have noted a flawed core listing of all plant species in the Proponent's Environmental Analysis.

Three, it is difficult to determine if a particular plant is in a given location. Node segments are confusing.

Four, it appears not all species of concern are listed in particular node segments.

Five, it is difficult to reference field survey data with tables and charts. It's grossly premature to determine acreages for mitigation.

Six, ten days' notice is not sufficient advance notice for plant removal during construction to protect species of concern.

Seven, the proposed route has changed since the PEA, so the document as prepared does not protect species of concern.

Eight, access roads necessary for construction and maintenance will be very disruptive for the life of the line.

Our conclusion at this time is that the documents supporting this application fail at this stage to analyze risks to rare, endangered, or threatened native plants, and, therefore, it cannot be conclusively stated that there are or are not risks to species of concern.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay, thank you.

John Pierre Menvielle.

**MR. JOHN PIERRE MENVIELLE:** Okay. My name is John Pierre Menvielle. I reside at 897 West Ross Road here in El Centro. The comments I want to make have been stated by the Farm Bureau and Mr. Van Leeuwen and Mr. McGrew about the West Valley.

A 500 kV line going through there is going to be detrimental to the Van Leeuwen dairy and also to the future plans of getting dairies here in the Valley. The dairy attraction committee has worked for the last 12 years to start attracting dairies out of the Chino area. So the proposed route will do economic damage here in the Valley.

The hay industry is very dependent upon the dairies, and the dairies are moving out of the Chino area and we're trying to get some of them to come here, which will be an economic boon to this area.

I know that when we first got involved in these lines, they were talking about running it through the bombing range, and I thought that's where it was going to go, and then all of a sudden, we show up with that route.

Another thing, I farm in the south end of the Valley and we have land down there, and a big 500 kV line goes through the valley in the south end and in the area of the — it does have single poles, and they are much better to have single poles from the crop duster standpoint and from the farming standpoint. And we have one ranch where the 500 kV line goes right over the top of it. You can stand over it and that thing hums like crazy. And even if you get a ways away from it, you can still hear it. So I know that Mr. Van Leeuwen's dairy would be greatly affected by the electricity in the lines. And so this route through the agriculture area on the western side of the Valley really needs to be relooked at.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Scott Martin, please.

**MR. SCOTT MARTIN:** My name is Scott Martin and I appreciate the opportunity to give these comments. I do plan on doing written examples, but I came here to see how this process was going and figured I'd take the opportunity to mention a couple of things.

I would really like to make sure that in this process we look at the correlation between the Sempra Energy LNG plant terminal that's going in in Baja California, where I understand that they have invested

\$1.5 billion in putting in a liquified natural gas terminal, and my understanding is that that is supposed to supply a significant amount of gas for power plants on both sides of the international border. And my concern would be — is if this line goes in, what are the effects on air quality on both sides of the border, particularly in Imperial County, because of the power plants that are currently in place south of the border that do supply power into California.

I would just like to note that there are some inaccuracies, or at least I believe there are some inaccuracies, between the Notice of Preparation and even SDG&E's application.

There's a misprint on the number of acres that would potentially be impacted. These are state wilderness acres. I believe that the NOP says 43 acres and the application says 73 acres. And I also noted a difference in the amount of miles through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. I think we're only talking half a mile, but I think one document says 22 and the other says 23, or says 22.6.

I don't believe that there was any survey done for paleontology along the line and I think that that should be done. I think that there may potentially be some impacts too on paleontology resources.

Unincorporated communities are grossly under noted in the application. In particular, the community of San Felipe, the community of Ranchita, the community of Santa Ysabel, they are not listed as unincorporated communities, and indeed I believe that they are.

I would like to echo the comments of the woman from the California Native Plant Society. Those exact same comments could go to endangered animals, federally listed species, along the line.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

The next speaker up is going to be Jeff Martin, then Denis Trafecanty, T. Huss, and Kelly Fuller.

**MR. JEFF MARTIN:** My name is Jeff Martin. I'd like to talk about some alternative thinking.

I feel that you've moved the line up against our farmland area. Originally, it was out in the desert going through military land. I feel you can bury this line underground to make the military happy. Right now on our Chocolate Mountains we have gas lines going through which service the Imperial Valley. And this is a bombing range and you can go up there and watch them bomb, from a distance.

The line can be broken down into smaller voltage lines and run through vaults underground. This also will not affect the wildlife as much because it will still be movable underneath it. It will be more natural looking for resources around us. To me, just running those big power lines just kind of makes the desert look ugly in itself, and I think we can think of some other ways. We can come and bury these lines, hide them from society, where we can be more in tune with nature.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: One thing I might say, the pronoun used was “you” moved them. I just want to be clear that the Applicant is not sitting up here and these are the agencies that are reviewing the application.

Denis Trafecanty.

**MR. DENIS TRAFECANTY:** Thank you.

Susan mentioned the three R's that SDG&E — my name is Denis Trafecanty. I came from Poway to come to this meeting, and I live in Santa Ysabel. I have a business in Poway that I share with my partner, and we're not worried about a shortage in electricity in 2010. But the three R's of SDG&E, I just have to comment on it because it was on that board.

As far as renewables, untested technology has been driven out by some other utility companies. There's six prototypes in Sandia Park in New Mexico, and the experts — I'm not an expert, I'm a finance guy. The experts, as you go along in your travels, you'll find out that — it's highly questionable, but the executive that's running it, that spoke to me the last week at the County Board of Supervisors, is a retired executive from SDG&E. Renewables, we talked about.

Reliability. It's kind of comical to me. If you can do in-county generation of power in San Diego County at Carlsbad, where they want to move the plant, and make it more efficient using natural gas — and the Chula Vista plant, to me that's a heck of a lot more reliable.

Both of these lines, the — the proposed Sunrise Powerlink and the SWPL, I guess they call it, the Southwest Powerlink, would be coming out of the Imperial power station right here. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out how to disable all of our power — if you took that substation out.

And also — I'm just showing you something. Last time I went to Mammoth Lakes, I went through Mojave. There's five lines on this piece here. These are five transmission lines going right next to each other. So this story about reliability, you can't use SWPL's line and run another line along that, that's just the story; it's not the facts.

And reduced costs — they just raised their prices 13 cents. They are going to have a five percent increase in power in January of '08, they are proposing. This is the same company that said we were short of energy supply, and they manipulated the supply and they manipulated the gas prices. They ran — they did contract sending energy out of the state and bringing it back in at higher prices. And they are the same company that's going to spend \$350 million to pay us back. So the reduced costs doesn't compute for me either.

Real quickly, 120 miles of this whole line goes through the back country. I consider myself the same as these folks from Imperial Valley here. I'm in Santa Ysabel. The pictures in the application, if you look at the pictures that they showed you to tell you that it's less than significant impact, they are pictures of roads. Some smart cameraman took pictures to make it look like — I plead for you to drive through Borrego Springs and go up through the grade and come across Santa Ysabel and go down into Ramona and see what we look like. We want to preserve that.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

T. Huss. And I don't know when people came in towards the later comments. They may not have heard that we have three minutes, and when you have one minute left, I'll put up my finger, like that (indicating).

MR. T. HUSS: I'll try to keep it brief.

When you all get over there to the gas and electric company, the first thing when you go out there — it's new soil, it's not old. You got old dirt in the mountains. This is new soil. What are we going to do with the wells out there if something happens when they go out there? Are they going to drive pile? You can auger down, but the water level out there goes up and down. But if they drive pile and hit rock, what's

to keep them from cracking that rock and the water shooting off somewhere else? Nobody said nothing about that.

One gentleman mentioned the hum. Out in the desert, you can hear for miles, somebody just talking like this, for miles. You get that hum out there — I don't understand it. People can't live like that. If — the electromagnetic fields are dangerous to be around for two minutes or more because it affects your body. How they keep moving them over the highway on 78 and 86 where you can't get away from it — ten miles on 86 and 10 miles up on 78. I don't understand that.

On the maps they made — they made those in 1994 — they were already labeled “Powerlink,” or “Desert Powerlink,” whatever. 1994, that's 12 years ago.

Figures 2 and 3, the desert link, No. 2, and Figure 3, the blowup of the park. The desert link is an inch and a quarter equals five miles. Figure 3, an inch and 5/16ths equals two miles. You can't see anything. It is the least resolution of them all. But on the Central East Substation, Figure 4B, you got two inches to 800 feet.

Well, I believe they give us those poor maps because they want — don't want us to see the fields they were going through, the total destruction of the desert that they are going to come up with, because they are out there on quads right now and go anywhere they damn well please, just tearing up everything. No respect.

Now, how are they going to keep the people off the roads, and are the people in Ocotillo Wells just supposed to sit out there and breath the dust from the wind from their work plots and the roads that go to the powers, or — the people that come out there on the weekends are just going to go over those roads that they are supposed to build. Are we supposed to get asthma? That's ridiculous. The wind blows out there.

Do you know if you go out there with a flashlight in your hand, underneath 500 kilovolts you can have light saber star wars out there. I did it down in Tecate. I was going to try and go down here on the highway and have the CHP just give me warnings. I can show it does happen.

You can't put windmills out there; they kill birds. That's just ridiculous.

All right. I'll be back. I'll wait.

MR. MICHAELSON: The last speaker is Kelly Fuller.

**MS. KELLY FULLER:** Thank you.

I'm Kelly Fuller. I'm from the San Diego and Imperial County Sierra Club. Tonight I'm just going to be giving a portion of our comments on Imperial County. We have lots more that we can submit on the later due date.

The San Diego and Imperial County Sierra Club is opposed to the Sunrise Powerlink and feels that there is a number of other energy solutions that should be selected instead, much as we would select different kinds of food to make a healthy balanced meal.

These potential alternatives that should be studied in the environmental review documents include better programs for conservation, demand management and energy efficiency; more local renewable energy, based on proven technology, not experimental technology; replacing current transmission lines with new wires that can conduct more electricity; more local power generation.

If we need more transmission lines to move more renewable energy from Imperial Valley, we should look at upgrading existing very high-voltage lines, such as the existing Southwest Powerlink or existing IID high-voltage lines, rather than creating new high-voltage transmission corridors. That's what I have on alternatives.

I'd like to — I think you're going to give me the one-minute sign.

Impacts that should be studied are the air quality and related human health impacts of increased power production in Mexicali — and that would be new power plants and increased production from existing power plants — should that power be transmitted over the Sunrise Powerlink, because both CAISO, the California Independent System Operator, and SDG&E say they cannot guarantee that renewable energy will be transmitted over it; air quality impacts from particulates added to the air by off-road vehicles driving on the new access roads created for the project; cumulative ozone production from power lines and related equipment; and the PEA's section on air pollution caused by power line construction is particularly inadequate.

Impacts of this project on global warming and fulfillment of California's global warming policies, especially if the Stirling Solar project and/or other renewable energy projects are not completed by the time the Sunrise Powerlink project would start transmitting power. We found the PEA's analysis of the timing of renewable energy development projects particularly inadequate.

Noise impacts. We are skeptical of the noise readings conducted by Greystone because they don't match our own experience.

We're concerned about impacts on endangered species and rare species.

And groundwater. We very much, like the last speaker, are concerned with groundwater impacts from earth compaction and subsoil effects created by the road and power line construction and what they would do to wildlife and wells.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: We appreciate everyone providing us with the written copies. That way we have a complete record of what you have had to say.

That exhausts all of the speaker registration cards that I've been handed today. Do you have one more for me?

Why don't you go ahead and give us your name and start speaking. I can wait for the card to catch up.

**MS. V. DOYLE:** I'm V. Doyle and I live in Imperial County as a resident. And where the current proposed line is going along the western edge of Imperial County, the line goes within a half a mile or less of several residents with small school-age children, and I'd request that that line be moved back away from them.

Also, one thing that I've been — there's really been no notification to Imperial County residents. San Diego Gas & Electric filed August 4th. They've had almost full-page ads in the newspaper, and not once have they mentioned that their preferred route there is going through Imperial County at all, from the south to the north along the whole entire western edge. They have full-page ads, they don't say anything about any of this. And essentially, they don't want people in the Imperial County to notice and know.

And I request that the Public Utilities Commission come to Imperial County and have a meeting, like they had in Ramona on September 13th, and I request that they put it in the paper and show the route so that the people will know. Because the few people you see here, they are just microscopic. Most people don't even know; they have no clue. You know, maybe some of them want it, maybe they want it right there, maybe they want to destroy the whole western edge of Imperial County and its economy. Maybe that's so, but they should at least have the opportunity to know about it.

That's all I have to say.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Is there anyone who would like the opportunity to come back — well, first of all, let me check. Is there anybody who didn't sign in who would like to take this opportunity to speak? If not, I'd like to invite anyone, who would like to have what I like to refer to as a second helping, to come on up.

Yes, sir, come on up. This is T. Huss, correct?

MR. T. HUSS: Yes, sir.

This power in Mexicali, it's against the law right now for them to bring that power into America because they didn't put scrubbers on those power plants like they said they would do. So I don't know why they are doing this. I mean — unless they are going to take it to Canada, which I think they are going to do.

But I want to go back to this power. If they go out there and they drive pile or they do dynamic compaction — and I've done both of them when I was running cranes — I guarantee you some of these wells are going to go out.

Now, when they go up there and do this and then the guy's well doesn't work, they are going to tell him to go to the lawyer department. And then this is going to be just a long, drawn-out — and I guarantee you there's some old wells out there.

And dynamic compaction — I don't know if you're aware of it. They usually lift about (inaudible) pounds, pick it up 75, 80 feet, and drop it two or three times until the ground is packed, and then come in and drill on the side or whatever. Some of them old wells out there — use it or lose it. They are not cased all the way to the bottom. You shake them up like that and that man's well is going to cave in. There's a \$90,000 well out there; it's expensive. And there's not a thing that these people are saying about it.

On those maps, the density that they have shows — about the park and their blowup, you can't see anything in there. And they took them in 1994, which 12 years ago, and then the last five or six years, this place has grown. It was the last cheap property in San Diego County out there. And it's grown. Trust me. And the maps that they have don't show any people, don't show any flowers.

The one map they have, the main one, that has all the lines of — somebody just went we'll put a line here and there and a line there and a line there. Then the next one that has the blowup, it's so high up in the air, you can't see. But yet you can go over to the — another map that doesn't mean anything, 4B, and it's two inches to 800 feet on that map. Well, you can see everything. But out there where they are going to go to the flora and the fauna, and everything else they are tearing up, the most delicate part of it. They used the worst maps. This isn't fair, nor is it right, nor is it needed.

If it's all for brand new houses, and they haven't been made yet, you can put solar panels on the south-facing route. The government will pay about two-thirds of the 30- or \$40,000, so the homeowner

ends up with only about or 5- or 10,000, and that's if they don't put batteries in it. Then they only have to run the power plants at night, just half the time, until the sun comes up.

So that's about all I got to say. I'll see you again in Borrego. I'm sure we'll meet. I appreciate your listening.

**MR. MICHAELSON:** Thank you.

And I'm sure others on the panel would echo this. Everyone has been providing extremely helpful, relevant, appropriate comments, giving us a whole range of issues to look at and examine in more detail. So as far as this being already a good scoping process, you guys have set a very high standard.

I think you wanted a second chance. Just give us your name.

**MR. DENIS TRAFECANTY:** Denis Trafecanty, Santa Ysabel.

I just wanted to add a little bit. I know Anza-Borrego State Park is a crown jewel, and we'd never take lands away from the park and — for the purpose — like, is the park a land bank for future development? I don't think it was ever planned to be that way. I don't think anyone ever planned that.

But in addition to the state park, there's the remote back country. All through Santa Ysabel, Mesa Grande, and Grapevine Canyon and Ranchita, there's a tremendous amount of property there that somehow the people that governed us in past years declared it — pretty much no growth. I own 49 acres, my wife and I own it. We're allowed one house on it. If you have 80 acres in Santa Ysabel, Mesa Grande, you're allowed one dwelling.

The Williamson Act is agricultural preserves. You could declare your property as an agriculture preserve and you get tax benefits for doing it, but you're committed not to develop that land for a period of ten years. And that's a rolling ten years. And the year that you decide that you don't want to be on the Williamson Act, you have ten years before the property taxes go back up to the way they should be. What I'm trying to get across is all this back country is really remote. It was set by somebody to be remote and not to grow.

We have scenic highways. There's — I believe that this proposed — I like to use the term “proposed.” The proposed Sunrise Powerlink that is — has been — the current proposed route runs about four miles of a scenic highway, a “scenic” highway. Someone designated that as a scenic highway. Now, why do we want to run a 160-foot power line along a scenic highway?

We have people — one lady in Santa Ysabel, six-generation family, she made a goat pen, and because of the no-growth area, she was told that she couldn't put a cover on this pen. Okay. And the reason was that it's in a no-growth, scenic area, and so she had to put little dog houses in the pen to protect the goats from the rain and the wind.

And then there's another guy by me that — that he wanted to put a shed to put his motor home in. They said that's too tall, make two sheds. I'm saying why are we going to run a tower along a scenic highway and run this power back across 78 all the way down to Ramona if we can't as individual property owners? Don't we have some right? We can't even build stuff on our own property.

We had a wind storm when we first built our house. Our house was built in 2001. We had a wind storm that was in excess of a hundred-mile-an-hour wind — that can be documented. I don't know if there's records on wind. But 105 miles. Our house didn't get blown over and the roof didn't get torn off,

but our gutter got torn off on the east-facing side. I read that some of those power lines fall over suddenly, so I'm concerned about that.

And finally, when CAISO, which I think is the California Independent System Operator that gets paid for by our rate payers — they were asked to evaluate the Sunrise Powerlink. I went to the CAISO meeting. It was a real laugh. There was hundreds of people there at the San Diego regional energy office, and the gentleman there got up and said, “We're here to hear your comments, but we're not going to change our opinion.” This was a couple of days before August the 3rd.

So as you can tell, I'm a very frustrated property owner, and there's a lot of us out there. And please remember that 120 miles of the line is in the remote back country, it's not just in the city.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Anyone else who would like to add to their comments?

**MS. KELLY FULLER:** Kelly Fuller again from San Diego/Imperial County Sierra Club.

What one of the women here earlier tonight said about problems with notification, people not knowing about this, I've got to say, we have been discovering that a lot. I have been getting phone calls at home from the general public, upset because a neighbor told them; they didn't know this was going to happen. Also, there are people in the Southern San Diego County who have no idea that some of the alternative routes that may now be on the table could affect them, and yet this whole week of scoping meetings is going to pass because those people don't know what's going on.

Also, I've had some experiences now, this week, where I have talked to reporters who did not know about these scoping meetings until I press-released the reporters. So I will be happy to share my reporter E-mail list with anybody who wants it if it would help getting out the word to the media about these events.

A few more impacts we're concerned about: Fire. I don't know if everyone knows, but the desert is not fire adapted and there's an increasing problem throughout the west of what's called “type conversion,” and when you get too many fires, instead of the native vegetation coming back, you get a different kind, and deserts all over the west are turning to grassland after repeated fires. Well, that might sound good at first, it doesn't have a lot of wildlife habitat value. And it burns more easily, so you set things up for repeated series of fires.

We also are concerned about if the line gets moved back to where the original preferred route was — and I know a lot of folks are concerned about the dairy cattle. There are other concerns out there as well.

When I talked about what was then the preferred route in April. I slept out there, and one night in particular, I couldn't sleep for part of the night because I was being repeatedly buzzed by a military helicopter that was doing night-landing practice. If that 500 kilovolt line had been out there, that pilot would have been in quite a bit of danger of bashing into it. So I don't think we expect to see a situation where it's the dairy Farmers versus the military airspace.

What's going to happen with the new roads that will come in when and if they open up more remote areas to visitation? One area we're very concerned about, on what used to be the preferred route and is now an alternate, is the far western Imperial County; it's adjacent to the Carrizo Impact area. It's

marked with signs warning people to keep out because of the unexploded ordnance. I don't know about you guys, but you tell people not to go somewhere, like a child, you know where they want to go.

What is the impact on public safety going to be when you get more people coming in on those roads that are improved and therefore easier to come in on?

I want to end with just one thing about the wildlife. We'd like to know what the projections are and how many bird deaths or bird injuries would result from collisions with the line; how SDG&E would monitor deaths or injuries to these birds from collisions with the line; what would be the impact on the bird population and the danger created from the additional perches that the line would create?

For example, would this create a change in balance from the prey species to the other species. For example, the flat-tailed horned lizard. If you have increased perches out there with the birds of prey, would you see problems with the flat-tailed horned lizard population because now it's being preyed on due to more perches? And it's those kinds of sort of domino issues that we're really concerned about.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else? Yes, sir.

MR. SCOTT MARTIN: Scott Martin.

I'd like to reiterate an issue that hasn't been brought up specifically to Anza-Borrego State Park, and it would be the notice issues of this 500 kV transmission line.

Currently, and actually historically, Anza-Borrego Desert State Park has had open camping on its 500-plus miles of dirt roads where anybody can go out on any one of those roads and find a spot that is to their liking and they can camp there, and that is unique among state parks and — in California and maybe parks across the country.

I took a trip with my daughter last summer and we got in trouble from trying to open camp in Santa Barbara County. And I invited the sheriff that I dealt with to come down and spend some time in Eastern San Diego County where it's encouraged to open camp. And so all — well, I guess we'd have to except the distance of the scenic highway along Highway 78, but all of the other distance in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is open to camping, and I don't think that that has really been addressed in the document that SDG&E provided. That would be the Applicant.

There is also in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park an air route. There's a tour that anybody in a small aircraft can do, and there's a route — you can buy the booklet, and it includes Grapevine Canyon, and that is not addressed at all in their application on recreational uses in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

And there is also — there may be mention of it in writing, but in the maps that are presented, at least by Aspen and in the maps that SDG&E has in their application, there is no indication of the 500 kV — actually, that would be 500/230 kV transmission — or substation in the — again, in the unincorporated community of Ocotillo Wells, which also is not designated as an unincorporated community on SDG&E maps. And on the Aspen maps, there are no indications of the proposed 500 kV or 12 kV substation in Borrego Springs on one of the alternate alignments.

And then — I touched on it a little bit before, but I want to make sure that it really gets touched on adequately. It's grossly undervalued — I don't know what the right word is — the impacts to animals. I would really say along the whole route, including the multiple species conservation areas as well as in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. I think there are just a whole lot of species that are not listed that could

be impacted, and these may not necessarily be federally listed endangered species, but they could be species of concern, and I would hope that we would take the time to look at all of those.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

All right. We mentioned that we would also provide the opportunity, after we took public comment, for questions of clarification.

If I could be clear about that. Remember, again, we're at the scoping stage, so if you ask what have you concluded about the impacts to X, they haven't, so they are not going to be able to answer questions like that. But to the degree to which there may be some lack of clarity about the proposed action itself or the alternatives or steps in the process for the EIR/EIS, if anyone has a question like that, the panel's prepared to try to answer those questions, or they might have to do some more research and get back to you.

Just so we can get everything on the record, sir, if you have a question, if you wouldn't mind coming back to the podium to ask it.

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**MR. DENIS TRAFECANTY:** Denis Trafecanty from Santa Ysabel.

I am concerned about the word, "mitigation." And I do know that the president of — the lady from the Anza-Borrego Foundation, a foundation that's been around for many, many years, has been buying up — that foundation has been buying up lands that are owned by private property owners in Borrego Springs and then they donate it to the park. And I do know that I've heard through her — I was at the San Diego County Board of Supervisors meeting last week — that SDG&E is now purchasing this land, raising up the prices, and basically making the Anza-Borrego foundation inept.

So my question of you is, what does mitigation mean, that it was looking on the sites? Does that mean that there's thought that we may permit the utility to run this transmission line through the park if they donate lands to the park that are somewhere else in there? What does mitigation mean?

MR. MICHAELSON: Let's see if we can get you a start of the answer to that.

MS. BLANCHARD: Basically, what we're talking about is under the requirements of NEPA/CEQA, what mitigation monitoring would occur if the project or some kind of amended project is approved. There is adopted mitigation measures that would go along with that. Per the CEQA and NEPA requirements, we would be monitoring all of the adopted mitigation measures that the decision-makers would make. That's just strictly on the NEPA/CEQA law.

Mitigation monitoring is caring and making sure that the mitigation measures that are adopted are in fact enforced and carried out, and we have an extensive mitigation monitoring program with our consultants who are out there monitoring the construction process the whole way.

Susan, do you want to add to that?

MS. LEE: Just with respect to defining mitigation, there's a huge range of options, from things as simple as enforcing a speed limit for construction workers driving along on a dirt road, keeping a speed

limit of 10 or 15 miles an hour, which keeps dust down, to things like doing surveys the day before certain construction activities occur so you make sure we're not affecting a population of some endangered animal that may be there that wasn't there when you did the survey, to things like you mentioned.

Mitigation can include, if the impact is determined to be a loss of a certain amount of habitat, that SDG&E purchase similar lands here that mitigates the loss of land in one place. So there's a huge range in the definition of mitigation, from the very, very site specific to a way that you can more regionally balance loss and gain of habitat.

**MR. DENIS TRAFECANTY:** This is Denis Trafecanty.

The fact that they are already purchasing the property makes me, as a concerned citizen, feel like this is a *fête accompli*. We're going through this process, and maybe all we're going to do is trade properties at the end. It's very frustrating.

You know, I'm supposed to be — I'm going to all these meetings. I'm working to try to earn a living, and I know when SDG&E is here, they are getting paid, and we're all leaving our job early, or doing whatever we're doing, to try to express our concerns. But when I see that — as a finance person, it sounds like some decisions have already been made, because they are buying all this property up.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay, thank you, sir.

Other questions that you'd like to ask?

**MS. KELLY FULLER:** Kelly Fuller, San Diego/Imperial County Sierra Club.

I'm wondering if we see some alternative routes, new alternative routes, that avoid the park, and I'm thinking specifically in Southern San Diego County, will there be a scoping process for those new routes, because those people don't know right now, and that you would not be able to get their input if there isn't going to be one.

MS. BLANCHARD: I think that's something that we need to consider and talk about amongst ourselves. But the NEPA/CEQA process evolves, you develop a Draft, and it goes out with these alternatives and --

MR. MICHAELSON: Good question for a lawyer, which we're not. So let's take that under consideration.

MS. BLANCHARD: But it's a great idea and I think we need to talk about it.

MS. KELLY FULLER: May I ask?

One thing I want to add is one of those local communities, Boulevard, is actually going to discuss this at their meeting this Thursday, and they are very uncomfortable — if — especially if you go on the website and you look at the PUC's data request, you can see specific areas of south county mentioned, and none of those people know about it, or virtually none.

About the mitigation, you were talking about monitoring. Does that monitoring only happen during construction, or is there monitoring that goes on later to make sure if something, for instance, say, some mitigation was on non-native plant removal, that those plants cannot come back?

MS. LEE: It depends on the way the measure is written, but oftentimes a measure that requires re-vegetation will have a requirement for ongoing monitoring over a period of years. If the draft comes out and you see a measure that you don't think provides adequate monitoring — and that's something that we usually try and incorporate — we would love to have a comment on there saying this kind of thing requires ongoing monitoring. I know with desert vegetation, that's definitely an issue.

MS. KELLY FULLER: South of the Imperial Valley Substation areas, there is some Tamarisk that was cut for the relatively new power lines that go to Mexicali and it's sprouting and coming back and there doesn't seem to be any follow-up on it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Anyone else have a question of clarification about either the process or the proposed project?

**MR. DENIS TRAFECANTY:** Denis Trafecanty.

I noticed — I'm pouring through that 2000- page report with my wife and — what was really troublesome to me is SDG&E's comment about what the impact of these lines are to the aesthetics of the area. And I saw it so many times, “less than significant impact.” And I just wondered, Susan — I mean, when you go through the process, how do you evaluate comments like that?

Because I am — I mean, unless I'm totally out of it. I mean, I'm a runner, I'm an endurance runner. I've been all over the park up in the mountains, and it's one of the most beautiful places in the whole world, this area that we're talking about. A lot of people say it doesn't even seem like it belongs in California. It's so unique, this area of the Cuyamacas and the Anza-Borrego. How do you evaluate those kinds of comments?

MS. LEE: You're talking about the impact conclusions made?

MR. DENIS TRAFECANTY: Yes.

MS. LEE: Basically, we look at them and we move on and make our own conclusions independently, because we need to use our own assessment of the environmental setting, our own standards in terms of the way impacts are determined and our own professional judgment in terms of making impact conclusions.

And I think if you look back at documents that have been done for the CPUC over the years, you'll find many, many, many cases where the Applicant's PEA has one purpose, which is to present the project in a certain light. When you're doing an EIR/EIS for the lead agencies, the purpose is to be objective and present the information that we believe is fair and complete and, we hope, impartial.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, sir, did you have a question? I have to ask you to come up to the mic, sorry, because we are recording this.

**MR. SCOTT MARTIN:** Scott Martin.

I want to make sure that we were going to — I heard earlier there was going to be some discussion on the workshop. Was that going to be talked about further?

MR. MICHAELSON: The workshop, the one with the --

MS. LEE: It was mentioned on one of the earlier slides, and I'll just go back and reiterate.

On the 13th of October, SDG&E is sponsoring a workshop at the request of the CPUC. The assigned Commissioner and the Administrative Law Judge have asked them to hold a workshop for the parties committed to be involved in this process as it starts now and continues through the next year. So it's not open to the public, but it is open to everyone who is a formal party at the proceeding.

MS. BLANCHARD: People can attend the workshop, but the parties will be the speakers mainly involved in the interaction.

MS. LEE: Several of us from the team will be there just to listen. SDG&E has also been asked to provide a summary memo in terms of the proceeding to the rest of us.

MS. BLANCHARD: Are you on the service list?

MS. LEE: I think he's a party.

MS. BLANCHARD: Okay. So you have seen the ruling. And it lays out the particular process of what they are going to do at the October 13th workshop.

MR. MICHAELSON: So you're a party, so you'll be there.

**MR. SCOTT MARTIN:** Scott Martin.

I thought that there was an indication that there was going to be some more specifics about that. And I am a party so I'm sure that I will get the information, but I thought maybe you had some more specifics about where it was going to happen.

MS. BLANCHARD: As the Energy Division staff person, you saw the ruling, and it directed SDG&E to do this, and it stated what they should address, and there was an agenda that was put out.

MR. SCOTT MARTIN: Right.

MS. BLANCHARD: And then they had discussion about when to have it, and I believe there's a draft agenda out there for what that workshop will be about. I'm not sure if that agenda is changing in motion at this point. I've seen an agenda, that's all.

MR. SCOTT MARTIN: Okay.

MS. BLANCHARD: That agenda would be what the workshop would be about.

MR. SCOTT MARTIN: Okay. I just had not seen any specifics yet and I thought maybe you had them.

MS. BLANCHARD: No.

MR. SCOTT MARTIN: But I will wait patiently.

MR. MICHAELSON: You know as much as she knows at this point, I believe.

MR. SCOTT MARTIN: I guess I would like to just clarify that as a party we are allowed to invite —

MR. MICHAELSON: Observers.

MR. SCOTT MARTIN: — observers?

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes. Parties are going to be interacting with SDG&E because they are parties and this is a workshop set up around this ruling that is stating this. But it is an open, public meeting where other people can attend. It even says in there that the Energy Division staff won't facilitate it, but that we will attend. So anyway, it is a public meeting.

MS. LEE: I think the one thing SDG&E has requested is that you tell them how many people you are bringing. That was in one of their E-mails.

MR. MICHAELSON: They need to know whether they need Qualcomm stadium or whatever.

We just have two last slides — before we lose anybody — I just don't know how many more questions we are going to have. If you want to --

MR. T. HUSS: My name's T. Huss.

There's one more thing. On that preferred route, the route that the young lady over here walked, San Diego Gas & Electric, IID Department of Water and Power, California Water Authority and Borrego Water District want to put a waterline from the end of the East Main Canal and follow that exact power line to Borrego Springs at the cutoff there at Canyon Springs Road. It will be at least 200 feet wide for that power line.

Now, if they want to go back to that, you've got to ask them about that road that they are going to put in there. They won't talk to me about it. They say it has nothing to do with the power line. But it's the same people that are going to bend that waterline to Borrego Springs that want to put this power line in there. If they run it on the same place, they are going to have a 200-foot-wide road.

Now, you need to talk to SDG&E and IID about it. They would not discuss that subject. They said it had nothing to do with it. Some examples: You're going to put a power line here, you can't come within 150 feet of it. Then you're going to have a 200-foot denuded swath through the desert on the same utilities, so — and if they are all involved in it, I don't see the difference.

So anyway, I asked those people, San Diego Gas & Electric and IID, about monitoring stations on my properties. I said if — I wanted them on there right now and — so if they wouldn't put them on there, I'd pay for it and have them — I have to know where to find them. Because if they come out there and do what they want to do and I start eating dust, I'm not going to have anything to do with — a year ago, it wasn't here, and now I got it. They won't discuss it with me. And they will not put dust monitoring stations on my properties, and I just do not understand it.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. If we could go to the last two. I just want to mention that we appreciate everyone who did take the time and energy to come out and offer us comments orally. But we know that there are people who either have a lot more to say or aren't comfortable with public speaking. So please be aware that Billie Blanchard with the CPUC and Lynda Kastoll with BLM are the people specifically taking the lead in reading your comments, and that written comments will be sent to the care of Aspen Environmental Group, to that address. There's also an E-mail, so you can send them that way as well. So there's lots of ways for you to get your written comments in.

If we could go to the next one. There is a website, which will be kept updated as details become available. There are 18 information repositories in case you don't have Internet access and you want to have background documents to look at. If you have questions or, again, don't know what the process is, need to know what's happening, when is the next meeting, those types of things, you can email that address, sunrise@aspeng.com. And there's also an 800 telephone line that you can call if you need project information.

So the CPUC and BLM have tried their best as technology allows — I think carrier pigeon is the only thing they haven't included to try to make it easy for you to get your questions answered throughout this process.

Is there anyone else that has something to say, that they wanted to say tonight?

Okay, yes?

**MS. KELLY FULLER:** Kelly Fuller, San Diego/Imperial County Sierra Club.

Pardon me if I missed this, if it was answered earlier. Do we have an estimated date yet of when the schedule for the proceeding will be released?

**MS. BLANCHARD:** Well, there's two things — go ahead. Okay, I will.

As I had indicated. There's two things going on. The ALJ, Administrative Law Judge, Steve Weissman needs to prepare a scoping memo, which will basically outline all of the issues and the dates that things will be addressed. It's my understanding at this point that he's supposed to have that out by mid-October. The CEQA/NEPA schedule had some issues that we needed to address. We hope those get resolved such that we can finalize a schedule for the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final, and at that point, when we do that, we are going to send out a card to the entire CEQA/NEPA mailing list to indicate what those dates are. But right now, I can't come here tonight with those dates.

**MR. MICHAELSON:** So stay tuned.

**MS. BLANCHARD:** Hopefully soon. I would like to know soon because we've got a lot of work to do.

**MS. KELLY FULLER:** By “some” issues, was one of the issues you're referring to as one the request for some of the biological surveys to be done in the summer and the question about whether or not it will come out in the spring when there was still surveys in the summer?

**MS. BLANCHARD:** You're right that that came up at the Pre-Hearing Conference, and that is an issue.

**MS. KELLY FULLER:** The other thing I want to ask is a number of us have photos of the route and of wildlife and all kinds of stuff that's out there, and we're wondering what's the best way to submit them — submit paper copies, submit them electronically? What's the easiest way for you folks to look at them?

**MS. LEE:** I'd say the ideal thing would be if you can PDF them. Then it makes it easier for us to direct them to our team and we don't have to worry about JPGs and file sizes.

**MS. KELLY FULLER:** So we would go ahead and send that in as part of the comment like --

**MR. MICHAELSON:** Yes.

The court reporter desperately needs a finger break here, so I'm going to call a temporary recess. If ten minutes from now people are still around and want to start up again, we can do that, but for now we're going to take a recess. Thank you.

(Recess.)

MR. MICHAELSON: This is Lewis Michaelson. We've just recessed for about 30 minutes. We have not had anyone new come for the past hour, so we're going to go ahead and officially adjourn this meeting. Thank you very much for coming. It's 7:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 7:00 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

\* \* \* \*

**SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT**  
**Reporter's Transcript of the CPUC/BLM Scoping Meeting**  
**for Preparation of a Draft EIR/EIS**

Held 4:00 p.m. October 3, 2006  
At Ramona, California

Reported by:  
Shannon L. Marcos, CSR No. 8348

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Lewis Michaelson - Katz & Associates, Public Facilitator  
Susan Lee - Aspen Environmental Group  
Billie Blanchard - California Public Utilities Commission  
Tom Zale & Lynda Kastoll - Bureau of Land Management

Presentation: pages 3 to 9  
Public Comments begin on page 10  
Q&A begins on page 20

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

Eric Larson ..... 10  
Mimi Limerez ..... 10  
Peter Schultz..... 10, 17  
Jim Davis..... 11  
Diane Conklin..... 11, 14  
Paul Tarr ..... 12, 17  
Sharon Lynch ..... 13, 19  
Don Larson ..... 14  
Dennis Trafecanty ..... 14, 19  
John Bremer ..... 18

**Q&A, BY SPEAKER**

Diane Conklin ..... 20  
Dennis Trafecanty ..... 21  
John Bremer ..... 22  
Kelly Fuller ..... 22  
Sharon Lynch ..... 23  
Unidentified Speaker ..... 23

## STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. I ask everyone who is not presently seated to please take a seat. I encourage you to sit as far forward in the room as possible so that the acoustics are better and you can see the screen better as well. If the people at the posters could wrap up those conversations, it would be very distracting to the rest of the proceedings. So, Tom, that means you wrap this up, okay. You may want to turn off your cell phones and other things that beep.

My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work for a firm called Katz & Associates. We are under contract through Aspen to the California Public Utilities Commission to help support these public scoping meetings. I am here to moderate all these scoping meetings being held this week.

This meeting, as you may or may not know, is being held to satisfy both the federal requirement and the National Environmental Policy Act as well as the California Environmental Quality Act. That's both the EIR and the EIS, State and federal respectively.

Some of you may be unfamiliar with the scoping process under the EIR/EIS process. We want to make sure that we orient you so that you clearly understand where we are. This is a several-step process and this is the very beginning as far as the impact review and analysis. There's a very specific purpose to tonight's meeting.

In terms of who we have with us tonight, I introduced myself and I will be going over the scoping process. Seated directly to my right is Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group. She's going to be covering the description of the proposed project. Billie Blanchard with the California Public Utilities Commission seated next to her will talk about the CPUC process and the schedule. And then we have two representatives with the Bureau of Land Management, Lynda Kastoll and Tom Zale, who are going to talk about their special piece of this in terms of where the Bureau of Land Management plays into the process. Then Susan Lee will wrap up with some more details about what's to come and how the EIR/EIS is actually prepared and what you can expect as we go through that process. Then we're going to get to what is really the most important part of the scoping meeting and that is your opportunity to offer us your comments.

I've already have several speaker registration cards that have been handed to me. I will be calling those in the order in which they have been filled out. If you haven't done so and you want to speak, you can go back any time to Dan, who is seated there at the table, and fill one out and he'll get it up to me. If, however, you are like most Americans and afraid of public speaking, don't feel left out if you don't speak tonight. There are ample opportunities to give written comments. And written comments are given the same consideration as oral comments will be offered here tonight.

The purpose of scoping is to inform you, the public and responsible agencies, about an upcoming project for which the EIR/EIS is going to be prepared. It's to tell you about the review process, and more importantly, the input regarding the potential alternatives to the proposed project and the scope of issues to be studied the EIR/EIS. That's why it's called a scoping meeting.

We already had one meeting yesterday in El Centro. It went very well. It was very informative. And we've already picked up several new things to look at and to examine. If we can identify additional issues of concern, that means scoping is working. Then, a scoping report will be prepared and distributed to the repository and placed on the project website. So even if you don't go to all of the meetings, you'll be able to see what the differences or similarities were between what was offered in one location versus another as well as the written comments.

The key players, as you probably know, are first, the California Public Utilities Commission, which is the lead agency of the CEQA process, second, Bureau of Land Management, the agency for the NEPA process, and finally Aspen Environmental Group. As you quickly learn this is a world full of acronyms, so I hope you'll stay with me on this. An acronym you're probably already familiar with is SDG&E, the Applicant. They are not going to appear tonight. This is an opportunity for the agencies who are doing an environmental review to hear from you independently. There are a number of people here who are going to be involved in the environmental process so that they can hear your comments firsthand.

I want to emphasize that there is no decision being made tonight. Again, we're early in the process. This is really more information gathering, input, data gathering. The people here are not making decisions. They just want to hear all the comments as we go throughout the various locations in Imperial and San Diego County firsthand.

I'm going to turn it over to Susan Lee who is going to go through the description of the proposed project.

MS. LEE: I'm Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group and I'm managing the EIR/EIS environmental report on this project. I will briefly describe the project, but not in as much detail, to save time.

The Notice of Preparation that we've handed out to you has a fairly detailed description of the project itself on Pages 4 through 8 and also a fairly detailed set of maps.

One thing I want to make sure that you know that we can do for you is we can help you find your individual property on the really detailed maps we have in the back of the room. So feel free after the comment period is over and we're in a break to come find one of us to help find your own property on that map.

The Sunrise Powerlink project is 150 miles of new transmission line proposed by San Diego Gas & Electric. The first part is 500 kilovolt, which is the high voltage line primarily in Imperial County and coming into San Diego County up by Warner Springs, where there's a proposed new substation. The second part is a 230 kilovolt line that will run through the rest of San Diego County, including this area here just south of where we are in Ramona, and all the way out to the coast at the Penasquitos Substation.

To highlight on the maps that are included in the NOP: the parts surrounding the area where we are today are the maps shown on Figure 4A, which is what we're calling the Central Link. It's the upper part of the 500 kV portion running up near Warner Springs and down through Santa Ysabel. There's a very detailed map in here of the proposed substation, which is also fairly near Warner Springs, to give you a sense of the way the substation will be laid out. And then there are two maps of the Inland Valley Link. One that's an overview coming in from east of Ramona down towards Mussey Grade. Then there's an underground segment that's south along San Vicente and Gunn Stage Road that San Diego Gas & Electric has proposed. So if you have questions on where your properties are with respect to that, again, we'll be happy to talk to you afterwards.

There are a couple of other components of that property that are physically separate from there. There are some substation upgrades that will have to occur. I think there's one final map that shows the location of those upgrades, substations that are separate from the route itself.

So one other thing I would like to point out is, in addition to the Applicant, San Diego Gas & Electric, there's another utility entity that's involved in this project, the Imperial Irrigation District. And the IID has a Memorandum of Agreement, with San Diego Gas & Electric under which IID would

ultimately own, operate and construct the 500 kV portion of the line in Imperial County and a little ways into San Diego County, ending at the Narrows Substation, which is shown on map Figure 1.

The next slide shows San Diego Gas & Electric's three main project goals. If you've been to their earlier meetings, I imagine you've heard this before. The number one goal that San Diego Gas & Electric has presented in its application is to maintain the reliability of the electric system. The second one is to promote renewable energy. The reason that SDG&E has proposed for building a line into Imperial County is to have access to the potential renewable resources out there, primarily being solar and geothermal, because there are solar resources in the desert and also the geothermal fields at the south end of Salton Sea. The third goal is to reduce energy costs. Having an additional line into San Diego would allow for the configuration of the electric system in a way that would reduce costs to San Diego rate payers.

This next slide shows the objectives of the project. There are eight of them. They're much more detailed, but they basically all tie into those project goals. They deal with reliability, with renewables. The last couple are land use principles that SDG&E used to define where they're siting the route based on a principle to avoid highly populated areas.

I will turn this over to Billie to talk about the CPUC process.

MS. BLANCHARD: Hi, I'm Billie Blanchard. I'm the CPUC project manager for the environmental document.

I just wanted to go over some things briefly about the CPUC review process and the schedule. The CPUC has two parallel review processes. One is the general proceeding with an administrative court judge. The second is the environmental review process that I'm mostly involved in.

The Certificate of Public Convenience Necessity of the general proceeding is being led by the Assigned Commissioner who is Dian Grueneich and Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman. You may have seen both of them at the prehearing conference if you attended that in Ramona on September 13th.

The scope of the CPCN is dictated through the Public Utilities Code Section 1002, which looks at the need for the project and also considers community values, aesthetic and historic issues, recreational and park issues, as well as, of course, the environmental impacts associated with the project under CEQA.

Where we are in the schedule for the general proceedings: there was a first prehearing conference in Ramona on January 31st. And then there was a second prehearing conference and public participation hearing in Ramona on September 13th. The ALJ has to now prepare a scoping memo for the proceedings, which will outline all the issues, the schedule, et cetera. That is scheduled to be completed and sent out within the first couple of weeks of October 2006.

Now, as far as the dates, the testimony and evidentiary hearings and decisions, those are not known at this time because he has not issued that scoping memo. So that is all that I can tell you at this time.

On our Environmental Review Schedule, what's taken place is that SDG&E filed an original CPCN application December 14th, 2005. Then they filed an amended application and a Proponent's Environmental Assessment, a PEA, on August 4th, 2006. The Notice of Intent to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement, the EIS, was published in the Federal Register on August 31st, 2006. Now we have sent out a Notice of Preparation for the EIR, the NOP, which started on September 15th, 2006. The public scoping for the EIR/EIS closes on October 20th. And the thing that we don't know at this point right now is the actual release of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final certification. There is some

analysis and information that's being assessed, so we don't have those dates yet, but hopefully will soon. When we know those dates, we're going to go ahead and send out a card to everybody on our CEQA/NEPA mailing list that will indicate those dates. So that's where we are at that point.

Okay. I want to turn it over to BLM at this point.

MR. ZALE: Thank you. My name is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are here representing the El Centro field office of the Bureau of Land Management. BLM is involved in this process because San Diego Gas & Electric filed an application for right-of-way crossing public lands. There are about 33 miles of public lands involved.

In addition, we've listed on the slide behind me Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. When the patent was issued for the Park in the 1930s, it included reservation for an existing power line right-of-way. There's some discussion or consideration about what role BLM might play in the issuing of a right-of-way grant for those lands as well that we're still working on. In addition to issuing a grant as part of this process, we will be required to amend the land use plan for this area, which is the California Desert Conservation Area Plan that was written back in 1980. And the requirement for a plan amendment is to propose a line that deviates from the designated utility corridors.

In addition to working on the federal side in complying with NEPA, BLM will be responsible for conducting government-to-government consultation for interested tribes. BLM will also have the lead in consulting with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

MS. LEE: One of the other responsibilities that the lead agencies have under NEPA/CEQA is preparing this environmental document in a way that serves the needs of all the other agencies that need to issue permits on this project. There are many, many of them. We listed just a few of them here. In our scoping process we have approached each one of these agencies with a copy of the NOP and asked them to give us comments and tell us what information we need to include in this document and to let us know what their concerns are about the project itself. So we've met with some of them. We're meeting with more and we'll have an ongoing discussion with these agencies over the next month or two.

The computer just went blank. Okay. You should have in front of you the handouts for this presentation, so let's pretend you're looking at the slide of the flow chart. The EIR/EIS process is shown in a flow chart in the handout. In the second box there's a shaded box that says "EIR/EIS scoping." The purpose of this flow chart is just to let you know that despite the fact that SDG&E has been here many times over the past year or so to hear your input and work on their project, for our project per the EIR/EIS this is the very beginning step. We're here to hear your comments so we can start work on the project, define what the alternatives are, evaluate the impact and look for mitigation measures. So the little flow chart and the handout there show what the other steps we'll be going through are. I'll talk about those just briefly.

We will be preparing a project description and looking at alternatives. I'll talk a little more in detail about alternatives because we know that's a really important issue. We will be back here after the draft EIR/EIS is issued. We'll be back here to hear public comments. We'll likely have a workshop to make sure everyone understands what the concerns are and what's included in the document. There will be a 90-day public comment period, as Tom mentioned. Then the Final EIR/EIS will be issued.

The slide following the flow chart is the one that talks about the general contents and purpose of the EIR/EIS. This is really an overview just to give you a sense of the type of information that's included. We'll have a very detailed description of the setting, which is what is the environment setting right now, what the biological resources are, what the land uses are, how far away are the homes from the right-of-

way. We'll address the impacts both of the project and of the alternatives that are included in the environmental report and we'll present mitigation measures that result from the impact analysis.

The purpose of environmental document is really twofold. No. 1 is to give the two lead agencies, the CPUC and the BLM, the information they need to make a decision on the process on the project itself. And No. 2 is to allow the public to know what the impacts are and be able to provide input into the process.

So in order to do that, the major elements of the EIS/EIR are presented on that next slide. One of the reasons we include that and the slide next to that, which is the one showing the environmental disciplines, is so you know the kinds of comments that would be helpful to us when you're presenting spoken comments. If you have concerns about any of the disciplines that are listed on that environmental disciplines slide, such as visual impacts or biology or social resources, comments on those would be really helpful to us on the EIR/EIS process.

The next couple of slides deal with alternatives. This we know is a really important issue. As you may have heard, the CPUC Commissioner Dian Grueneich and the Administrative Law Judge were here on the 13th of September. The Commissioner specifically asked SDG&E to provide information on an alternative that did not pass through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, so that was actually supplied to the Commission yesterday. We just got a copy of it last night. I think there was an article in the paper today. It's very clear that an alternative analysis for this project needs to be very thorough and detailed.

The process that we use to look at alternatives under the NEPA/CEQA requirements is that an alternative must meet three main criteria. No. 1, an alternative must be consistent with most of the project objectives, not all of them. No. 2, it must be able to reduce or avoid the impacts of the proposed project. No. 3, it must be feasible, which is to say you have to be able to build it and get the permits that are required to build it. So those are our guiding principles in looking at alternatives. We're looking at a very wide range.

The next slide called "Alternatives Analysis" list the sources of information that we'll look at for alternatives. The types of alternatives we'll look at include route alternatives, or what are the different ways to provide energy into San Diego. The route that San Diego Gas & Electric has proposed is a start and we'll look at other ways, such as what the commissioner suggested, which is go around the park.

There are generation alternatives. As you probably know, there is new generation proposed within San Diego, the South Bay Power Plant, other power plants that are expected to be upgraded in the future, so we'll look at that. And we'll relook at the alternatives that SDG&E originally proposed but did not pursue. So we look at all of these independently with our own experts.

When the EIR/EIS is finished, the CPUC and the BLM need to make decisions and they have different processes for this. The CPUC itself is made up of five members of the commission who are appointed by the Governor. They will ultimately need to vote on the approval of the project through the process that Billie already described.

The BLM also has a process that's different. After the final EIR/EIS, they have a 30-day comment period on the final. Then they have a Governor's Consistency Review and that's to prepare the Record of Decision.

I will now turn this back to Lewis for scoping comments.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. I have a unique vantage point, I could see the fan stop turning on the other projector and when it does that it overheats and automatically turns itself off. You're going to get it up just in time for my last slide, aren't you? That's good.

That slide is actually a reiteration that this point in time is the scoping period. The Draft document has not been prepared by the agencies and by the environmental consultant. The most useful scoping comments that you can provide us, again, identify the location and extent of environmental impacts that you perceive could result from the proposed project, and recommend alternatives that would avoid or reduce impacts of the proposed project. So hopefully you've come prepared to do that.

We have, as I said, five speaker slips right now, maybe more will come forward in time. As you probably know this is the first of two meetings. There is another one this evening. I'm sure there will be more people showing up for that.

We are using a standard time limit of three minutes for speakers. I have a very high tech way of letting you know when your time is up. When there is one minute left, I'll put up my index finger like this. That will allow you to find a comfortable way to wrap up. When your three minutes are up, I'll put my fist up like this.

Now, we want to run through all the speakers so that everyone gets an equal chance in the beginning. Given that there are a relatively small number of speakers, what we will be able to do at that point is anybody who wants to come back up when I call second helping, can go ahead and do that. So there's no need to rush through your comments if you feel like you need more than three minutes tonight.

As you probably have noticed, seated to my left is a court reporter. She's busy typing away everything that's said through the public address system. She's going to be keeping and making a verbatim transcript of this meeting for us. She's pretty fast, but if you get going really fast, she won't be able to keep up with you, so keep that in mind.

I will actually just call names so you know what order you're in and that way you'll be prepared to come up when it's your turn. If you don't mind using this microphone up there so she can hear you clearly. I'm seeing a gentleman holding his hand up in the back. That's difficult because I don't know if everyone is going to hear you. Is there something I can help you with, sir?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Will there be a point at which people can ask --

MR. MICHAELSON: He just got to the next thing I was going to say. Thank you. After we've taken all the comments, then we will have an opportunity for people to ask questions for clarification. I want to be clear about that. What I mean is if you want to ask questions about whether the impacts are "X" or "Y," they're not there yet. Obviously they have to be questions that they can answer at this stage of the process. Hopefully that should be things like the nature of the proposed project or what are the types of issues that they anticipate looking at, things like that. So to the degree it is a question answerable at this stage, they will make every attempt to do that.

So the names that I have, and I apologize in advance if I'm mispronouncing, Eric Larson, Mimi Limerz, Peter Schultz, Jim Davis and Diane Conklin. And, again, if you have lengthy comments, you can always hand them in as written comments. And up first is Eric Larson. I have another speaker right here. Thank you. I'm sorry, I have six, Paul Tarr, and Sharon Lynch. All right.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. LARSON: Thank you. I'm Eric Larson, Director of the San Diego County Farm Bureau. And in my comments today we have three direct CEQA concerns on the proposal. First, that NEPA would propose alternate routes to convert farmland to non-agricultural use to the physical structures of power substations and exclusion of cattle from grazing areas.

Our second CEQA concern is that the project will lead to changes in the existing environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Specifically the conversion occurs when land is no longer suitable for grazing, because cattle are physically excluded or shy away from grazing land because of added human activity. When cattle no longer use the land, it will not be farmland and, therefore, converted.

Third, while attention to scenic vistas has been concentrated on the Anza-Borrego State Park, the open farming grazing lands of the county create visual character that is a community asset and worth protection.

We believe the EIR should assess impact to agriculture on all route proposals, included visual, direct impact to agriculture, and indirect impact on the economical farming that could lead to financial losses for farmers and ranchers.

Then finally as an alternative we believe priority should be placed on alternatives as a way to keep the county's agricultural resources. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Next speaker is Mimi Limerez.

MS. LIMEREZ: My name is Mimi Limerez. I'm representing the People's Powerlink and the sustainable Julian Group. We have a single message for the California Public Utilities Commission. The project submitted by SDG&E in this application is not the real project being planned by SDG&E and its parent company Sempra. The real project being planned by these companies is a project that stretches from the SDG&E plant in Mexico to the Los Angeles area. There is ample evidence for this. If you need to see the evidence for yourself, we refer you to the People Powerlink website at [www.peoplespowerlink.org](http://www.peoplespowerlink.org) where you can view a movie using Google Earth that shows the enormous massive degeneration system and its associated transmission lines connecting to the El Centro Substation from which Sunrise Powerlink originates.

In addition to the impacts to the environment, our state parks, to the lives of all the residence affected by the route of this line, perhaps the greatest impact is on our integrity. Democracy is served best when in the light of honesty. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Peter Schultz.

MR. SCHULTZ: I'm speaking on behalf of Starlight Mountain Estates owners, a group of owners of property that is just east of San Diego Country Estates in the application's segment 10P and it's on your map Figure 5A. I'll give you just a -- we filed a protest on September 8th, and so I'm going to give you just a brief summary of that.

Essentially we're simply asking that the overhead facility that's proposed in the application be instead an underground facility for just 6/10ths of a mile from the point that SDG&E is proposing to go from underground to overhead.

And a quick summary of the reasons. We feel it's discriminatory against the owners in our community, because the same justification that applies in the PEA to taking it underground through Mount Gower, an open space preserve, are precisely the conditions that we have in our community. The visual impacts would be roughly three times the current impact of the 69 kV line that's running through our valley. We have reduced fire management and fire protection. And also topography in our valley is actually more conducive to an inexpensive construction of underground as opposed to the adjacent area.

Damage to property. They're asking for 200 feet width as opposed to a 60-foot width. And then we have issues with ELF, MEF, fear by the public and substantial aesthetic damage.

Now, according to the CEQA guidelines, the negative impact in a number of areas is substantial adverse effect is scenic vistas, substantially damaging scenic resources, substantially degrading an existing visual character, providing farm and unique farmland because of our soils type there to nonuse in a biological substantial adverse affect through habitat modification, substantially affecting the movement of native and resident migratory species, especially birds. We have a wide variety of Rafter, falcons, hawks, Golden Eagles, and so on that hunt in this valley. And an overhead facility will impair their ability to live what they would think is a normal life.

MR. MICHAELSON: Mr. Schultz, your three minutes is up. You can come back if you want. Thank you. Thanks very much.

Jim Davis.

MR. DAVIS: My name is Jim Davis. I'm a rancher from Mesa Grande, Santa Ysabel area. I have some concerns that I would like to have addressed. One is I don't understand why SDG&E wants to build this powerlink prior to the approval of the renewable energy plant Sterling Energy is proposing to build. It seems to me that they're putting the cart before the horse.

The second issue is the Santa Ysabel area and basically all this back country is an open space area where the residence of San Diego County move every weekend. On the roads you'll see hundreds and hundreds of cars coming into this area to enjoy the open spaces, the agricultural endeavors that are going on, and this power line will basically reduce their ability to enjoy these open spaces.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Diane Conklin is next.

MS. CONKLIN: My name is Diane Conklin and I'm representing Mussey Grade Road Alliance, which is located here in Ramona. The alliance was formed in 1999 to preserve and protect Mussey Grade Road, which is a historic road recognized by the State for Preservation Office.

Along with many other groups in the county, the collation of CUSP, Communities United for Sensible Power, and I'm also speaking with recognition to that collation.

I'm going to speak and I hope to come back because I don't want to rush. Thank you for the opportunity to have this meeting here in Ramona. We have become very popular during this process and we hope that you like us and will come back here, right here in the Charles Nunn Performing Arts Center, for your post EIR/EIS written or draft sessions.

I will be augmenting my comments with specific comments that will be emailed to you by the deadline of October 20th. But I did want to tell you, and you may have heard this from other people, but none of us have received a hard copy of the PEA, which is over 1,000 pages. And we only have one copy

in the library. This makes it extremely difficult for people to intelligently comment, particularly in the quite speeded up process by which you need comments by 10/20. So if you have any way to ask the company to get copies to individuals who request them, we would appreciate that. And I would like to ask you to request a copy for me, Diane Conklin, the Mussey Grade Road Alliance, because I haven't been able to get one.

I would like to talk in this order about project alternatives. the CPUC development of alternatives, and the overall problem with this line.

What does that mean?

MR. MICHAELSON: That means you have one minute.

THE WITNESS: My goodness. Well, I'm going to come back up a couple of times.

SDG&E has stated the reliability with locals and lowering costs is the basis of this line. I'd like to point out as you well know that all of these lines come out of the El Centro Substation and that is in itself a reliability problem, but SDG&E has never talked about that. They only talk about the fact that they don't want to use the southwest corridor because of reliability. They don't talk about all of these lines emanating from El Centro.

As far as the renewables, I would like to talk about the Sterling Engine prototype. It is not a working example of a new and yet proven technology. And it might interest you and everyone else here to know the spokesperson for SDG&E was talking about -- excuse me, the spokesperson for Sterling is Bud Shop who used to work for SDG&E. And so that's a problem for me.

The third issue of lowering costs for electricity consumer, SDG&E Sempra according to UCAN stands to make one million dollars in the financing alone. I'll come back. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you for understanding that.

Paul Tarr.

Do you mind, I think it's easier if she can see you, so if you wouldn't mind putting it back where it was. Just makes it easier for her to do the transcript. Thank you.

MR. TARR: My name is Paul Tarr. These folks, a lot of them probably know what I look like anyway. And I'm a property owner, I'm a real estate broker, business degree.

I have a lot of problems. I'm going to try to stick to environmental, but the primary problem I have right now with the CPUC's process is that right from the beginning they were clear that they were in the process, the steps that they were going to take, that they would approve the project prior to the actual final route selection.

When they were here the last time in their order of slides they made that clear again. If that's the case, then the environmental review is not really relevant. So I'm going to make that statement right up front, because that slide was in their presentation the last time they were here.

Private property rights, the impact environmentally. A lot of large ranches and tracts that are fairly remote have been in families for generations are going to be heavily impacted by this. And I hope that this environmental -- the scope of this is going to go into some great detail with the environmental issues of those particular pieces of property, because it's simple to run something through one piece of

property that's large. It's a lot easier to do that than to run it through many smaller pieces, so I understand the route selection.

Fire considerations. I haven't heard anything on fire considerations. I haven't heard the fire department. I haven't heard the Forestry Department. I haven't heard anybody chime in on this problem of fire about the fire considerations. They're enormous out here.

Infrastructure versus commerce. My final thought -- I've got a couple of thoughts on this, infrastructure building a local facility for power. When you build power lines, it's commerce. They're a battery. You can draw up the battery at any point. What will happen is Mexico's going to realize they have a much larger market in that fuel, petroleum fuel burning plants that they have down there for power generation is going to expand. My recommendation is that a tariff be put on that power so that it's only an emergency power resource for times on the grid when the controller needs that power and to be bought at a premium to SDG&E. And that tariff be used to build infrastructure in San Diego County.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. And, again, keep in mind that there are two ways to provide comments, written and oral. And you will have a second chance to come back if you want to expand on your comments. The last speaker I have a speaker card for is Sharon Lynch.

MS. LYNCH: Good afternoon. I'm a citizen of Ramona. And I live at High Oaks Ranch, which is just off of Dye Road in Ramona. It's a community of about 100 families. And I have concerns regarding aesthetics, quality of life, and also wildlife, just like Mr. Schultz was talking about his area, which has birds and wildlife also in our area has that.

I'm concerned about quality of life, because one of the sections of this powerlink I can see right outside my kitchen window. It will be about two football fields away from me. And I'm concerned about the corona effect, the noise. And I'm retired and would like to enjoy my retirement. And most of the people in our community are also retired. These lines are going to be over two, two -- twice as long or twice as big as the original. And, as I said, I can see them right outside my kitchen window.

On the map my section that is aboveground there's actually two portions, just to the west of N27 there's a section where the lines go into a gully, which may not be so much of a problem. It may be further away. But the section directly west of N27, which is aboveground, it's a small section like Mr. Schultz was talking about of his community of homes and I would like to see an alternative of having the powerlink of underground in that particular section, because I don't think it's necessary. It's such a small area that has to be aboveground in that area.

We think that our community of 100 families is just as important as Rancho Penasquitos and Country Estates. And SDG&E gave them consideration to put their power lines underground and we would ask that they would give consideration to that in this area also.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker card that has been handed to me is Don Larson.

MR. LARSON: My name is Don Larson. I'm a resident of Ramona. The Warner Springs Airport is located approximately five miles north of the proposed 500, 250 kV substation also in the Lake Henshaw Valley. This airport is an internationally recognized glider base and destination. Glider pilots routinely fly over the area of the proposed project. Clearly the addition of 100 miles of steel cables 120 feet in the air constitutes a new and additional hazard for any glider pilot attempting an off field landing. Please explore the safety impact to the existing glider usage of this area.

Also, the visual impact of the project in the Lake Henshaw Valley will not be positive in supporting glider activity in the region. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. For those of you who would like to add to your comments, if you want to come up to the microphone here, please do.

Would you like to come up here? Sure.

MR. TRAFECANTY: I'm Dennis Trafecanty from Santa Ysabel. And I was at El Centro yesterday. I know you know that. I wanted to touch on a few things. Are we off the three-minute thing?

MR. MICHAELSON: No, because this is your first helping.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Okay. Let me just talk for three minutes about something that will be kind of fun. My little wife over there and I we've decided that we are going to counteract an SDG&E advertising campaign. Now, I don't have as much money as SDG&E, neither does my wife, but there's a lot of people here in this community that are probably going to appreciate our little campaign.

You will notice on our property a sign that's says -- and we're probably going to move that sign because it's not close enough to the highway, but it says "Blue sky or cold steel." Another one says, "Enjoy the view before it's gone." And then another one says, that was put up last weekend, I hope you see it before you go back, maybe on your way to Anza-Borrego. It's on the way, Highway 79 north. And it was more appropriately placed with a contractor who built our home who used his own employee and himself to help put it up, because I'm a finance guy and when I try to mess around with things, I lose fingers. I'm not a contractor, but he helped us. One side of the sign says, "Aren't parks forever?" And the other part of the sign says park lines -- "Park Lands or Power Lines."

And we're now contemplating our next investment, which is going to be a sign on 79, something that will say -- I don't know if some of you were here for the hearing when there was a lady out there in a wolf custom. One side of the sign will say, "Beauty or the Beast."

And my wife and I are going to go home tonight and decide what the other sign is going to say. And thank you, but I don't even need that extra minute because I'm going to come back.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. So first person, and if you would just again for the court reporter give us your name again before you start.

MS. CONKLIN: Diane Conklin. I did not mean to turn my back to you. It's terrible to sit out there and see people's backs. Could we move it there and we could see everybody?

MR. MICHAELSON: I prefer that you do it there, because I know that you're here with your community, but these people have come from a long ways away to hear you speak to them.

MS. CONKLIN: Okay.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks.

MS. CONKLIN: Diane Conklin, Mussey Grade Alliance. I wanted to go back to the one billion in profits in terms of quoting the paper on this project. And that is an estimate that UCAN has spoken about publicly. That's the interest that Californians would end up paying on this line, so it's quite a -- it's quite a money-making operation from the very get-go.

Now, I'd like to take in reverse order my own concerns regarding the overall problem with this line. This includes the real possibility, and I know you've heard this before, but that this line will carry a power generated in Mexico. And that area is not covered by the environmental review. Now, we know that there are people who are deeply engaged in that whole subject area, and I'm not going to go into it because they're the experts and I'm not. But there is the obvious concern that you can't prove a negative, so if SDG&E says we are not going to produce power in Mexico and put it on this line, it's very difficult for them to prove a negative. And then after the CPUC process is over, what will happen when they put power on this line generating from Mexico.

And, of course, the reason people are interested in that issue is because the whole environmental scoping process is jinxed. If you cross an international border with a project, you don't have any control of what happens on the other side of the border. And the reason that people are really interested in these possibilities, not because they have secret ideas about the company, but because SDG&E, Sempra SDG&E is building one of the largest liquid natural gas facilities in Baja, so -- it won't stay in Baja, I don't think. So it's going to be used. And the idea is that they will build gas lines as well as produce electricity both coming into the United States and one of them coming -- one of them -- the ways it would come in terms of electricity would be this plan for Sunrise Powerlink.

Of course, the issue of the Sunrise portion of it is in question because of the seemingly infeasibility of Sterling Engines and whether they really would work. They have six prototypes now and they want to bring them up to a thousands by 2010, so nobody knows quite how they'll do this.

This other issue is this is not an issue of roots, I would like to say that it's not an issue of roots alone, but on the issue that the line is really for other reasons. And that the line starts if you look at the map at Central Substation, ostensibly because Sterling Engines would be out in the desert, and ends essentially at the Warner Substation. It has to come back down. It goes up north and it has to come back down to go out to San Diego. It's a really strange dogleg from the new Warner Substation from the border to the coast. So it looks like the tail is wagging the dog. Is that just to make us feel that this is for San Diego County when, in fact, Warner is pointing north.

Then the line when it does cross over, and I know you're aware of this, but when it does cross over to San Diego County goes through up to five open space preserves. These preserves were established, some of them, under the Multiple Species Conservation Program, which was a pilot program here in San Diego County, which was signed off by the feds and the state and the county to preserve open space as mitigation for development. So now we have the potential of having the very land that was bought to mitigate development in other areas being developed itself as an industrial corridor.

The other issue I wanted to talk about was the development of alternatives. We hope, and I noted in your materials you are going to look at alternatives including in-base generation. And we really hope you sincerely look at that. And, of course, you're aware of the 2030 energy plan stressing in-base generation and local support for electricity, because it makes us stronger to have our supply be local.

I ask you on behalf of the alliance to please look at the rooftop solar and the comparison of costs between rooftop solar to the suggested 1.3 billion dollar cost of this line. Now, SDG&E has come up with these figures, like 23 billion dollars to come up with the same amount of electricity that the rooftop solar would incur in terms of cost versus the line. And yet they're only talking about 300 megawatts that they need. So I don't understand that, and maybe you could help us figure that out in terms of your discussions of generation alternatives and including rooftop solar generation.

The other point is that of the 2030 energy plan, which was arrived at with the San Diego Association of Governments, does have at Point No. 5, and I'm sorry to say things you already know, but

I need to do it. That Point No. 5 is for transmission. And SDG&E will often talk about transmission, as you know one of the points, one of the suggestions of the report, therefore, Sunrise Powerlink is perfectly okay. But, you know, this transmission recommendation at Point No. 5 is a recommendation that is less emphasized in the report, if you read it completely, than the other kinds of recommendations involved in in-base generation. And I understand it was a political compromise, because SDG&E sat on the committee that wrote the report. So obviously it was in their interest to have a transmission recommendation.

Finally, regarding the no conduct alternative. The alliance would expect the commission to fully develop this alternative. Based on the many problems with this potential line, not the least of which is the potential to be the source of ignition for wild fires.

Now, if you look at the Cedar Fire route, you will see that the line actually follows some of the very path of the Cedar Fire route, actually the most important portion, because the fire gathered in strength as it crossed the county. And it was -- just so I have you understand what it means to us who lived through it, and certainly Ramona lived through it, it was the largest wild fire in the history of the state, covering some 280,000 acres, over 2400 homes and structures were destroyed. Thousands of people were dislocated and to this day many of those have not been able to rebuild, so it has changed communities. My own community lost 107 homes. It destroyed in its path some 80 percent it's estimated, you can find the actual percentages, verify it, of a wild fire in the area that it -- that it ran through. And that it also burned to a crisp many of the open spaces that SDG&E would like to run through.

The issue for us -- I moved to Ramona the 1999 from overseas and I had never been in Southern California in my life. And when I went to Ramona, the Triple A people would not insure our house and they said it was too much of a risk. Then I went to National Geographic and I found a little flame on Ramona on a map which says fire. We're known for fire. Then I realized that we actually have a problem. The fire went through our area as well. We saved our house, but by very, very extensive work previously done. I'll give you that in the written comments.

The bottom line is that fire is something we live with, but we don't want to have extensive fires started in the back country that can't be handled as the Cedar Fire was unable to be contained. And then have as a point of ignition towers in the very areas where these ignitions would cause the most damage and danger.

It is extraordinary to think that SDG&E would suggest putting this line through the path of the Cedar Fire from the Mount Cuyamaca area to Sycamore Canyon Preserve and Sycamore Canyon Substation. So I wanted you to look at that very carefully. People's lives have changed. We live with fires, but we don't want another source of ignition. And I thank you for your extra time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Who else would like to come back up?

MR. SCHULTZ: Peter Schultz for Starlight Mountain Estate Owners. The checklist that you have here -- this isn't prepared. The negative impact on the areas on your checklist are numerous for us in our community. It's actually too numerous to elaborate here in this session. But the area of quality of life is very subjective, it's very personal and difficult to define as far as impact. But to corroborate with what Ms. Conklin was just saying, our community and the community that we've described in our protest is within the Cedar Fire burn area. And even though we only lost a couple of structures in our community, the rest of it was turned into ash. And my wife and I were trapped on our property. Even though we have three CDF units stationed in our little valley, we were trapped on the property. And I watched 200 acres burn to ash, to just dust within 20 minutes because of the capacity of that fire.

Now, our primary responder, the captain of our primary response unit for fire has stated that with overhead facility in our valley, aircrafts will be literally impossible or ineffective because of the height to avoid the power lines. And that no crews are likely to be allowed in our valley because of the proximity of the power lines. So just to add that.

And, again, taking the line underground will mitigate the adverse effect in all of these different areas on your checklist.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Anyone else? Yes, sir.

MR. TARR: I think all of us appreciate the opportunity to come up and address a lot of these concerns, because they're close to us, we're watching this process, it's moving very quickly towards the side of the project.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can I just get you to state your name.

MR. TARR: Okay. It's Paul Tarr and I'm a resident in Ramona, property owner. And I see this as an opportunity to import more power. And I see this as an opportunity to move power more than to supply power for the San Diego area. And that gets away from the environmental aspect of it, but my understanding is that SDG&E -- right now the only block from the Carlsbad project, which they want to build a 640 megawatt facility next to the old fuel burning facility is SDG&E's commitment to buy power from them. And SDG&E is then withholding that. And I'm having a hard time understanding why.

I think when the whole big picture gets put together, it looks like there's a lot of business behind this power line. And a lot of environmental concerns that are going to get run over, so I would expect this environmental study that you're looking into, because you're going through enormously sensitive environmental land, a lot of it to get here.

The last point that I wanted to make was if this was about green power and solar power, and when I first moved here, I built a solar power system. We were off the grid. I understand it. I like it. And it is a renewable source. Sterling is talking about building not only I guess wind generated by a solar farm on some property that is out there and I guess it is an enormous project and something on the scope of a square mile. But it's not there and I don't see the process with environmental review and I don't see the wheels turning for that project, yet I see infrastructure being built. Historically infrastructure never proceeds crisis. I don't see that they're getting ready to build that project. And I don't believe that project is going to get built because it's an enormous project and it would be started now.

My request would be that if this power -- because this is advertised as being Sunrise Powerlink, this is advertised as SD -- well, not SDG&E, but the CPUC's ability to transport green power to San Diego, but I don't see the project starting.

I think that my request and a reasonable request would be to require that the project be brought on line at the same time this project was being built. And without that I don't think this project has validity. And I think that the whole guise that is being represented as green power might not be as truthful a representation of it as it could be.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is there anyone who hasn't spoken yet already? We said we would save time for question and answer. If you want to make a comment, I want to finish all of those

and then we'll go into Q and A. If you haven't filled out one of these already and you feel like you want to say something. Just come up here to the microphone, sir. Give us your name, give us your comments, and then I'll ask if you don't mind filling one of these out. Thank you.

MR. BREMER: My name is John Bremer. I'm a resident of Mesa Grande Road, one of Jim Davis' neighbors. I am energy independent from SDG&E, so this -- this is going to affect me, but it's not going to give me an opportunity to use some of their nice power. I -- I think -- I think this whole thing is very simple and it made a giant circus of this whole thing. If we were to allow SDG&E to count all the renewable power that is generated on individual rooftops as part of their 20 percent for their renewable mandate, that would allow them to have their renewable without this operation in the desert that doesn't even exist. If they support or if somebody supports Encina, South Bay retrofits so that they can come on line with cleaner greener power that they can make, their infrastructure already exists and there will be no more power lines. The power line that comes from the desert, 130 plus miles of lines through some of the prettiest country in Southern California. The losses in power from the source to their destination will be incredible. The amount that they're going to generate in the desert is going to just evaporate by the time it gets to the beach. And being on solar power I understand a little bit about how it works.

If they can come on line with their Stirling generators, at best their only going to work seven hours a day. How many hours are left in the day that they won't have anything generated from the power? The geothermal is not developed. It doesn't exist in a commercial amount that they haven't proven yet. They're just now starting to put wells in to see if they can use this. So the things that they want to do only work for less than a third of the day, so you're going to tell me that this line is going to just sit with no power running through it for the rest of the day, I don't think so. I think it's going to come from other sources.

The terrain that this runs through out in the desert and into the Ranchita area and over into Warner Springs and Mesa Grande Road is pretty much indefensible and inaccessible to fire trucks and whatnot when they get a fire in there because the roads will be closed off. There are only three access roads to the whole area.

The ultimate routes that they've proposed seem convoluted and don't make sense so that they will be discounted without proper consideration. It seems to me by just looking at a map if I were to follow Highway 8 all the way up to the point where it connects to the 67 and run over to their power plant, they wouldn't have to go across any virgin grounds. And that's about all I can think of.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Someone else? Sure, come on up. If I could ask you to fill out a speaker card on your way out.

I just need your name.

MS. BREMER: Phyllis Bremer, resident of Mesa Grande, also on solar power. Two things, I attended the solar conference in San Diego last week. I might just point out that the attendance has doubled from the year previous. And Commissioner Dian Grueneich was there and well received, but it just goes to show you how many people are interested in alternatives.

My second is a question to you to explain how you conduct your environmental review? Do you send biologists out to the field, do you do it via helicopter, do you take whatever we've submitted and contact the property owners? And so I'd like you to explain that, please.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Can I suggest we go to the Q and A session. Do you want to start answering questions or did you want to take a break? We're coming up so close on the 6:00 hour anyway to prepare for the 7:00.

Is there anyone here who had additional comments that they wanted to give? Let's go ahead and do those and then we'll go into the Q and A.

MS. LYNCH: Sharon Lynch from Ramona High Oaks Ranch. Diane Conklin just jogged something in my memory. My husband and I moved from Chicago in 2002 and were subjected to the Cedar Fire in 2003 and had never experienced anything like that in our lives. It was just totally horrifying to see this fire come down the power lines, the hill outside my kitchen window, just following those power lines, coming up toward our house just before we evacuated. And I hope to never see this again. And it's even more dangerous with higher lines. And the only way that they could get to these lines is by that retardant and flying the planes, so it was really rather scary and I hope never to experience this again. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. TRAFECANTY: John Bremer and Jim Davis remember those winds that we had in Santa Ysabel over 100 miles an hour and would those power lines withstand that? I was going to offer these pictures. My wife is making a picture --

MR. MICHAELSON: Can you state your name?

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty from Santa Ysabel. Common spelling for Trafecanty.

My wife is making an album, because I truly believe that the application that was submitted by SDG&E had people taking pictures from a road like this, so that you could really not see what the beauty is of this area. And I know you're driving around. I was going to offer to let you see the pictures. This is a panoramic view of Santa Ysabel Valley last Sunday. And there's information on the back or maybe at dinner time you could just take these and bring them back so we could put them in our album to send to you, give us something to look at.

And, also, an article on our Bald Eagles in Lake Henshaw. I know you heard about it, but I was going to hand these to you and give you a chance to see Santa Ysabel in the springtime. We've got the golden Santa Ysabel now. But, see, the power line would go right through these pictures, so that's what I wanted you to look at.

I know you're anxious to get this part of the meeting ended, but I want to read one section about fires because you heard it a little bit, and I did give this to the court reporter in El Centro yesterday. But the myth is the proposed Sunrise Powerlink proposes no fire hazards through San Diego back country. The facts are, according to Gary Boland, fire chief of Innermountain Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department, the proposed power lines could present adverse fire response conditions in three ways. Now this is a fire official, it's not me. A, access. If Santa Ana wind conditions along confined areas within some canyons, access to some of the residence structures would be hampered or prevented in conditions such as those we experienced in the 2003 Cedar Fire. Second item, B, defensible space. In some areas of alignment of the power lines restricts the potential to create effective fire breaks between surrounding natural brush and structures. C, attack. The height of the proposed towers would probably prevent effective operation from CDF airtakers in some areas due to the maximum altitude limits for effective retardant payload and relative close proximity of the lines to some residences.

One final thing, because I know we've got to get out of here, Santa Ysabel right at the intersection there is a heliport for emergencies. And there's two times when the Life Flight helicopters come in. Once is usually Sunday morning when they want to get some donuts at Dudley's Bakery, but the other time is to handle emergency response. And they're in and out of there especially on weekends all the time. And I

fear for them if there's large power lines around Santa Ysabel Valley, which is the area where these pictures are. Thank you very much. I'll just hand these to you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Has every one spoken that wanted to speak tonight? I just wanted to make sure. If so, then let's go ahead and take some time for questions.

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. CONKLIN: Diane Conklin. Again, I just wanted to ask a couple of questions. I realize you're taking questions and then you will answer them all at once. The first question is will the transcript that she's doing be made public on your website so we can see, register what each other has said? The second one is, can we invite you to come to our area while you're in town? Mine is very steep, rugged mountains and valleys. No. 3, can we submit pictures to you? And, No. 4, could you explain to us the effect of overriding considerations on the EIR process?

MS. LEE: On the question of the transcript: We certainly could put them on the website. We will be preparing a Scoping Report that will include copies of all the comments that are submitted and it will include transcripts of the public meetings. We'll be preparing that during the month of November and we'll have the report itself on the website. These oral comments definitely will be in the report along with all the written comments.

Thank you for the invitation to see your area. We have a large team of environmental specialists that are going to be working on this project who will be all over this area.

This actually ties back to an earlier question that somebody asked about biology, it was mainly in terms of how are we gathering the data. SDG&E has had biologists out doing surveys of the route for the last several months. Our biology team has been tracking with them the areas that they have finished, the areas that they haven't yet been to because they haven't gotten access permission, and areas that they weren't able to get to for topographical reasons. What we normally do is field-validate what they've done to make sure that what their biologists did we think is correct. We will do our own surveys of alternatives, because unless SDG&E has done it, and they haven't done too many surveys of alternatives, and we have to start from scratch on alternatives.

Let's see, submitting pictures with comments, absolutely. It would be easiest for us if you could submit them electronically. If you have them electronically please pdf them, but you can submit photos as well and we'll scan them and make them part of this scoping report.

Overriding considerations: the Environmental Impact Report will make a statement about whether or not there are significant impacts, so if the EIR/EIS determines that there are significant and unmitigable impacts in any geographic area and the CPUC decides to approve the project regardless, they're required by CEQA to include in the approval document, as Ms. Conklin referenced, a statement of overriding considerations. This says why we are approving this project even though it has significant impacts. So it's a requirement of CEQA. It allows a lead agency to approve a project that does have significant impacts, but it basically forces them to explain why.

MR. MICHAELSON: Do you want to talk about the difference between that and the NEPA process? It's not a similar piece. Let me hand this down to you.

MR. ZALE: Well, that is correct, that there isn't a similar piece to that required by NEPA, but the BLM would be issuing a decision that will include the decision rationale.

MS. BLANCHARD: I would just like to add one more thing. As far as the transcripts, we have a website for CPUC for the project. I was talking with a consultant today as far as the need to go ahead and upload our data requests, the response to data requests, anything that we're doing, scoping reports, information that we're receiving from people in the transcript. We'll go ahead and do that.

But I also understand there's a need for people in certain communities to have hard copies of things. So we will go ahead and make available hard copies of the scoping reports and other things, because we understand that not everybody has access to computers.

MR. MICHAELSON: Would anyone else like to come up to the microphone and ask a question?

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty, Santa Ysabel. I wanted to ask Tom a question. Last time I heard Buzz from Stirling Energy speak, he said -- he made it sound like the BLM was working very closely with them in their efforts to build these 36,000 solar. I'd just like to hear whether or not that was accurate. That was before the San Diego County Board of Supervisors last week.

MR. ZALE: Well, we have had several meetings with the project proponents. At this point in time we are awaiting submittal of an application for right-of-way and plan of development that would go with that. I think at our last meeting they indicated that would be probably a time frame of January and February for submittal. We don't have any applications yet, but we have had some discussions.

MR. MICHAELSON: Tom, they were originally looking at several locations. Have you gotten to a point where a particular location at least has been narrowed down?

MR. ZALE: Yeah, the project proponents have indicated that there is about 6,000 acres, predominantly public lands, by Plaster City between Old Highway 80 and Interstate 8 that they're looking at.

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm just going to stand up here. Other questions? Just come up to the mike, that way we can get it on the record.

MR. BREMER: John Bremer from Santa Ysabel. I was wondering on the amendment to the CDCA plan, how is that process done? You say they need to amend the 1980 plan.

MR. ZALE: As part of the environmental analysis here, part of the proposed action would be to do an amendment that would designate a utility corridor along the proposed route and/or alternatives. That will be part of the analysis that is required by NEPA. That is the reason that the public comment period would be 90 days on the Draft as opposed to the normal shorter period.

MR. MICHAELSON: So BLM will be doing that as a part of this NEPA process.

Come on up.

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller, San Diego/Imperial County Sierra Club. I want to follow up on the CDCA plan amendment question. It's my understanding that Stirling Solar Plant would also require some new, and correct me if I'm wrong, some new 230 kV transmission line to get the power to whatever power line is going to be around. And I'm wondering, would that 230 kV line also require a utility corridor, and if so, would that utility corridor for the 230 kV for Stirling Solar also require an amendment for the California Desert Conservation Plan?

MR. ZALE: As we understand their proposal right now, they would use an existing corridor to the project site down to the substation paralleling the existing 500 kV line.

MS. FULLER: One more question on it. Thank you. My understanding of the 1980 California Desert Conservation Area Plan is it mentions that it is a national conservation area, and normally those are for conservations, but this one is kind of unique because it has some energy project in it and that plan states that there needs to be a balance for energy and for conservation. And I'm wondering how the BLM is going to find that balance? Do you have any ideas how you're going to do that for this utility corridor?

MR. MICHAELSON: Wow, that may be one of those questions that is not answerable at this point.

MR. ZALE: I'm not sure. Let's clarify, for which corridor, the proposal associated with this project?

MS FULLER: I think I mean for the Sunrise Powerlink, because it's my understanding it would need to go through an area of environmental concern and some things like that. So how do you balance those two things in a national conservation area?

MR. ZALE: You do an EIS. I mean, as we pointed out before, we're just at the beginning stage of this, so I mean, that is the whole purpose of going through this analysis is to identify what the impacts are and to make a decision based on that analysis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: Hi, Sharon Lynch again. I had been looking at the very detailed maps in the booklet that you provided and I have a couple of technical questions. This is Page IV dash P15, it's in the Ramona area, aboveground area. You have on a map something called "Proposed Structures." Are they just simply replacing taking out the old existing structure and putting in the proposed structure, or is this in addition to the existing structure?

MS. LEE: I believe that in the area these are in addition to the existing structures. There are many portions of this project where an existing line would be co-located on a new tower and the existing towers are taken away. I can verify this at the break if that's okay. I'm fairly certain that this is an area where the existing line would remain and the new one would be adjacent.

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm going to suggest that if we have an extremely specific location on a map, we do that at the break, if that's okay.

MS. LYNCH: This is more a general question. My neighbor has located on this map something called a pull site. What is a pull site?

MS. LEE: P-u-l-l. This is the site which after the towers are built, the conductors are pulled from one pole to another. It's a process in which they bring in a reel of the wire that actually hangs on the towers and they pull it usually over a span of several towers at a time, so they identify an area that's usually a larger distributed area right along the right-of-way and they bring in a couple of pickup trucks and pull the conductor across.

MS. LYNCH: So it's not permanent?

MS. LEE: No, it's a construction site only and would not be permanent.

MR. MICHAELSON: I fear we are near the reaches of our court reporter's fingers, so I think we've got about five more minutes she can hang in there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm with the County of San Diego. I believe we'll have an opportunity to talk with you later this week, so thank you for that.

My question is really more for my information prior to that meeting and I heard a lot of different input from the proponents and others about the project, what kinds of social impacts that would we have. My question for is what resource will you use that's not affiliated with any interested parties to determine what the actual impact would be in terms of power availability and socioeconomics impacts?

MS. LEE: Okay. That's a good question and project alternatives is often a challenging one because it requires a lot of speculation about what would happen if this project is not constructed. The team that we have includes engineering and transmission planning experts. They're on the EIR/EIS team, so we've got our own resources and we review information, including the SANDAG data, the reports that are there, the ongoing projects that are in permitting stages, including the South Bay Power Plant, the potential for Encina. It is definitely an issue we would like to have scoping comments on because it's not a simple answer to define what would happen in the absence of this project.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Any other questions?

Okay. If not, we're going to see if Billie and/or Tom have anything to say. I think what they would do is thank you very much for coming today. We may see some of you back at 7:00. If you could go out to stir up some more people and we appreciate you being here. And we're now adjourned. Thank you.

(Scoping meeting adjourned at 5:56 p.m.)

**SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT**  
**Reporter's Transcript of the CPUC/BLM Scoping Meeting**  
**for Preparation of a Draft EIR/EIS**

Held 7:00 p.m. October 4, 2006  
At Ramona, California

Reported by:  
Shannon L. Marcos, CSR No. 8348

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Lewis Michaelson - Katz & Associates, Public Facilitator  
Susan Lee - Aspen Environmental Group  
Billie Blanchard - California Public Utilities Commission  
Tom Zale & Lynda Kastoll - Bureau of Land Management

Presentation: pages 3 to 8  
Public Comments begin on page 9  
Q&A begins on page 17

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

Kelly Fuller ..... 9  
Kathleen Beck ..... 9, 14  
Jim Lydick ..... 10  
David Lloyd ..... 10  
Diana Lindsay ..... 11  
Dennis Trafecanty ..... 12

**Q&A, BY SPEAKER**

Elizabeth Broom ..... 15, 16  
Kelly Fuller ..... 16  
Diana Lindsay ..... 17  
Carolyn Dorroh ..... 18  
Dennis Trafecanty ..... 18

## STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. My name is Lewis Michaelson. Welcome to tonight's scoping meeting. I work for a firm called Katz & Associates and we've been hired to provide support to these public meetings and to provide neutral moderation services.

This meeting is being held to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act in which scoping is the beginning of the environmental review process.

Because some of you may be unfamiliar with this process, we want to be sure that we properly orient you to this meeting and what you can expect and where we are in the process. So after I finish going through the purpose of scoping, then Susan Lee, seated immediately to my right, with Aspen Environmental Group will give you a description of the proposed project. Billie Blanchard sitting next to her with the California Public Utilities Commission will talk about their process and schedule. And seated to her right are two representatives from the Bureau of Land Management, Lynda Kastoll and Tom Zale, who will talk about their aspect of this under the federal regulations and laws. And finally Susan Lee will provide a more detailed description of the EIR/EIS process. Then we will come to the most important part of the evening which will be your opportunity to provide comments to the agency officials and consultants who are here tonight.

I want to mention that we are at the scoping phase, which is the early part of the process of the EIR/EIS. The people here are not here to make decisions tonight, but they are here to listen firsthand to anything that you would like to offer.

I will mention that written comments are also extremely welcome and will provide the opportunity for much more detailed comments. They're given the same consideration as oral comments. So for those of you who are uncomfortable with public speaking, please do not feel left out by this process. We welcome any and all written comments.

The purpose of scoping, or why are we here: first, it is to inform you, the public and responsible agencies, about the upcoming project for which the EIR/EIS is being prepared. It's also an opportunity to inform you, the public, about the review process so you can understand where your opportunities lay to participate.

Then we need to solicit input regarding the potential alternatives for the proposed project and the appropriate scope of issues to be studied in the EIR/EIS. Those are most types of comments that will be appropriate to the proceeding tonight. We are also able to identify issues of concern and areas of potential controversy from your comments.

It's important to note that a Scoping Report will be prepared based upon all the written and oral comments. It will be distributed to the information repositories and placed on the project website so that you can be aware of the other comments and meetings and locations. If you didn't know already, this is one of seven meetings being held this week in a variety of locations around Imperial and San Diego County.

Of the key players in the process, you probably figured out by now, one is the California Public Utilities Commission, who we'll refer to as the CPUC. They are the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act for preparing the EIR. Also the Bureau of Land Management or BLM is the agency for the NEPA process. San Diego Gas & Electric is not an official part of these proceedings here tonight, but obviously they are the applicant and they are the ones who initiate this process and then it goes for review by you. And then finally, from Aspen Environmental Group, Susan Lee is seated up here,

but there are a number of other representatives that are here tonight. They are responsible for preparing the EIR/EIS. I know some of you got a chance to talk and meet the EIR/EIS team around the boards to get more information.

With that, I will turn it over to Susan Lee for a description of the proposed contract.

MS. LEE: Thank you. I am going to give a very brief description of the Sunrise Powerlink Project, because I know you all have copies of the Notice of Preparation. If you don't, we have additional copies at the table as you enter and there's a fairly detailed description here.

The most relevant maps for this portion of the project are included in the NOP. There are Figures 4A and 4B which show the Central Link of the project which is the area of Santa Ysabel and south of Warner Springs. And Figure 5A and 5B show the area around Ramona, heading down towards Mussey Grade Road, so those are the most relevant figures in terms of where we're located today.

The project itself, though, is about 150 miles of new transition lines starting in Imperial County at the Imperial Valley Substation just west of El Centro. It involves a 500 kV transmission line, about 90 miles, that goes mostly through Imperial County and into San Diego County ending at a new substation which is illustrated here on Figure 4B. At that point the line will become a 230 kV transmission line continuing for about 60 miles through San Diego County to end at the coastal portion of San Diego County at the Penasquitos substation. There are a couple of portions of that route that are proposed to be underground. One of them is just south of here, in the Ramona and the San Diego County Estates area.

I'll make couple of other points related to the proposed project. As you know, San Diego Gas & Electric is the proponent and has submitted an application to the CPUC. The Imperial Irrigation District is also connected to the project. They have a Memorandum of Agreement with SDG&E under which if the project is ultimately approved, they would be the entity to actually construct and operate the transmission line starting from Imperial County at the Imperial Substation and ending at the Narrows Substation, which is actually in the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

SDG&E in its application to the CPUC has indicated the three major reasons for which this project is needed. The first one, according to SDG&E, is to maintain the reliability of the transmission system. The second one is to promote renewable energy. The project as described in the application by SDG&E describes some solar projects in the Imperial County area and also the fact that geothermal resources in Imperial County have been identified to such an extent that they believe that Sunrise would be able to bring renewable resources into San Diego. The third purpose in terms of the need for the project is to reduce energy costs. And this would allow SDG&E to reduce costs to its rate payers by changing the structure of the way electricity is provided in San Diego County.

This slide shows the objectives that are basically the more detailed reasons that define SDG&E's project and the reasons for which it would be built. They relate to the three issues that I already described and I won't go through them. The last couple, No. 7 and 8, are the ones that define SDG&E's land use principles that they've used to site transmission lines in terms of avoiding urban and suburban areas.

Now Billie will talk about the CPUC process.

MS. BLANCHARD: Again, hi, I'm Billie Blanchard, the CPUC project manager. Basically this is pretty much complete here, but the CPUC process has two parallel review processes for this application for CPCN, a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, the general proceeding and then the environmental review process, which I'm involved in with the CEQA/NEPA documentation.

The general proceeding for CPCN is going to be led by the Assigned Commissioner Dian Grueneich and Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman.

The scope of the CPCN review is defined by Public Utilities Code Section 1002. And there's a variety of things that are being looked at in the general proceeding, including the determination of need for the project, considerations of community values, recreational and park areas, and historic and aesthetic values. And also, of course, the review of the environmental impacts of CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act.

Right now as far as the schedule goes, we had a prehearing conference initially in Ramona on January 31st, 2006. There was a second prehearing conference and a public participation hearing in Ramona on September 13th of 2006. There is a scoping memo that is to come out on the general proceeding hopefully the first part of October 2006. That will be prepared by the administrative law judge and it will outline all the issues and the schedule for the proceedings. As far as the other aspects of that proceeding, including testimony and evidentiary hearings, that is yet to be determined and will be outlined in the scoping memo.

The environmental review schedule that we have thus far is that the application was filed initially in December of 2005. They filed an amended application along with a Proponent's Environmental Assessment, the PEA, on August 4th, 2006. The Notice of Intent to prepare the EIS portion of this document was published in the Federal Register on August 31st, 2006. We are now at the point of Notice of Preparation for the EIR. That was released on September 15th. And the public scoping closes on October 20th, 2006.

And as far as the dates for the release of the Draft and the Final, we haven't determined those yet because of a number of issues that we're still looking at, but when we do, hopefully soon, we will be sending out a card to the entire CEQA mailing list to indicate what those dates are.

So I will now take this over to BLM.

MR. ZALE: Thank you. My name is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are here representing BLM's field office in El Centro. The reason that BLM is involved in this process is that SDG&E's project as is currently proposed involves crossing about 32 miles of public lands primarily in Imperial County, but also involving about a mile and a third in San Diego County. Also on the slide behind me you see a listing for Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. When the patent for the Park was issued back in the 1930s it included a reservation for an existing power line right-of-way through the Park. BLM administers that right-of-way, or did in the past. At this point in time there's some assessment being made in terms of what exactly the BLM's role and responsibilities will be to the park there.

As the slide also indicates an Amendment to the land use plan for the California Desert Conservation Area will be required as part of this analysis. The reason for that is the proposed right-of-way as it's configured deviates from the established utility corridors. The fact that there's a plan amendment involved also means that the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and EIR will be 90 days as opposed to normally a shorter period of time.

In addition to participating in the NEPA and CEQA process, BLM will also be responsible for conducting government-to-government consultation with interested tribes. And we will also be the lead agency in terms of Section 7 consultation with the Fish & Wildlife Service in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

MS. LEE: In addition to the BLM and the CPUC decision process, one other really important purpose of an EIR/EIS is to get input from other agencies that also have to issue permits on this project. And this slide lists a few of them. We're also meeting with some of these folks during our scoping period and will continue to meet with them on an ongoing basis throughout the project, because getting input from these agencies is really going to be critical to getting the information we need to complete an accurate document.

Lewis alluded to this earlier, but one thing we really want to make clear tonight is the fact that we're at the very beginning of this process. We know that SDG&E has been out here a couple of times. The CPUC has been here a couple of times in its general proceeding process, but in terms of the CEQA process we're just now getting started. The yellow box on this slide shows where we are at now. The scoping period, in terms of the EIR/EIS preparation process, is pretty much square one, so we have a lot of work to do.

We'll be developing a very detailed project description. We'll be gathering information on alternatives, preparing the Draft EIR/EIS, and then we'll be back out here to hear your comments once the Draft EIR has been issued. And as Tom mentioned, there will be a 90-day public comment period so everyone will have plenty of time to let us know how we did.

I'll give you some basic information on the contents of an EIR/EIS, and the main purpose for doing this is to help you give us information that will be useful to us while we're preparing the document. We'll be preparing a very detailed description of the environmental setting, which describes what's here now: what kind of species, what kind of land uses, what are the impacts of the project within each one of the environmental areas, what kind of mitigation measures would reduce the impacts that are identified. We will gather all of this information together in a way that will be useful both to the decision-makers that ultimately have to make a decision on this project and also to the public that is affected. We expect you to help us with your scoping comments to prepare a more thorough document.

This slide shows the major elements of an EIR/EIS in terms of the major sections and the types of issues we would like to hear comments on, in terms of impacts of alternatives, mitigation measures, cumulative and indirect impacts. We're going to be looking seriously at these issues.

Here we show a list of all the environmental disciplines that are going to be included in the EIR/EIS, again to guide your thinking. It would help us to know what kinds of specific concerns this project may cause with respect to any of these issues.

I'll talk in a little bit more detail about alternatives, because we know that the alternatives identification process is probably the most important step in this EIR/EIS. Those of you who were here in Ramona on September 13th heard Commissioner Grueneich ask SDG&E to identify an alternative that avoids Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. SDG&E has submitted through the general proceeding process yesterday some information on an alternative that, in fact, would go through Cleveland National Forest. That information is coming to us as a part of our alternatives process.

We are looking at alternatives under the guidelines of NEPA and CEQA by using the three criteria on the slide to define whether or not alternatives should be analyzed in detail in the documents. Those three criteria are, No. 1 does the alternative meet most of the project objectives, not all of them but most. No. 2 does it have the ability to reduce or avoid impacts of the proposed project. And No. 3 is the alternative feasible, can it be built and can it be permitted.

Here we've listed a whole variety of types of alternatives that we'll be looking at. People mostly talk about routing alternatives in terms of different ways to connect Points A and B from the Imperial

Valley into Central San Diego. There's several ways to do that, but if you're looking at ways to avoid Anza-Borrego, there aren't that many ways, because Anza-Borrego goes south almost to the border.

We're also going to be looking carefully at generation alternatives. South Bay Power Plant is being proposed to bring power to San Diego; we would examine the effects that that would have in terms of replacing the need for this project. We'll relook at all the alternatives that were proposed by SDG&E and either eliminated or carried forward in their document to see whether we agree with that. And we'll look at any alternatives that may come out of the workshop that's being held next Friday by SDG&E as part of what the Commissioner ordered, for SDG&E to gather further information on alternatives through the general proceeding process.

When the EIR/EIS is finished, both of these agencies have a process that will allow them to document their decision. The CPUC process requires a vote by the five commissioners that are appointed by the Governor. It will include as one factor of several the environmental information. It will also include their determination on project need. And if the project is approved, the decision will include a requirement that the mitigation measures that are included in the document be monitored to make sure that they're actually enforced the way they were intended.

The BLM also has a different process under NEPA. They have a 30-day comment period after the release of the Final EIR/EIS. They have a 60-day review by the Governor as a part of their state process, the Governor's Consistency Review, and then they will prepare a Record of Decision.

Let's turn this back to Lewis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Daniel, would you collect and bring me up the speaker cards. Thank you.

The final slide that you have up here shows that the most useful scoping comments at this point are the ones that address location, extent of environmental impacts or potential impacts caused by the proposed project, and that recommend alternatives that would avoid or reduce impacts. Now is the opportunity for you to provide us with comments on those. We already had two meetings earlier, one this afternoon and one in El Centro yesterday, and we've received a lot of very useful, constructive comments so far.

We have set up, for consistency's sake, throughout all the meetings, a three-minute time limit for people to speak, but we also have enough time here that once we've gone through the full list of speakers who had their three minutes, we have the opportunity to provide a second questioning. So if you'll just stay within the time limit the first time, then, if you have additional comments you want to make, I'll give you a second opportunity to come up here.

After we've taken all those comments, then there will be an opportunity for questions and answers. If you have a question later on, the panel up here will answer the types of questions that they can based upon where we are in the process. Obviously, if you say, "what will that impact affect," they can't answer that because we haven't done that part of the analysis.

As far as the three-minute time limit, I will let you know we have one minute left by putting up my index finger. And then when the three minutes are fully up, I'll put up my hand like this. I'll also run through the cards so we have a general idea of where you fall in the process so that you can come up to the microphone and be prepared.

The people I have right now who turned in their cards are Kelly Fuller, David Lloyd, Kathleen Beck — actually, what I'm going to do, I'm trying to do it in order, Kelly Fuller, Kathleen Beck, Jim Lydick, David Lloyd, and then Diana Lindsay. So if you would come up here to the microphone.

If I haven't mentioned already, there's a court reporter here who's trying to capture this verbatim and so please speak at something less than lightening speed. She can keep up pretty fast but, in particular, if you're reading from prepared remarks, please slow it down to make sure she can hear it. Again, you can come up for a second time if you don't finish those comments. Of course, if you think you have some more details in writing, again if you hand that in, those are given the same consideration as any oral comments.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. MICHAELSON: Ms. Fuller.

MS. FULLER: Thank you. I'm Kelly Fuller from the San Diego/Imperial County Chapter of the Sierra Club and thank you for this opportunity to speak again tonight.

I spoke to you last night about what we see as some of the alternatives to this project. I would like tonight to briefly talk about the filing that SDG&E did yesterday in response to the Commissioner's request for non-Park alternatives. We're concerned. We noticed that when we looked at them that all of those rejected alternatives of SDG&E and the current ones all go to that Central East Substation. And we're wondering is that the only place where that could go? It seems odd to us that the line would need to go so far north and then head down south again. And we think SDG&E's justification for this in its filing yesterday is weak. All they said about it was that the area was the most opportune one that would accommodate the required facility and allow the necessary 230 kV features to exit the facility. And we strongly believe that this is just the first phase of a larger project headed to Los Angeles. And we are very concerned that only this first phase, the proposed Sunrise Powerlink, is going to be analyzed and that there will be no CEQA/NEPA analysis of what we see as a future project going to Los Angeles. And we think the fact that everything is heading toward that way far north substation suggests that future project going to L.A.

Also, we noticed that one of the maps, or a couple of the new maps that came on, I believe today were posted on SDG&E's website, showed dwellings and also showed wildfire outage areas on the rejected alternatives. And none of the other maps we've ever seen showed this, so we feel that the company is — with these rejected alternatives that it doesn't want is showing dwelling data, fire data, and we request that that be provided for the other maps as well for the project as it is proposed.

Also, we noticed that with the dwellings — that they're saying that about 50 dwellings would have to be eliminated. They've got a year to tweak — they said that to the press. It's been quoted widely. They had a year to tweak those routes so that the proposed routes don't eliminate houses and they're showing you routes that they have not been tweak. If they tweak those suggested alternatives, they would not be going through a bunch of houses also.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Kathleen Beck.

MS. BECK: Hello, I'm Kathleen Beck and I'm an outdoor educator through the county schools. I work with sixth-graders. I've also been involved since December with a group we call People's Powerlink. We have the Julian area and the Santa Ysabel area through Borrego, a lot of back country. So one of the things I wanted to talk about today is ethics. Being a teacher, of course, I speak from that place, and also being a resident whose family goes back a couple of generations. There's five generations in my family in the area. I would like to speak about respect, responsibility and protection. And I'm asking today what SDG&E, BLM, any of the organizations involved might tell their children along the way, how much responsibility you might have in this process, and what you might say to them if they ask you later on how you could have allowed a company with profit as its motive to desecrate our public lands, because our public lands do belong to all of us. I'm not just talking the state park, but the national — at the national level, at the wilderness preserve areas' level, people's back yards, all of it. It is for all of us to protect and it's our job as citizens of this county.

The beauty of San Diego is known the world over. There's more diversity in plants and birds in this county than anywhere else in the United States in this 48 states here. For that reason, I consider this area a biogem and for that reason this is a jewel and we really do need to think about that when we're making these decisions.

As far as number one and number two, what you have written up here, as far as identifying the location, I would say the rooftop is the best location for the route. And I would also say that that is the best recommended alternative that I have.

There is someone who has come up with a plan for the San Diego area, his name is Jim Bell. If you go to [www.jimbell.com](http://www.jimbell.com), he has a plan for the San Diego area. You might remember his name, he was running for mayor a few years ago, and that was what he was going to focus his time and energy on if he had become mayor was the energy policy of this area. So I would recommend that you look into that.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Jim.

MR. LYDICK: Hello. One of the things I find fascinating and kind of really an experience for the possible proposed project is that a lot of community members and the people that have never met before have come together. And it's really — it's really nice to see so much concern over our back county areas.

I also work in outdoor education at Sixth Grade Camp at Fox Outdoor School. Some of the areas that we've heard about would be going right through the areas that we take the sixth-graders. And I'm just in love with the area and watch — teach out there, watch the students learn about what their neighborhoods used to look like. And it would be a terrible shame to see 150-foot transmission towers marching through these areas especially when they're unnecessary. And when I've talked to people that really don't know much about what's going on, I try to make it as simple as possible from everything that I've learned and I'm sure a lot of people here learn. I suggest to them seeing a movie "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," see "China Town." I know that's dealing with water in the Los Angeles area, of course. I feel like the proposed Sunrise Powerlink is just the situation in the movie "China Town," but would have to deal with electricity.

And I would hope that everybody here could work to the best of their knowledge towards really doing what's best for San Diego. And everything I've heard about the original 23 plan, the in-base generated power along with rooftops sounds great to me. And I would hate to see a really good thought out premier idea be laid to waste.

Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

David Lloyd.

MR. LLOYD: My name is David Lloyd. I'm an officer for Cabrillo Power Plant in Carlsbad, California. Also unrelated to that is that I am a member of the Public Advisory Committee with the Southern California Wetlands Advisory project. I'm concerned personally about environmental issues.

MR. MICHAELSON: Sir, could pull that microphone closer so we can all hear you.

MR. LLOYD: I'm very interested in seeing transmission going to the resources that can be used over and over again. Early in my career I've helped build windmills, unfortunately they also killed birds and bats. And the solar projects that are proposed for the desert cover many, many square miles and will require lots of washing and probably Windex and other things. There's no good energy that doesn't cause some environmental concern, but if we have an opportunity out in the desert to have good generation, it needs to get to San Diego and other places. We've only been concerned, however, in looking at this line as to what its real purpose is. It goes a long ways north and there's a direct route right across following the Southwest Powerlink. So our concern is this site in case and also the environmental review is more alternatives ought to be studied carefully before we build a billion for a transmission line, which is a staggering amount of money for a transmission line.

AB 1576 encourages the Commission to consider carefully repowering existing generating sites like the big Encina Station in Carlsbad. By putting in more efficient generation we can take the same amount of gas and generate twice as much electricity.

There are also renewables proposed for the Imperial County area. This transmission line should be reserved for renewables. We shouldn't be importing a long transmission line, natural gas fire generation, whether it's from Mexico, from the Gila Bend area or anyplace else. The Commission should seriously consider reserving the entire line for renewables. And if gas power generation is transported in an operable basis, that will certainly bring to life whether or not this line is really for renewables or really for something else.

And then a need analysis has to take into account energy production modeling. The CPUC in its past has spent considerable time billing energy production lawsuits to determine whether each power plant is really needed. That same model has to be part of this environmental study. In addition, transmission modeling should be part of the studies. Those are very serious time consuming models that need to be run and analyzed by the public and by the other alternatives.

Appreciate your time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Diana Lindsay.

MS. LINDSAY: My name is the Diana Lindsay. I'm president of the Anza-Borrego Foundation and Institute. We are an association established at the request of the California State Park and Recreation Commission forty years ago this coming year. Our mission is to support the park through land acquisition, education programs and research projects. We had 1200 due-paying members and many more beyond that, members who also support the project and our activities.

In the limited time that I have, I would like to focus on three areas of major concern that have not been adequately addressed by San Diego Gas & Electric. Areas which clearly challenge the rationale of constructing massive transmission lines through the state park and wilderness areas. One, environmental review conducted under the CEQA requires that project alternatives be included within the project review, Section 15126.6A. Specifically CEQA requires that alternatives be included. And I, quote, "would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant affects of the projects," close quote. San Diego Gas & Electric did not include an alternative route that minimizes impacts to the project in their original plan. Per the CPUC directive issued at the prehearing they have listed alternate routes that avoid the park, but the listing is structured to justify their original plan rather than following the spirit of CEQA which calls for lessening impacts to the park.

I would suggest that San Diego Gas & Electric's goal is rather to pick the route that has the least impact to the body of —

MR. MICHAELSON: Could I ask you to slow down.

MS. LINDSAY: Oh, sorry.

Two, the proposed project would likely have significant unmitigable environmental impacts. Impacts to community character. Visual and biological resources would likely be significant and unmitigable. This is probable given the input provided by Ruth Coleman, Director of California State Parks, in her prehearing statement to the CPUC. As a result, the project would not be approved without the adoption of overriding considerations by the lead agency. What overrides are possible that would be used to offset the significant, unmitigable impacts to the state park.

Three, State Wilderness Lands. The current route selection would require that the 500 kV transmission line cross state designated wilderness lands. This would require a determination from the California State Bar Commission to allow such an action when no — of no similar past actions to remove state designated wilderness lands. This is an unheard of precedent. Wilderness should not be viewed as the path of least resistance, but rather as a last resort.

San Diego Gas & Electric has not offered or made available to us alternate routes that do not intrude upon or violate the wilderness values that we hold so dear. Current plans will make the transmission lines visible for 90,000 acres. We are talking about transmission lines that are as tall as a 20-story building.

We're asking you to oppose the devastation of our wilderness legacy upon which this country was built. Let parks do their jobs. Let parks be there for future generations to enjoy. The integrity of the park must not be destroyed. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is there anyone who has not yet spoken who would like to?

Just give us your name.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty, Santa Ysabel.

We really don't need this proposed Sunrise Powerlink. One of the reasons we don't need it is one of the gentleman that just came in here that is involved in the Carlsbad plant, Encina.

But I want to talk about what I think you've heard so far on the other side, the environmental side. The Farm Bureau out in El Centro, they talked about their dairies, they talked about how this alternative line is going right through their dairies, and the cattle will not even get within a mile or a half of mile of those lines. If the cattle are afraid of these lines, what do you think the Big Horn Sheep feel about them? And I don't think there's been any studies to determine whether they're going to continue to migrate like they need to migrate in the park.

Number two, the native plants. There was a lady out in El Centro who talked about the native plants, what impacts it's going to have on the native plants.

Number three, I talked about the wind in Santa Ysabel, and I'm sure it's in a lot of other areas. And I've seen pictures in the paper of down towers in other locations in Southern California.

Number four, I talked about the remote back country. The Williamson Act. All these landowners that are in Santa Ysabel, Mesa Grande, and a lot of other areas, have designated their properties as ag preserves, which means they can't build on those properties for 10 years.

Number five, I've given you some pictures, that I'll get back from you, so that we could formally present them to you. But those are pictures of view sheds. Those are a little bit different pictures than what you see in the SDG&E applications, which were pictures that were intentionally presented to not show us as having a beautiful open space preserve area.

Number six, I talked about the military. They're not in favor of this. They've got problems, and I'm sure that an alternate line was presented to handle their concerns.

What about the cropdusters? How are they going to get up and down and around out in Imperial Valley to handle the agricultural area out there? What about the emergency response helicopters that come into Santa Ysabel? They are flying really low to save people's lives.

Number ten, what about the gentleman that was here a little earlier today talking about the gliders over at Warner Springs and the glider port? What about the Sierra Club said yesterday regarding some form of lizard, I believe, that is endangered.

So for all these reasons, I think there are so many environmental reasons that I think we need to focus on in-county generation. And if I have time, I want to talk about that a little bit later. Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Is there anyone else that wants to speak? If not, then the floor is open if you would like to add to your comments. I don't know if anyone would like to add to their comments.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty, Santa Ysabel.

MR. MICHAELSON: That's fine.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Thank you once again.

Don't believe that this proposed Sunrise Powerlink is the only source to meet the energy needs for San Diego County. We have the South Bay plant. We have the Encina plant. They both want to improve the technologies of those plants. They want to take those plants away from the ocean so they don't heat up the waters of the ocean.

And, by the way, SDG&E just demonstrated that they're doing the same thing. They just opened or started up this Escondido plant and that's part of the in-county generation. They also have permits to generate power in Otay Mesa.

SDG&E uses these three R's. Everywhere I've heard SDG&E in the last year, they've talked about reliability, renewables, and reduced costs. Don't believe that there is a more reliable energy source with the proposed Sunrise Powerlink. It's a 150-mile transmission line. If you think that that's more reliable than in-county generation, then I'm wondering what we're smoking here. Because it doesn't seem like a 150-mile line is going to reduce the amount of energy that starts at that Imperial Substation to the coast is going to reduce the amount of power. You lose at least 30 percent of it.

I know you're going to hear from Bill Powers and I know you're going to hear probably from UCAN and other places, but it just doesn't compute for me. And the Imperial Substation, the renewables go through it, the Mexican power goes through it, the Southwest Powerlink goes through it. It doesn't

seem like this reliability statement that they keep saying on the radio and I'm assuming the TV, I don't watch much TV, but they constantly talk about this word reliability. It doesn't compute for me.

On the renewables you heard already a lot about — and you're going to hear more about Sterling Energy and the six prototypes they have in New Mexico. Unproven technology so far. It would be great if it could be proven, but let's say it is proven, what about the Southwest Powerlink. Even SDG&E made a statement last week before the Board of Supervisors or SANDAG, I can't remember which meeting, which stated that you can at least run 300 megawatts, or whatever they are, on the Southwest Powerlink. Bill Powers said you could run 900 or 1,000. What is the Southwest Powerlink being used for right now?

And the reduced costs really troubles me. Here's a company that back in 2000 and 2001, they just — they're in the process of settling a case for 350 million dollars to pay back to the rate payers, because they did not — they weren't honest in their assessment of how much of what the supply was and they were not honest in their assessment on pricing. They misrepresented us. They cheated us. They took our money away from us. And they're going to pay it back. I don't know what perk stands for, but I read that in the paper. It doesn't get much publicity. And then they're going to have a 5 percent increase that's going to occur January of '08. We're never going to see that hundred-million-a-year reduction in costs for our rate payers. Our rate payers pay — I think, a hundred-million-dollar reduction in cost is equivalent to somewhere between 20 and \$30 a year per rate payer. All their price increases that they're coming up with, we're never going to see that rate reduction, so that doesn't compute either.

So I believe that there's other alternatives or other ulterior motives that SDG&E has with a 500 kilowatt power station trans — whatever you call it, in Warner Springs that's going nowhere. And so I respectfully request that you consider that in your analysis.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Is there anyone else who would like to make comments? If not, you can move into — sure.

MS. BECK: Kathleen Beck from Julian. I would just like to say to add to everything that's been spoken here, we are at a tipping point. Whenever there's a change that occurs and plans start being made, we could use this time as a tipping point to push us into a more sustainable way of living. This would be a very good time now that this proposal is coming up.

But rather than going back into time and creating a energy far away and using expensive, dangerous technology to bring it to us, we could use this time to move forward with a more sustainable type of energy, both production and transmission, by generating energy closes to where we're going to be using it. It seems completely absurd to me and to most of us who have studied it that we're still using these transmission lines. And it just seems like we do have a technology and that we should use what we have that will move us into the 21st century.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. As I mentioned earlier, there's also an opportunity at this point in the meeting for some questions and answers. Again, we accept the types of questions that can be answered at the scoping stage as opposed to those whose answers will come later on when the environmental analysis has been done. So if you have a question, I'll ask that you give us your name.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. BROOM: Hi, Elizabeth Broom. And I live within the site of the proposed transmission line. And I'd like to know how written in stone is the route and what process would we go through to try to get that route slightly altered? Because actually what's also close to my house is one of the most popular hiking destination in San Diego County, the Iron Mountain hiking area. And I think it would really be a blight on the landscape for people enjoying one of the few open space areas that's close to where people live to have this huge transmission tower within their sight line while they're hiking on the mountain. So I notice that the map actually shows it following an existing utility easement. And I'm wondering if it could be altered to go a little bit further south which would bring it below the site line, because right now it's going right along a ridge line.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thanks. Let's see what we get in terms of answers.

MS. BLANCHARD: First of all, the Applicant has proposed a project and a particular route, and I would say from my standpoint as the manager of this environmental document that at this point we're just starting out. And I wouldn't say that this description is cast in stone. And as Susan had pointed out we will be doing extensive alternative analysis that would include segments or alternative segments to the proposed route, as well as all the other things that we indicated that we will be looking at. So what would be helpful from my standpoint, as I've indicated to some others, is that if you have a particular area that you would like to suggest an alternative segment, that it would be great to get that in writing just to make sure that we have it. It's great to hear it, but also in writing would be great, indicating the area and your proposed suggestion for the alternative segment.

MS. BROOM: And how will I know that has any effect?

MS. BLANCHARD: Well, how it will affect it, is that you will give it to us through the scoping process and it will go into the alternative screening analysis that we talked about here tonight. If we find that it fits the CEQA/NEPA criteria for alternatives, it gets carried forward into the EIR document and fully analyzed.

MS. BROOM: So I will hear some response or feedback?

MS. BLANCHARD: You will see our responses and analyses coming up in the Draft EIR/EIS.

MS. BROOM: And then the other — let me think about it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Sure. Are there any other questions? Yes.

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller, San Diego/Imperial County Sierra Club. I may just be kind of dense. I'm trying to understand something that's puzzled me for a while. The project has a purpose and then it has the eight objectives, and it says that the objectives will guide the development of alternatives to the Sunrise Powerlink, but because CEQA does not require that they meet all of them, the objectives do not reasonably constrain the alternatives.

I'm kind of puzzled by these, because I noticed something that is really left out of this. There is nothing in these objectives that says we will minimize environmental impacts or we will choose a project that is not going to have a large impact on the environment, so to me it seems, just as a member of the public, that these are — I don't want to say arbitrary, because arbitrary is not quite the right word, but there could have been a different set of objectives. And so the project proponent gets to choose the objectives, but then the project needs to meet most of them. What is the process by which we know these are the right objectives that a big project like this should even meet?

MR. MICHAELSON: And I would also mention that the things that you mentioned like environmental help, maybe where they're picked up is in criteria for evaluation. I'm going to let someone much more knowledgeable answer that question.

MS. LEE: You're right that the objectives are defined by the Applicant and they're defined usually in a way that fit the project that they're presenting. The way we look at them in an environmental document like this is to look at the ones that most guide where the project is coming from, but still leave the flexibility to come up with alternatives that are reasonable in a sort of big picture way. We haven't had a project before that had eight objectives. It makes it a little more complicated when you have lots and lots of objectives.

As I mentioned earlier, those last two are really land use concerns. We like to minimize impacts to highly populated areas. The way to get the environmental consideration into the objectives the whole purpose of the EIR. The purpose of an EIR is to identify where the impacts are and to find alternatives that minimize the impacts of the proposed project, so it's kind of a different level from the objectives. But it is always a challenge. You have to look at objectives that are presented by the Applicant in a way that defines their own project but that doesn't unreasonably constrict alternatives. And that's I guess all we can say.

MS. BLANCHARD: That's about it, yes.

MR. MICHAELSON: Did you remember your other question?

MS. BROOM: Elizabeth Broom. And I'm very interested in trails in the region. And it seems that building a larger transmission line across the county might be an opportunity to improve trail access to some areas. And I'm wondering if there's any plan to include that aspect or that possibility in the project plan?

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

MS. LEE: That's a good scoping comment as a suggestion that might be considered. Just so you know, we hear the opposite comment from many of the public agencies who are concerned that the access roads create an opportunity for the public to get to places where they previously wouldn't have been, so there is certainly a trade off, but maybe it's a regional issue. Much of these transmission lines do require access roads. If the terrain is such that an access road can be built parallel to it, then it is certainly an opportunity. But in the case where they're built across private land, that may not be something that landowners would want to see.

I would suggest that you put that in a scoping comment and maybe try and identify the particular areas in which you're interested in that being presented as an opportunity and we'll look at it from a land use and recreational point of view.

MS. BROOM: Well, specifically are you working with any trails organization, like the San Diego County Trails Association?

MS. LEE: We're meeting with the County actually the day after tomorrow.

MS. BROOM: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Any other questions? Yes. All we need is your name.

MS. LINDSAY: Diana Lindsay. I just have a question. San Diego Gas & Electric has had a representative come to our board meeting to answer some questions and we were asking about the possibility of burying the line through sections of the park. And Jim Avery had stated that where they could bury in areas outside the park, that they could not do that within the desert because of the heat element. And I'm wondering about this plan, that when I was looking at the map it shows that sections of it in the proposed plan is to bury it along the right-of-way for the road along Highway 78, but that doesn't make sense to me when Jim Avery specifically said that is not possible within the desert. And I don't understand the technology involved in it, but, you know, he's said that we had too much heat in the desert.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

MS. LEE: I can explain the difference and actually part of this you'll see. As some of you know that the CPUC and the EIR/EIS team have submitted a data request to SDG&E. In particular, one of the questions that was asked is to look at the feasibility of undergrounding a 230 kV route through Anza-Borrego and Highway 78 as opposed to the alternative.

The difference in what I think Mr. Avery was addressing, is that a 500 kV underground, while possible, has pretty severe feasibility constraints. It's possible in shorter segments. You wouldn't underground the 500 kV line in a desert situation because the extent of disturbance in a non-paved area would be huge. It would be equivalent with a very wide dirt road huge with amount of trenching. So not only is the heat as an engineering issue, but environmentally the impacts would be very much greater than an overhead line. But 230 kV lines can be undergrounded and are commonly, in fact, even by SDG&E undergrounded generally below paved roads. That is one of the things that we'll be looking at.

MS. LINDSAY: And could they be side by side?

MS. LEE: It would be two circuits of the 230 kV line, a double circuit line which is what is proposed per this project from the Central East substation, so what it would be is basically two parallel trenches. There's a picture of it we can show you afterwards, because it's the same configuration that is proposed, in fact, through this area south of Ramona, an underground 230 kV.

MR. MICHAELSON: Anybody else have a question? If you come up here, please, to the microphone. Tell us your name, please.

MS. DORROH: I'm Carolyn Dorroh, member of the Ramona Community Planning Group. Last year my employer had sent me to Alaska. While there I read a newspaper article that I found very interesting, because there's an abundance of wildlife up there. And what it discovered was that pathways created into previously inaccessible areas, pathways were created with the transmission line clearings and also highways, and what they saw was a decrease in population of the animals. Even though the habitat was still there, they couldn't figure out why the animals would not stay, mainly Caribou and some of the smaller species as well. But what they realized was that the predators could easily enter into the inaccessible areas, where they could not do that before, and so they take the path of least resistance, go into these areas, hunt and come right back out. And so I would like for SDG&E to address the impact of creating these accessible pathways into previously inaccessible areas by the predator species.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty, San Ysabel. I was wondering if somebody could help me a little bit with this group called CAISO, California Independent System Operators. I think it's a group — I went to the San Diego Regional Energy Office back, oh, a couple of months ago, and there must have been 150 people there on a very hot night. And they came up — we went there with the thought we were

going to have some voice in a matter that related to the proposed Sunrise Powerlink, and when we got there we — I understand now that the rate payers pay for their fees through — like a company like SDG&E would collect fees from us, they to go the CPUC somehow, and then this CAISO group starts making decisions about things. And, of course, SDG&E made a big bally-hoo about it, the fact that CAISO suggested that the proposed Sunrise Powerlink was something that we needed to have. It had a cost benefit that we needed to consider. But when we asked them, they said, well, we only looked at three things, we looked at the proposed Sunrise Powerlink, we looked at some Tehachapi thing, and some other thing that was out of the county, I thought. And those were the only three things they were evaluating. They weren't looking at in-county generation. And then this big thing, bally-hoo by SDG&E about CAISO, you know, this big outfit is proposing — is approving this. And I mean, what is that? Tell me how — that doesn't seem like a fair analysis. I mean, I'm a financial officer and I like to consider all the alternatives at once, but this group considered just three.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Maybe there's someone here who could address a little bit about it.

MS. LEE: What I won't do is get into their decision-making process. What you may want to do is look at their website. They have a fairly good website. I think it's [www.CAISO.com](http://www.CAISO.com) that describes what their purpose is and they have some nice graphics.

What the independent system operator does is to operate the transmission infrastructure the State of California on behalf of the members of the ISO, which is the independent — the IOU's, the SDG&E, and other utilities that have opted to be a part of ISO system. So they operate the grid basically on our behalf and they were established by law. So they're funded through all of our transmission rates. But as far as their process goes, it is entirely separate from what we're doing.

MR. MICHAELSON: So no one here represents them or is going to try to explain to you why they made the decision they did. So do you have another question?

MR. TRAFECANTY: I just want to make a comment that what I really believe — I think I'm pretty good at judging character of people or groups. And when I think CAISO, I think SDG&E. They seem like they're talking the same language wherever I go. And I've been following this for several months now. I just wanted to make that comment.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Let me suggest we take a little break for the court reporter's fingers and we'll also see if anyone new maybe comes in the intervening minutes. So we can always go back on the record, but we're going to go into recess now for about 10 minutes. Thank you.

(Off the record.)

MR. MICHAELSON: Going back on the record temporarily. Since we have such a small impact group here anyway, we thought what would work best is if you have any additional questions, we're going to leave the posters up and all of the staffers will be back there to answer your questions.

With that, we will adjourn. Thank you.

(The scoping meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.)

\* \* \*

**SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT  
Reporter's Transcript of the CPUC/BLM Scoping Meeting  
for Preparation of a Draft EIR/EIS**

Held 2:00 p.m. October 4, 2006  
At Borrego Springs, California

Reported by:  
Michelle McLaughlin, CSR No. 13025

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Lewis Michaelson - Katz & Associates, Public Facilitator  
Tom Zale & Lynda Kastoll - Bureau of Land Management  
Billie Blanchard - California Public Utilities Commission  
Susan Lee - Aspen Environmental Group

Presentation: pages 3 to 10  
Public Comments begin on page 11  
Q&A begins on page 23

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

Linda Carson.....	11
Sam Webb.....	11, 22
Lori Paul.....	12
Rebecca Falk.....	14
Bill Collins.....	15
Jim Lendemahn.....	16
Fred Emery.....	18, 19
Mark Jorgensen.....	17
Judy Haldeman.....	19
Betsy Knaak.....	20
Jeanette Hartman.....	20, 23
Kurt Levens.....	21
Laurel Granquist.....	21
Bob Hipchen.....	22

**Q&A, BY SPEAKER**

Rebecca Falk.....	23
Joe Raffetto.....	24, 30, 32
Fred Jee.....	25
Lori Paul.....	25, 26
Peggy Hurley.....	28
Gus Swiggers.....	29
Linda Carson.....	29
Sam Webb.....	31
Jeanette Hartman.....	31
Linda Pequina.....	32
Katalina Prince.....	32
Laurel Granquist.....	33
Jim Lendemahn.....	33

## STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good afternoon. My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work for a firm called Katz & Associates, and we've been hired to help support these public meetings and for my services as a neutral meeting moderator to make all of it run smoothly and efficiently and make sure everyone gets a fair and equal chance to offer their comments.

As you may know, we've already held three of these meetings between El Centro and Ramona. Today and this evening, we're in Borrego Springs, and tomorrow we have two different meetings in San Diego County, in the Mission Valley and Rancho Penasquitos area.

This meeting is a scoping meeting being held to satisfy two regulations — or two laws, one state law, the California Environmental Quality Act, and the other a federal law, the National Environmental Policy Act.

Up here on the screen, we'll be going through a series of slides just to give you some orientation. What to expect today: I will briefly explain the purpose of scoping. Following that, Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group, seated immediately to my right, will go through a description of the proposed project, then Billie Blanchard of the California Public Utilities Commission, next to her, will go through their process and schedule for the Environmental Impact Report.

Next to her is Lynda Kastoll and Tom Zale with the Bureau of Land Management. They're the lead agency for the EIS process under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Then we'll go back to Susan Lee briefly just to give you some more details on how the whole EIR/EIS process works and how the documents are prepared.

Then we'll get to what is really the heart of a scoping meeting which is your opportunity, the public and agencies, to provide input to the people who are seated up here.

I want to make it clear that this is very early in the environmental impact review process. That's why it's called scoping, so no decision is going to be made today or in the near future. This is an input-, data-gathering phase. But they did want to be here. Part of it is so they can hear your comments firsthand.

Now, while that's very important to some people, I want to make it also very clear that there's ample opportunity to provide written comments, and written comments are given the same weight and consideration as oral comments. So if you're like most Americans, uncomfortable with public speaking, please don't feel like you've been left out. The people representing the Bureau of Land Management and the California Public Utilities Commission would very much like to have any and all written comments that you would like to provide as well.

To reiterate, the purpose of scoping is first to inform the public and responsible agencies about an upcoming project for which an EIR and an EIS is being prepared, to inform you about the review process so that you can understand how to participate, and then, importantly, to solicit — during the scoping period — input.

And I want to put the emphasis on these two things: Potential alternatives to the proposed project and the appropriate scope of environmental issues to be studied in the EIR/EIS.

Additionally, they are able to identify issues of concern and areas of potential controversy from your input, and, finally, a scoping report will be prepared which will summarize all of the comments

received orally and in writing from all of the meetings, and it will be distributed to the information repositories and put on the project website so that you can, if you want to, see what were the comments that came from different people in different areas. So all of the comments will be available to you after the scoping period is over.

I've already mentioned — alluded a little bit to this, but there are some key players that you need to be aware of. One is the California Public Utilities Commission, who is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act. The Bureau of Land Management is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act. They are not a part of this proceeding, but, obviously, one of the other key players is the San Diego Gas & Electric Company, which is the applicant.

Sometimes I've noticed there is confusion, even after the meeting, talking with people. They want to know if we're with SDG&E. We're not. This is an independent review process that follows after an application is made by somebody like SDG&E.

And finally, Aspen Environmental Group is the consulting firm that's been hired by the CPUC and the BLM to be the main workhorse in providing all of the subject matter experts and all of the environmental subjects in order to do the analysis and the independent review of the potential impact.

So those are the key players.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to Susan Lee to do our description of the proposed project.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Lewis.

The Notice of Preparation that you all have a copy of includes a fairly detailed description of the project as it's been proposed by SDG&E. The text description is on Pages 4 through 8, and then there's a large series of maps in the back; I'll just point you to a few maps. Maybe you had the opportunity earlier to look at them around the back of the room.

Figure 1 is the overview of the entire project, but the area where we are today is most visible on Figure 2, which is the Desert Link. That figure shows the proposed project that would pass through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. It also shows Borrego Springs just to the north.

The other map you probably want to take a look at is the one in the very back that shows alternatives because you may have noticed that SDG&E has suggested a possible alternative that goes through Borrego Springs. I'll talk in more detail about alternatives.

We wanted to make sure you understand what information you have in this package. The project that SDG&E has proposed is a 150-mile long transmission line with a 500-kilovolt portion that would cover the first 90 miles. That's the portion that would go through the desert ending up at a substation near Warner Springs, and at that point, the transmission line would convert to a 230-kV transmission line continuing down through Santa Ysabel, the Ramona area, and on out to coastal San Diego.

The Imperial County portion has one different aspect, which is that despite the fact that it's been proposed at this point by San Diego Gas & Electric, the line ultimately would be built and owned, if it's approved, by the Imperial Irrigation District up to the Narrows Substation. Narrows is the small substation just within Anza-Borrego on the east side, and that's being addressed. There's a memorandum of agreement between SDG&E and Imperial Irrigation District that addresses the details of their cooperation.

This next slide shows SDG&E's three main purposes for building this line. The first one is to maintain reliability of service into the San Diego area.

The second one is for renewables, and I'm sure you've heard about this. The renewable energy resources out in this area are geothermal resources around the south end of the Salton Sea and a fairly large proposed solar plant, the Stirling Plant, as well as possibly other solar facilities out here that would be down closer to Imperial Valley Substation.

The third reason that SDG&E has proposed the project is that it would reduce energy costs overall within San Diego.

Here we've listed the objectives, and these are, again, SDG&E's objectives. These are the reasons they say the project is required. These mainly mirror the three goals that they've defined. The last two, however, define their land use process in siting a power line, which basically is to avoid dense residential areas.

We will now turn this to Billie Blanchard.

MS. BLANCHARD: Good afternoon. I'm Billie Blanchard, and I am the project manager at the CPUC for the environmental document. I just want to go over briefly the CPUC review process and the schedule that we have at this point in time.

Under the CPUC, there are two review processes that are ongoing for this application for the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, known as a CPCN. There's the general proceeding, and then there is the environmental review process with the CEQA/NEPA document which I am mostly involved in.

The general proceeding will be led by the Assigned Commissioner Dian Grueneich and the Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman.

The scope of the CPCN proceeding is determined by the Public Utility Code Section 1002, and the scope of that includes determining the need for the project. That's a very important part. Also under the CPCN, we consider community values, recreational, historic, and aesthetic values, and then, of course, the environmental impacts under CEQA.

The schedule that we have so far for the general proceeding is that we've had several pre-hearing conferences. One was held in January, and then the second one was held on September 13th in Ramona.

Now, the scoping memo for the general proceeding will be prepared by the administrative law judge, and that is expected to be done within the first part of October 2006. In that scoping memo, they will outline all of the issues to be addressed in the proceeding as well as the scheduling for all of the activities in the proceeding, which will also include our environmental schedule.

So the aspects that are listed here right now are yet to be determined, but hopefully that will be coming out in the next couple of weeks. The environmental review schedule is: The application was originally filed in December, and then there was an amended application along with the actual Proponent's Environmental Assessment, known as the PEA, and that was filed on August 4th. The Notice of Preparation, which Susan was talking about, was issued on September 15th, and so our scoping process schedule will continue until October 20th, 2006.

We have not yet determined the start date of the public review of the draft EIR/EIS, which will be a 90-day comment period. However, we should be doing that pretty soon, and when we do, we will go ahead and send out a card to everybody on the CEQA and NEPA mailing list to tell you what those dates are.

Now I'll take this over to BLM.

MR. ZALE: Thank you.

My name is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are here representing the BLM's El Centro field office. We're here because the right-of-way application that San Diego Gas & Electric filed involves a proposed right-of-way that would cross about 33 miles of BLM land, primarily in Imperial County. As you can see from the slide, there's a small piece in San Diego County that's also administered by BLM.

In addition to that, when the patent was issued for Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, it included a reservation for the existing right-of-way grant, and we're still working in our office to determine exactly what role BLM would have in administering that reservation.

As part of this process, we will be evaluating a proposed amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, which is the land-use plan that covers the public lands in the vicinity of the proposed right-of-way application.

The plan amendment would be required because the proposed right-of-way would deviate from existing designated utility quarters, so we'll need to make a decision about whether or not a new designation for a utility quarter should be made in the area that's proposed for this project as part of the environmental review and decision-making process.

Because there's a plan amendment involved, the public review period for the draft EIS/EIR will be 90 days as opposed to a normally shorter review process associated with the EIRs and EISs. In addition to working on the federal side, the NEPA side, BLM will also be responsible for conducting government-to-government consultation with interested tribes, and we will also be the lead agency conducting the Section 7 with the Fish and Wildlife Service in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

MS. LEE: One of the really important roles that an EIR/EIS plays, in addition to helping these two lead agencies to make their decisions, is to provide information to a range of other agencies that also have to make decisions and issue permits to allow a project to proceed. We will be coordinating with lots of other agencies and will expect input from these agencies, especially where we are right now, Borrego Springs. Of course the most important agency is the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. With more than 22 miles of this project proposed through there, it's the largest individual landowner after BLM, which has 33 miles.

So the agencies listed on here are some of the many agencies that we will be working with throughout this process.

This is a flow chart you may have seen in the back of the room that, again, just reiterates the fact that we are at the very beginning of this process. This shows the whole EIR/EIS process, and we are in that yellow square that says EIR/EIS scoping. It's basically the first step of the process, when we come out and talk to the public and find out what concerns you have and what impacts might exist.

Concurrently, we are starting to work on our project description. We are doing a lot of work on alternatives, and I'll talk about that in a minute. Ultimately we'll be back here after the draft EIR/EIS comes out, and we'll hear your public comments during the comment review period.

I'm going to briefly describe the contents of an EIR/EIS, mainly so you can get a feel for the kinds of comments that would help us. As we are thinking about preparing this document, it would be very helpful for us to hear input from you on some of the components and specific issues of the EIR.

Usually the most voluminous parts of a document like this is a description of the environmental setting, which means a description of what is here now, what's in the area (e.g. biological resources and cultural resources), and what are the land uses, and population centers.

We describe the impacts of the project, and in an equal level of detail, we describe the impacts of alternatives. We present mitigation measures, and the purpose of all of this is to pull information together for the decision makers to be able to understand the impacts of what's being proposed and also for the public to be able to comment on the proposal and the alternatives.

The major elements of an EIR are listed here so you can get a feel for the major sections that will be included. Again, the project description is essentially provided to us by SDG&E because we don't control the project that was proposed, but we do have a lot of input into the rest of it.

This next slide shows all of the environmental disciplines that we cover in a project such as this. There are a couple of others in addition. For example, Tom mentioned the other day that we haven't listed wilderness here, and certainly wilderness is a huge issue on this project given that the project would pass through wilderness areas within Anza-Borrego. So any comments related to the issues you see up here would be welcome tonight.

I'll talk in just a little more detail about alternatives because alternatives is a very high-profile issue and very important to this analysis. It's always important in an EIR/EIS, but if you attended the pre-hearing conference a couple of weeks ago, Commissioner Grueneich from the CPUC made a point of requiring SDG&E to submit its preference for an alternative that would not pass through Anza-Borrego. They submitted that just earlier this week.

We are working very carefully on alternatives and looking at a huge range of alternatives. This slide here explains to you the process we use to evaluate each alternative. It has to meet, essentially, all three of these bullet points. It has to meet most of the project objectives, but not all of them. It has to have the ability to reduce or avoid the impacts of the proposed project by going around certain areas, and an alternative must be feasible, which means you have to be able to construct it technically, and it has to be regulatively feasible in that it has to be able to be permitted. So those are the criteria we use to look at alternatives.

In this project in particular, we're looking at a wide range of alternatives, and this is something in particular we would love to hear from you about. We are looking at routing alternatives, and that's the issue most people think about especially when you see a linear project like this that goes through an area you don't want it to go through. We would love to hear your thoughts about where else it could go, and obviously we're looking at alternatives that do avoid Anza-Borrego.

But in this case, we're also looking at generation alternatives that could replace the need for this project. Examples are the South Bay Power Plant repowering within San Diego, to what extent that

project and other power plants that have been addressed for repowering possibilities in the future. Non-wired alternatives, in terms of things that would reduce demand within the service area, energy efficiency.

We are looking at the alternatives that were suggested by San Diego Gas & Electric, and you'll see those on one of the maps in the back. One of them we thought would get a fair amount of attention here is an alternative that SDG&E suggested that would go through Borrego Springs. We would love to hear from you about that.

We are also looking at the alternatives that SDG&E considered but did not carry forward, that they decided to eliminate. We start at square one with alternatives, so we would love to have your thoughts on this.

Just a note on this last bullet, there is an alternatives workshop being held through the CPUC's general proceeding that Billie described a little earlier next Friday. It's focused especially on parties to the formal proceeding, who can participate in that workshop. Other people are able to go and listen, but they won't be able to participate. We would love to have your alternatives comments here, and they will carry the same weight if you give them to us as if you attend that other workshop.

This slide shows what happens after the EIR is done, just so you understand the proceedings in terms of what would happen if the project is approved or when the Final EIR is finally issued. The CPUC, which is a five-member board appointed by the governor, will vote on the project. They will base part of their decision, as Billie mentioned, on the EIR itself. They will also base their decision on need.

If the project is approved by the CPUC, they will require mitigation measures, which mitigation measures are included, and require that those measures be monitored to ensure they're actually implemented.

BLM has a different process after the finish of the EIR/EIS. It has a 30-day comment period on the Final, which does not apply in the State world. They have a 60-day governor's consistence review, and then they prepare a Record of Decision.

I'll turn this back to Lewis for comments.

MR. EMERY: I have one question on what you just said.

MR. MICHAELSON: The procedure we're going to do here is we're going to take comments and then Q and A, so I think we can get answers to the questions on that later, if that's okay with you.

MR. EMERY: It's directly related to what's being said.

MR. MICHAELSON: Let me explain something. I'm going to have to ask you to come up to the microphone. I'll have to ask you to give your name. We're recording this for a transcript, and she can't hear you. So if this is directly relevant, go ahead and come up here if it can't wait.

MR. EMERY: I apologize for interfering in this early stage. My name is Fred Emery. The lady Susan Lee — you said that SDG&E had put forward an alternative avoiding the park this week. Where is that? Is it anywhere on display here?

MS. LEE: Yes. Tom can show you in the back. There is a series of maps actually in the handout. If you have your NOP handout here, the very last map is Figure 8, and that's called "SDG&E Alternatives Considered and Eliminated." So when you find that one, the route that SDG&E focused on in the filing they submitted the day before yesterday is what is labeled on here as the B, C, and D groups.

Alternative D, which goes basically through the Cleveland National Forest from the vicinity of Barrett, down along the Southwest Powerlink, past Descanso, and up into the Santa Ysabel area, is the route that SDG&E identified as the route it would prefer if the park route were not pursued.

MR. MICHAELSON: What I'd like to do now — I have approximately ten cards of people who have filled them out. Daniel is going to bring me up a couple more. We have established a three-minute time limit for each person to offer their comments, but depending upon how long we go with that, we have had the opportunity at other meetings to have what I call second helpings.

So if you'll speak at a rate that the court reporter can record, we'd appreciate it. If you have additional comments that you want to make after that, after everyone has had at least one turn, then we can have time for you to come up and do that as well.

I have an extremely sophisticated way of indicating times to you. When you have one minute left, I'll put up my index finger like this. That will give you a chance to wrap up your comments. When your three minutes are up, I'll put my closed hand up such as this. Again, after we've run through and everyone has had at least one chance, we should have more time for you to come back up and complete those comments.

I'll also mention that one gentleman Bill Collins is representing two completely different organizations. He's filled out two cards, so I'm actually going to call him up twice to give comments for those, just so you know that's why that's going to occur.

My last slide up here — I think Susan Lee covered this quite well, but, again, we're at the scoping stage. We're not at the decision-making stage. In particular, the most useful comments at this stage are ones that identify location, extent of potential environmental impacts, as well as alternatives that you believe would avoid or reduce impact.

I'm going to read several names out in advance. That way you'll know about when you're coming up, so you'll be ready to come forward. I won't catch you off guard. Particularly if you're in the back of the room, it just helps us keep things moving more efficiently.

The first speaker cards that I have are Linda Carson, Sam Webb, Lori Paul, Rebecca Falk, and Bill Collins.

All I need you to do, again, is start with your name, and speak at a rate that is reasonable enough for the court reporter to keep up with. Okay.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

MS. CARSON: Thank you.

My name is Linda Carson. I'm executive director of the Anza-Borrego Foundation and Institute, a cooperating association of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. Our main mission is conservation of park lands. Our concerns regarding the Sunrise Powerlink Project are as follows: Number 1, we do not believe the project as now proposed adequately explores the alternatives that avoid state park lands. This project is completely at odds with the objectives, goals, and mandates of state parks. Alternatives, regardless of cost, must be thoroughly explored.

Number 2, the EIR/EIS should thoroughly analyze impacts on existing and future land uses. State parks should not be viewed as a place where lands are stored for some future non-park use. If so, perhaps we should create a new category of state parks, temporary parks until they're needed for some other use.

The EIR/EIS should fully evaluate the effects of declassifying wilderness. To our knowledge, the California State Park and Recreation Commission has never removed land from state wilderness. To do so would set a dangerous precedent that could well reverberate across this nation.

Number four, the EIR/EIS should include a complete analysis of the visual impacts of the Powerlink Project. It is estimated that upwards of 90,000 acres, much of it park wilderness, would be in the Powerlink view shed. Also visual impacts of the Powerlink along the state scenic Highway 78 need to be addressed.

Number 5, the EIR/EIS should evaluate project impacts on not only federally and state endangered species, including the endangered peninsular bighorn sheep, but also species included in the Regional Multiple-Species Conservation Program.

We would further request that the issue of wildfire, which does happen in the desert, be fully evaluated along the proposed route.

Number 6, the EIR/EIS should fully evaluate impacts the project could have on the recreational activities of park visitors. One of the major attractions of this park is the unspoiled scenic vistas. The EIR/EIS should evaluate impacts of placing the Powerlink in the immediate vicinity of the Tamarisk Grove Campground and Yaqui Wells Primitive Camp, as the close proximity of towers could cause a significant decline in the use of those campgrounds and thus a loss of revenue to those state parks.

And 7, the EIR/EIS should include complete and thorough surveys of the cultural resources along all of the power line alignment alternatives. Participation of the local Native American community is critical to this analysis.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Sam Webb.

MR. WEBB: My name is Sam Webb, and I'm a park volunteer at the visitors' center. I'm also the immediate past chairman of the Colorado Desert Archeology Society, which is a group of volunteers that assists the state archeology staff in doing their work of preserving the archeological features in the park.

My concerns are not so much the archeological sites that could be impacted because, you know, if there's something there, they'll make some concession for that, but the view shed of our park.

You know, our park was formed in 1932, and this existing right-of-way that San Diego Gas & Electric is wanting to put the route over is currently used by wooden poles, and it provides electricity for the back country. It doesn't send any electricity into the metropolitan area. I think that's an important note to make.

Secondly, I'm a little disturbed when San Diego Gas & Electric put an alternate route now through Borrego Springs because I figure that they did that as kind of a way to incite people to fight harder to keep it out of the town of Borrego Springs and rather have it go somewhere else rather than Borrego Springs, so I think that was a ploy on the part of San Diego Gas & Electric when they did that.

Where the power lines belong is to the south out of the park. There was a recent news story about — and I don't know which newspaper it was, so this is kind of secondhand information, but that, you know, one of the alternate routes out of the park would be impacted, and 50 people would have to be moved out of their homes.

That's not good, but that's better than destroying a park. The park is owned by the whole — every resident in the state of California owns the park, so, you know, I think these — what concerns me is that San Diego Gas & Electric — how do we know that they're not deliberately taking an alternate route that is really not the optimum alternate route? I guess that's some of the issues that you people have to address, but that concerns me a lot.

So I'm just going to end it by saying, to me and a lot of people at this meeting today, the only route that's acceptable is a route that does not destroy the most beautiful desert state park in the nation, Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. Take the power lines and run them out of our park, not through it.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Lori Paul, next speaker.

MS. PAUL: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'm Lori, L-o-r-i, Paul, P-a-u-l. My husband and I will be speaking about our own property at your session this evening. However, at this time I was asked by a neighbor who could not be here to read a letter into the record. It's Dr. David Garmon, and it is as follows:

"I am a homeowner in both San Diego and Borrego Springs, and I am writing to register my most vehement opposition to the placement of the proposed Sunrise Powerlink through the Anza-Borrego State Park. I oppose the Powerlink project 1) because of the devastating environmental impact" —

MR. MICHAELSON: Excuse me for interrupting. This is when we usually have our problem, people trying to read stuff into the record, so they just read it really fast instead of at a normal —

MS. PAUL: Slow down? Okay.

MR. MICHAELSON: So if you could slow down, I'd appreciate it.

MS. PAUL: Of course.

"I oppose the Powerlink project 1) because of the devastating environmental impact the project would have if sited through the State Park, 2) because of fiscal concerns I have as a rate payer and a taxpayer, and 3) because of technological concerns about SDG&E's proposed reliance on unproven methods of power generation.

"As the wisdom of the Powerlink project is debated, there will undoubtedly be many individuals who will provide detailed information to substantiate the environmental, fiscal, and technological concerns noted above. I am therefore writing as an individual who has come to appreciate the incomparable beauty of the Anza-Borrego desert, its wild life, the majesty of its hundred mile vistas, its unbroken silences. There are few, if any, such places left in San Diego County. If we sacrifice this one in the name of power and progress, we as a community will have sacrificed one of our last, and greatest, natural treasures.

"The sine qua non of the treasure that is our 'back country' is its unbroken vastness. The proposed Powerlink project would be a scar of unimaginable proportions that would irrevocably destroy that vastness with an inescapable ugliness spreading for countless miles on either side of the 120 mile course of the 10 story towers. It is inconceivable to me how anyone could propose placing a scar of such magnitude through such an environmentally and aesthetically sensitive location as the Anza-Borrego State Park when multiple alternatives exist.

"As a homeowner and business owner in San Diego, I am aware of our need for plentiful, dependable power. As with virtually any problem, however, I believe there are multiple ways of achieving this goal, particularly given the enormous budget proposed by SDG&E to address this issue. My hope is that we as a community will find a way to provide for our energy needs without destroying our irreplaceable heritage.

"Because of its fiduciary responsibility to its shareholders" —

MR. MICHAELSON: You're trying to fit it all in, aren't you?

MS. PAUL: Yes.

MR. MICHAELSON: It looks like it's a pretty long letter.

MS. PAUL: No. It's just one paragraph left.

MR. MICHAELSON: If you slow down, I'll let you finish it. Okay?

MS. PAUL: Thank you.

"As an owner of such equities, I believe SDG&E would be derelict as a publicly held corporation to do otherwise. However, my deeper concern is that the maximization of shareholder value is, in this case, at odds with the greater good of maintaining the beauty of a pristine horizon and protecting the habitat of a few dwindling species of desert flora and fauna. In short, preserving beauty and habitat does not maximize shareholder value. I believe in this case maximizing shareholder value would provide a short-term gain for the relatively few shareholders of SDG&E equities at the expense of current and future generations who would forever be deprived of the awe-inspiring beauty of the vast, uninterrupted Anza-Borrego State Park.

"It is my fervent prayer that this time San Diego will act wisely... that it will realize and protect the treasure it possesses... that it will not be asleep at a time of great decision... that it will not be herded like fearful sheep by those whose motives are necessarily about maximizing shareholder value.

"Sincerely, David Garmon, MD, Distinguished Fellow, American Psychiatric Association, Clinical Professor, University of California San Diego."

And I'll give this copy to you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, please.

I just want to mention that — Lori just mentioned wanting to have it read into the record. I just want to clarify again that a written comment is read by the people on the team. It's in the record, so a written comment handed in or mailed in is just as much, quote, unquote, in the record as anything spoken here. I just want you to be assured of that.

MS. PAUL: David wanted to share it with his community and the people here.

MR. MICHAELSON: I understand.

Rebecca Falk.

MS. FALK: Thank you.

My name is Rebecca Falk. I'm a full-time resident of Borrego Springs. I live here because the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park surrounds Borrego Springs and is a rare wilderness refuge in a country and world that has been developed in a way that does not preserve open spaces of this kind and doesn't respect how important they are for life, including human life.

My primary point is that as we realize the catastrophic effects of global warming, it becomes impossible to ignore our responsibility to do two things. The first is to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels so that we do not contribute to the load of carbon emissions that create the greenhouse effect on our planet.

The second is to keep our few remaining wild areas intact to create zones of refuge and balance as life itself becomes more challenging for all life forms.

SDG&E, also parent company Sempra Energy, has already proven itself to be unworthy of the public's trust as its unethical conduct cost us all dearly in 2000 and 2001. Here as I'm complaining about the name Sunrise Powerlink and the so-called Sunrise Powerlink, we are being asked to trust SDG&E/Sempra once again in a very expensive publicly funded project that would put them in a position of greater dominance in the energy market.

The timing is terrible. Just when the need for solar and alternative energy is clear and has resulted in a major project initiated by the California legislature and the governor, we are being asked to invest in old-style transmission from afar, of promised but nonexistent solar production that just happens to be located conveniently close and online with Sempra's dirty power plants across the border.

We are being asked to sacrifice wildlife habitats, wilderness areas, open back country areas, and lifestyles that are what we should be protecting as we face the ecological hardships that have already begun.

For what purpose? I think it is to further profit and dominance of a market for a company that has a bad reputation in California.

If we want to further the production of clean energy, let's talk about supporting, initiating, and funding projects that are local to the area where the power is needed. Let's pay attention to our increasingly and desperately stressed environment.

This isn't about being able to say that we supported a project that we thought at the time was going to be green. This is about making darn sure that we do the smart, ethical, and environmentally right projects to create the energy we want and need.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Let me read ahead the next few speakers again so you can be prepared. Bill Collins followed by Jim — it looks like Lendemahn. I apologize if I mispronounce any of the names — followed by Bill Collins' twin Bill Collins, followed by Mark Jorgensen, and Fred Emery.

MR. COLLINS: My name is Bill Collins. I'm chair of the Borrego Springs Community Sponsor Group. We're a planning and land-use advisory board appointed by County Supervisor Bill Horn. I want to thank you for traveling to Borrego Springs to see and hear firsthand from the people on the environment that would be affected by the Borrego Springs alternative power line. We value our peaceful, rural way of life and our dark skies.

Borrego Springs was voted to be one of the top ten places in the country to view the night sky. I would suggest tonight before you go to bed, walk outside, and you will be amazed.

16-story transmission towers with red blinking lights are not in keeping with the character of this community. They also plan on a 500-kilovolt/12-kilovolt substation near the mouth of Gloriette Canyon. This area has a wonderful secluded campground. The red lights and noise would destroy this area.

We also want to make it clear that no transmission line should go through any part of a state park in this country. If San Diego Gas & Electric is successful, then this opens the door for other lines through this park and other parks.

We feel that San Diego Gas & Electric hasn't explored all of the alternatives. The renewable energy industry is growing and rooftop solar should be explored. We have a lot of sunshine in the back country that could generate a lot of power. It could upgrade and re-power plants in Carlsbad, Escondido, and Otay Mesa.

They could put in peaker plants used at times when a lot of energy is needed. These peaker plants could be run on natural gas. Can we think out of the box and work together to find a less costly, less intrusive alternative? We believe this can be done, and we must try to achieve this goal.

Thank you in advance for your help.

MR. MICHAELSON: Jim Lendemahn.

MR. LENDEMAHN: Hi. I'm Jim Lendemahn. I am a homeowner and a person who, for years, has enjoyed the wonders of the desert and, as a park volunteer, have helped to introduce many people to those wonders. I stand in opposition to SDG&E's Sunrise Line.

I noted in the media recently that SDG&E has begun recently to try to characterize the opposition to this as public land versus private land. I believe that is entirely beside the point. In fact, I believe it is a red herring designed to divide the opposition to the project.

Opposition to the project arises from the many, many citizens, such as myself, who believe that a line should not be built through an area which is a sensitive habitat for endangered species, has been designated wilderness, and has been reserved for people to enjoy the peace and tranquility of the desert.

These objections pertain both to the primary line that has been proposed and the alternative line that has been proposed, the one through Borrego Springs. I believe that SDG&E has an acceptable alternative to build the line on its present right-of-away along Interstate 8.

I would like to just take a moment to underline one of the points just made by Bill Collins. I just recently learned about the blinking lights on top of the high towers, and it should be noted that this area is nationally and internationally renowned by astronomers as a place which has open sky and a minimum of ambient light, and such a parade of little red lights on the horizon would devastate that.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Bill Collins.

MR. COLLINS: My family has owned 320 acres in Tubb Canyon since 1952. This includes a 60-acre subdivision where only five homes are built, and no more will be built. We acquired an additional 412 acres in 1962. We own from the valley floor at 800 feet to 2,000 feet in elevation.

The property goes up to and includes the viewpoint on S-22. We have two miles of water lines of which three-quarters of the line runs on top of the surface. We have three storage tanks in line to break up the pressure from 600 feet of fall. We have a small road up the hill to service the pipeline and water tanks.

My fear would be that SDG&E would need a much bigger road, and thus the chance of rocks falling onto and destroying our pipeline is high. The same small road is used by the state park to count the 40 or so endangered bighorn sheep. We have mountain lions, bobcats, deer, coyotes, rabbits, you name it who enjoy our backyard in peace. We have a gate that is kept closed so the animals are free to roam and live as they will.

The proposed 160-foot towers and roads would be a permanent visual blight. My property is so quiet; I can hear the wings of ravens as they fly over my house.

The potential exposure to electric and magnetic fields generated by their towers is unacceptable. The light pollution from the red lights on the 160-foot towers would destroy our night sky.

The Tubb Canyon approach being considered would be a negative impact and likely destroy a population of 40 bighorn sheep that use this privately owned land and water guzzler that Superintendent Mark Jorgensen installed 25 years ago. This is the only water supply for many miles, and I believe the construction alone would drive them away.

The spring from which we receive our water has supplied water for thousands of years. Thus we have areas that we call native kitchens. These archeological resources contain grinding and milling features and artifacts. These kitchens and sleeping areas are connected by trails marked with the original guide marks called Ducs.

We allowed a GPS plate boundary observation station to be installed on our hill. Gloriette Canyon that runs through our property is a major fault that would be running right through the property.

May I walk over and just point out — our property is from here to here, here, here, and here. This is our little road going up the hill. This GPS station is up here on Jackass Flats. This is Gloriette Canyon, which is the (inaudible).

MR. MICHAELSON: Mr. Collins, after the meeting, if you would stay for a few minutes and maybe go over this in more detail, they would be happy to stay and do that with you. If I could get you to wrap up your comments, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks.

The next speakers are going to be Mark Jorgensen, Fred Emery, Judy Haldeman, Betsy — it's either Knaak or Knaak — Jeanette Hartman, followed by Kurt Levens.

Yes, sir.

MR. JORGENSEN: My name is Mark Jorgensen. I'm the superintendent of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. I sincerely appreciate the CPUC and Aspen and BLM coming out to Borrego Springs and listening to comments, and I get the feeling in discussions with you that you're very open to listening to alternatives, and I think there are plenty of good ideas that have come out of this room.

The official comments of California State Parks Colorado Desert District will be forthcoming in writing. There will be quite a few pages that have been put together by our specialists, and it will be signed by our district superintendent Dr. Michael Wells.

It will reiterate to you the comments from our director Ruth Coleman in Sacramento that the proposed plan for Sunrise Powerlink through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is totally unacceptable to state parks; that despite meeting with SDG&E and Greystone representatives for about a year and a half to two years challenging them to be creative in their planning, I think the resulting proposal is very uncreative, is highly impactive to the park, and I think that the group has totally failed in coming up with a creative way to bring a power source through a state park.

We talked early on with the proponents of this project about some of the guidelines that state parks would hold tight to. One of them that is dearest to our heart is preservation of wilderness. Wilderness, by its very definition, is forever. It's not for some future time when it's convenient to use it for development.

Another was that we didn't feel that Eiffel Towers coming through the park were acceptable at all, and the project that we see is Eiffel Towers and violation of wilderness.

We sincerely believe that there are alternatives. There are alternatives to move around the southern area of the park. Having two lines together up through the desert mountain areas through the rocks does not pose a fire hazard. When you get to the area up around Jacumba, the line would be split, and that would be an area where you enter some fuels and chaparral, so the concept that wildfires would endanger this joint line I don't think have any justification whatsoever.

I think there are other creative alternatives, too. Splitting the 500 into two 230's, probably undergrounding along causeways that are already impacting the area such as the interstates and state highway I think are viable alternatives.

Thank you again for coming to Borrego Springs and listening to our concerns.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Fred Emery.

MR. EMERY: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for this opportunity to speak.

The fact that I'm a foreigner is irrelevant. I'm a homeowner in Borrego Springs, relatively recently, but one of the reasons I came here was the phenomenal beauty of this area and this park, and I want to stress that it's not just an asset for the state of California, though of course you own it, and as a California taxpayer, I support that, but it's also an international asset as Jim Lendemahn stated with regard to its clear skies but also its unique beauty. It's something that cannot be replicated elsewhere.

We all know about Death Valley. We know about the south Arabian deserts, but fewer go these days. But these are different, and this is very special and something that should be treated with utter sanctity.

Others much more eloquent than I have spoken to you today about all the disadvantages and horrors that would await it. I wanted to address the issues here that you've asked us to bring up, specifically the inadequate, in my view, examination of alternatives by the power company.

I read all of their information going back to last year, and they do not seem even to have considered the northern route. I'm well aware there could be objections to the northern route, too, but there is a possible northern route that would avoid the park by going up Route 86, crossing over the back, and coming out towards Oceanside.

I'm not a technician. I just point out to you that I think you ought to ask why the northern route has not been examined because that would avoid the park completely.

The gentleman in charge of the park, Mr. Jorgensen, just noted the underground options. It's an interesting point. I raised this issue at the earlier meeting in January with Greystone, and they sent me the following answer which I think is of great interest.

They said the problem with underground wires is that the ones in Japan, which have had a 500-kilovolt line, run for less — or fewer than 25 miles.

Well, you've seen on your charts here today that the line that goes through the park is actually only 22 miles, so it would seem that that is certainly a candidate for complete burial of the line right through the park on the basis of Greystone's own document.

I raised earlier — thank you very much for allowing me to — the question of where this new line, suddenly that's been agreed on this week, would go, and you pointed out that it was the former Alternatives B, C, and D, which they now said should be considered.

Let's just read what they say in this document you all have in front of you of why they excluded it.

They said this was eliminated by SDG&E due to reliability concerns of locating a new 500-kilovolt line near the lower powerlink, but now suddenly they can do it. It seems to me that they are extremely inconsequential in their examining of alternatives and dismissing them. So I urge that even that alternative that they have suddenly come up with again be looked at to see what impacts it has. Lastly —

MR. MICHAELSON: We're going to do second helpings.

MR. EMERY: Can I have one little impact? It will take ten seconds.

MR. MICHAELSON: Ten seconds.

MR. EMERY: Electromagnetic impulses — these have been studied across the world to see whether power lines impact on people's health. There is contradictory evidence, but it's not for us as non-scientists just to dismiss it.

If you are going to introduce 500-volt lines across animals and people, we ought to know what the impact is.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, Mr. Emery.

Judy Haldeman.

Some of the speaker cards I have now were turned in perhaps later in the process, so if you weren't here when I was going over it, I have a very simple way to indicate the three-minute limit. When you have one minute left, I'll put up one finger and then my closed hand when you're at three minutes. I appreciate everybody paying attention to that.

Thank you.

MS. HALDEMAN: My name is Judy Haldeman. I agree with Fred Emery that there have been lots of very — more eloquent comments made today than I'm going to make, but I still want to speak my small piece.

This is a quote from an author, Terry Tempest Williams, who wrote a book called "Refuge" which doesn't address deserts but certainly does address protected areas. She said "May you recall the transformative power of wilderness and remember it survives now only through vigilance." There are two points here that I think are important. There is transformative power in wilderness. Anza-Borrego Desert State Park provides that transformation to those of us who live within its boundaries. It provides solace and stress relief for our many weekend guests from San Diego and Los Angeles and the awesome sense of discovery for visitors from out of state or foreign countries.

Secondly and more important is the point that wilderness survives only through vigilance. The proposal by San Diego Gas & Electric to invade and forever alter this precious wilderness of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park calls on all of us to be not only vigilant but passionate about defending our community and our pristine natural resource.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Betsy Knaak.

MS. KNAAK: Good afternoon. My name is Betsy Knaak. I am the executive director of the Anza-Borrego Desert Natural History Association and a long-time member of the Borrego Springs

community. I would like to speak to the socioeconomic aspect of the EIR today, as a member of the community.

I feel that the latest alternative route being proposed, that is through Borrego Springs and Gloriette Canyon and Tubb Canyon, would have an extremely serious negative economic impact on this community.

Borrego Springs depends, to a very large extent, on the sole industry of tourism. Most of our local businesses, including hotels, restaurants, retail, real estate companies, developments, are dependant upon tourists, snow birds, retirees, and second-home buyers who are attracted to the Borrego Valley because of its extraordinary natural and scenic beauty.

That beauty is comprised of the elements of broad mountain vistas, vast swabs of mature growth, native vegetation that supports a diversity of wildlife, clean air, quietness, and dark night skies.

The power line project as proposed through the Borrego Valley would affect every one of these natural elements to the degree of redefining the Borrego Valley and seriously jeopardizing the economic viability of this community.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Jeanette Hartman.

MS. HARTMAN: My name is Jeanette Hartman, and I'm a member of the People's Powerlink and the Sustainable Julian Group whose mission is to take Julian off the SDG&E power grid. We will be submitting detailed written comments for this scoping process.

Today, however, we want to go on the record with the following request of CPUC: SDG&E has a hidden agenda of which the Sunrise Powerlink is only one small part. The real project being proposed here includes a power plant in Mexico that pollutes air in the Imperial Valley, a transmission system that will have severe and irreversible environmental impacts regardless of where it is constructed in San Diego County, the true cost for which is closer to 4 billion than 1 billion, and that will end with distribution lines into and out of the Southern California Edison system in the LA basin.

The cost of need for impacts from and alternatives to the Sunrise Powerlink cannot be evaluated in isolation from the cumulative cost impacts and alternatives associated with this massive and hidden plan for a generation and transmission system.

The evidence for this plan is ample. We refer you to the People's Powerlink website at [Peoplespowerlink.org](http://Peoplespowerlink.org), where you can see a documentary using Google Earth that shows the very large generating plants in Mexico and the equally large transmission system connecting to the El Centro Substation, the point of origin for the Sunrise Powerlink. Also of evidence is SDG&E's numerous previous attempts to route a south-to-north transmission line through San Diego County.

Therefore, we ask the CPUC to reject the Sunrise Powerlink application on the grounds that it cannot be evaluated in isolation from the complete and interdependent electric production and transmission plan that stretches from Mexico to Los Angeles.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Kurt Levens is our next speaker.

MR. LEVENS: Hi. I'm not going to speak. I'm just going to present a written document. I may speak later.

So give it to you?

MR. MICHAELSON: That would be fine. Thank you.

Daniel, have you had any more speaker cards handed in to you?

Okay. This would be the point in time where we could ask people that have additional comments — first of all, is there anyone who hasn't turned in a card who maybe still would like to speak?

Why don't you come up here? I'll have you fill out a card kind of after the fact, if that's okay. All I need you to do is state your name for me. Okay? And pull the mike toward you.

MS. GRANQUIST: My name is Laurel Granquist. I live in Julian. The Santa Ysabel area where the proposed new plan of the transmission line will go through is composed of ranches dating back to the Spanish land grants as well as extensive Native American archeological sites.

The Cleveland National Forest should also be protected from transmission lines and ensuing probability of fires, just as in Anza-Borrego State Park. The quality of life for those in Santa Ysabel would be greatly compromised by health, visual, and cultural effects from this massive transmission line.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

I think I saw someone else's hand back there. Please come forward.

MS. WARREN: Yes. My name is Cristina Warren, and I'm a property owner here in Borrego Springs. I just wanted to touch on a few things, especially something that hasn't been talked about is that a lot of people out here in Borrego have moved out here because of environmental sensitivities, myself and my son included, and for us to face this type of electromagnetic radiation is quite daunting.

Also I lived in Julian during the Pines and Cedar fires, and the Pines fire was started, as you know, by a National Guard helicopter hitting a power line about 200 yards from my property. Anybody who's lived through the devastation of fire knows why this is a great concern to us, as well as the fact that a lot of us go through the inconvenience of living away from towns, away from big stores, summers that we go through here specifically because we care so much about the beauty. That's why we live out here, and to ask us to put up with that kind of a scar is really more than most of us can stand.

I also have the good fortune to have solar — a 5-kilowatt solar system on my house. It cost \$23,000 and makes enough electricity for probably two homes. If I'm doing my math correctly, you could put 40,000 of those 5-kilowatt solar displays on top of houses in San Diego and not be confronted with the expense of a huge power line to get the electricity back to San Diego.

Thank you very much for your time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Is there anyone else?

Yes, sir. Please come forward.

MR. WEBB: My name is Sam Webb, and I'm on the list already. I just think it's important that you're made aware of the fact that this is really not a good time to be having this hearing because we're missing probably two-thirds of the people that come into the community and spend the winter months here, but they have a vested interest in it as much as we do, the full-time residents. So somewhere in your calendaring, I think it's very important that you have some type of meeting that allows these snow birds to be able to give you some input in the process. That's all I had.

MR. MICHAELSON: Sir, can I just ask real quick, when do they start arriving?

MR. WEBB: Most of them come after the holidays.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. So January?

MR. WEBB: Right towards Christmas, so I would say you'd want to have it — the best time would be sometime end of February, I would think.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right.

Yes, sir. Come forward.

MR. HIPCHEN: How are you doing? My name is Bob Hipchen. I am here to represent the offroaders over in Ocotillo Wells. What he said just kind of brought something to light to me. Thanksgiving weekends or holiday weekends, there's going to be 100,000 people out here to use that desert, and they would be very disappointed to come out and see these towers and stuff that weren't there two months ago, and they didn't know about it or something like that, so I feel like these people should be made aware of this also so they can have a say-so.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

As you can come up, if you haven't already spoken, Daniel is going to try to intercept you and get you to fill out one of those cards, if that's okay.

Thanks.

Anyone else? If you've already spoken and you would like to come up and add to your comments, we have time to do that as well, and then after that we're going to have like a Q and A, so you can come up and maybe get some other things clarified.

So anyone want to add to their comments?

Yes. Please come on up. All I need is your name again.

MS. HARTMAN: Jeanette Hartman.

I wanted to add a postscript to the comment that I made about true costs being closer to 4 billion than the 1.3 billion that's in the SDG&E application, and those costs include the debt-servicing costs, operation costs, and maintenance in addition to construction. The Sierra Club San Diego and Imperial County Chapter developed those costs, and it will be included in those Sierra Club comments and ours.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Thank you for that clarification.

All right. Obviously, where we are in the stage of the process at scoping, there are some questions that can't be answered. For example, if your question is what will be the impact of this to that, they

haven't done that analysis yet. But to a degree to which you may have additional questions about the proposed project or the type of analysis that will be done or the type of resources that will be looked at, this would be an opportunity for you to come up, particularly if they are of general interest that you think other people would like to know the answer to. I think if you have specific comments or questions about — you know, very focused on a very specific area, perhaps your own backyard literally, those may be better off at the maps afterwards. But if it's something you think other people would like to know the answer to, this would be your time to come up and ask the question.

If you would, come up to the mike, please, and as always state your name first. Thank you.

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. FALK: Hi. My name is Rebecca Falk. I guess I just want some clarification about whether it's within your perception of your power, doing this report to just say "No. This does not pass as an environmentally do-able project and as an environmentally friendly project." The reason I ask that is that all of the points about mitigation — once you talk mitigation, you're talking "Yeah. We're going to do it. Here's what you do to compensate for the damage," so anything having to do with mitigation is already saying "Yes. We're going to approve this." So I would just like some reassurance that you are each willing to say "No. This project can't go forward," if that's what your finding is.

MR. MICHAELSON: I think we need to clarify who the decision makers are and where the environmental review fits into the general proceeding.

Do you want to do that?

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes.

As Susan spoke earlier about our process, we will be addressing all of the impacts of the proposed project, but we will also be looking at alternatives to the project. One of the major things about alternatives is that they lessen significant impacts, so we will be looking at those alternatives.

Under CEQA/NEPA, there is a point during our alternatives analysis where we will identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative from the alternatives we carry forward. We also will be looking at the No-Project Alternative as well.

MR. MICHAELSON: Tom Zale would like to add on, I think.

MR. ZALE: Similarly, in the NEPA process, we are required to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives, and among those alternatives would be the no-action alternative, so we'll include that in the answer.

MR. MICHAELSON: Other questions?

Yes, sir. Please come up and ask it at the mike.

MR. RAFFETTO: Thank you.

My name is Joe Raffetto. I own California Overland Desert Excursions, so we would certainly be impacted because we try to bring people away from 500-kilovolt towers, not take them to them.

My question is: Sempra's answer to the alternative route — basically, they — as expected, oh, it's a terrible thing. It means 53 houses are going to be destroyed, and I'm sure a couple of churches and two

hospitals and Mother Teresa's grave, but aside from that, do we know — it seems to me the most obvious route that this power line should take, if even indeed it should be built, is along the I-8 corridor, and I still don't know exactly why that hasn't been seriously considered, both in ease of construction, less environmental damage, less impact on private rights, and ease of maintenance. I just don't understand why it's not being seriously considered, and my question is: Do you know?

MR. MICHAELSON: Well, I think what they can answer is whether they're going to consider it in their alternatives. I don't know that they can speak for SDG&E.

MS. BLANCHARD: I'll just say one thing. This is the point where we're getting input from people for alternatives, so this is probably, I guess, the second time I've heard that comment about the I-8 corridor, so we'll take that into consideration in terms of our alternative analysis and run it through the CEQA/NEPA criteria for alternatives.

Susan, do you want to say anything more?

MS. LEE: I guess the other thing is the caveat we've told other people, which is the challenge of using Caltrans' right-of-way. Caltrans is very, very possessive of anything within its right-of-way, so the option we would be looking at is — Talk to them.

MR. MICHAELSON: We were doing so well up to now. That's why I hesitate to speak for why SDG&E might — MS. BLANCHARD: Now, Caltrans does have certain restrictions within its right-of-way for interstates and certain restricted highways. We know that, and we've dealt with that before in other projects, so obviously if we were looking at something like that, we would have to work with Caltrans in terms of being outside of that restricted area.

MR. MICHAELSON: Other questions? If you have a question, I need you to come up to the mike and ask it.

Sir? Please.

MR. JEE: My name is Fred Jee. I'm a 31-year resident here in Borrego Springs, and I've been involved in this community for quite a long time and grown to basically try to share the beauty of what this place has with people on my job as well as my family.

I have a question. In regard to the EIR process, would past projects that have a similar flavor be considered? And I'm talking about the Sun Desert Project, which was in the '70s. That was a nuclear power plant that was being proposed to run through three corridors of Anza-Borrego at that time east to west, and they didn't build it.

MR. MICHAELSON: What is the question?

MR. Jee: It's called Sun —

MR. MICHAELSON: I know.

What is the question?

MR. JEE: Would something of that nature — because it seems to have a similar flavor, power generation from somewhere else, power lines being brought through the state park, and that was almost 30 years ago. Here it sounds like Sun Desert is really Sunrise.

MS. PAUL: It's using the same data.

MR. JEE: Without the similar concerns about — objections and —

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm going to see if they have a response, if they've been able to define a question. It sounded a little more like a comment.

MS. BLANCHARD: We can check it.

MR. MICHAELSON: They can check it, is what they said.

MR. JEE: I just want to make sure all the different things are out there.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Yes. Come on up.

MS. PAUL: I would like to echo —

MR. MICHAELSON: Your name?

MS. PAUL: Lori Paul, L-o-r-i, P-a-u-l.

I would like to echo the same comment because there is probably a precedent set at that time for not siting the corridor through the park, and that precedent might have some legal as well as, you know, practical value.

Also in addition to Highway 8, it's interesting to me that Caltrans has more sway with their hard-lined policies than obviously the respect of the state park does here, or they wouldn't have proposed it.

It seems to me there's also in this last map, Figure 8 — you've got the existing 500-kilovolt transmission line. You can see that it runs basically along the Mexico border — to the Mexican border near where Sunrise Powerlink wants to be located, at that orange line. This stuff about fire reliability has been proven somewhat bogus, and I think it should be examined compared to all of the other adverse impacts and then weigh them on a scale, and then also I'd be interested in not only adding that alternative for that reason, but also someone was mentioning, at the other meeting in Ramona, reliability for seismic concerns and terrorist attacks and homeland security.

It sure seems to me that on existing corridors where you have security that — you're doubling up your security in one location instead of dividing it — not that terrorists could bomb two different places at once like they did the Pentagon and World Trade Center — but also you have a situation where the seismic activity in this area, as I think someone else mentioned — this is one of the most seismically active places on the planet in terms of shifting fault lines, and it would seem to me that that should be an issue of concern. We haven't had an event in a while, but that could be a bad thing.

I don't know what this corridor is called, so my last question — or my question is: What is that orange line? They just say existing 500-kilovolt transmission line. Is there a name or something we can cite on that to ask that that be considered?

MS. LEE: That's the 500-kV Southwest Powerlink.

MR. MICHAELSON: So if you would like to make the suggestion that the new one just follow that same route, you would reference the Southwest Powerlink, and I believe that's already been suggested.

MS. PAUL: Because when I tried to pull this up on the website — which is the last comment. The PDF files are so large. I have a huge iMac with a massive amount of, you know, memory, and I could die of old age before that thing loads, and the reporter, in fact, from San Diego Channel 10 got the blue screen of death when she tried to load these things up. It's like you can't pull data up on that Sunlink — Powerlink website.

Go to your home computer and try to do it, and then picture people in the back country on dial-up. I think CEQA/NEPA and all of your regulations require that people have access to the data.

MR. MICHAELSON: Are you speaking of SDG&E's site or the State's site?

MS. PAUL: SDG&E Sunrise Powerlink website that has these maps — I mean, these routes seem to pop up like mushrooms, and suddenly you've got this Tubb Canyon route, and I went to pull it up when I got a call from a neighboring landowner because we had not been notified by SDG&E. We suddenly had a surveyor's truck showing up on our land, and, quite frankly, I'd like to know who's trespassing and why. Bill Collins gives me a call. I go to the computer. I go to Sunrise Powerlink to look at these maps —

MR. MICHAELSON: You're going way too fast for the court reporter, just so you know.

Can I just clarify that they have — at this point, I would encourage you for the proceedings related to the EIR/EIS that you reference the State's website for the information. If you have problems with that website, then we would like to know that.

MS. PAUL: However, the only —

MR. MICHAELSON: If I could just finish. So far through the meetings we've had — so far, we haven't had anyone indicate that they've had any trouble with that website, so if we are, we'd like to know that.

MS. PAUL: There's a problem with that, and the problem with that is when you type in Sunrise Powerlink — what I'm trying to explain is when I get told about this for the first time and I go to a website and I type in Sunrise Powerlink into Google, your state site is not what comes up. What comes up is SDG&E's site with these maps, these exact maps they provided to you. You can't load, can't get them to load. You can't get the info. That's my point. I didn't even know about the state site.

MR. MICHAELSON: Did you get the NOP? Do you have a copy of the Note of Operation?

MS. PAUL: I got it today.

MR. MICHAELSON: If you look at that on Page 15-J, that's the website I would like to encourage you to reference.

MS. PAUL: But the point is the public at large with whom this process is supposed to reach, they are not getting to your website through Google, which is probably the best search engine that most people use, so there's an issue of accessibility. When they do get to an informative site, they can't pull that site up.

I know I'm not the only one who's brought this up. I think that public access needs to be an issue. Putting a hard copy at the library just doesn't do it anymore.

MR. MICHAELSON: Well, just so you know, this is the first we've heard of it, so we've got the comment, and we'll look into it. I would encourage you to help others — obviously, you're very plugged in — MS. PAUL: Sure.

MR. MICHAELSON: — to let other people know about this website.

MS. PAUL: I don't know about "plugged in." I live up in Alta Dena, California.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Are there other questions?

Yes. Please come forward.

MS. HURLEY: My name is Peggy Hurley. I'm a property owner and a business owner. I just have a question about the scoping comments being postmarked by October 20th. Are you going to discuss that? I guess, is that the final opportunity to put in information? And how far out there — I mean, do people know of —

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes. October 20th is the deadline for scoping comments to ensure that they are considered in the analysis that's being done by the EIR/EIS team. However, I'm going to let Billie answer how firm they are on that.

MS. HURLEY: Can you explain scoping comments and if there's going to be more information that's going to be taken from the public at a later date, or is this it?

MR. MICHAELSON: Were you here for the introduction that they did?

MS. HURLEY: Uh-huh.

MR. MICHAELSON: The next step in the process, using the scoping comments, is that a Draft Environmental Impact Report and a Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared. Those will be put up for review, and that's the next opportunity for the public to comment on the actual analysis that's been done and presented in a document, so at this date, the deadline is October 20th.

MS. HURLEY: But changes can still be made in the future, I guess is what I'm asking?

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, because those are comments on a Draft document before it becomes Final.

As a matter of fact, since you asked that question, let me go through these last two slides. This information is also available in the handout, but there are multiple ways of getting your written comments to the California Public Utilities Commission and the Bureau of Land Management.

You can send them to this — I don't know what to call it anymore — snail mail address, that's what everyone calls it — US postal address. There's also an e-mail address that you can send to. There's also a fax number, so there are multiple ways for you to get your written comments in by October 20th.

Just go to the next one, if we could.

There's the website address. Again, if you just want to have a copy of the NOP, you can pick it up from there. We did get a comment in one of the earlier meetings about some people having some lack of access, period, to the Internet, and so Billie Blanchard has already committed to putting more information, hard copy information, into the information repositories, of which there are 18 throughout the project site.

There's also a toll-free number you can call for project information. So the lines of communication are definitely as open as they possibly can be given the technology of our time.

Are there any other questions that anyone has?

Yes, sir. Come forward.

MR. SWIGGERS: My name is Gus Swiggers. The route that's proposed down through Santa Ysabel, Number 9, was an alternate route. That route is not brought up in the PEA. It skips right from 8 to 10. I don't know if you're aware of that or not.

MR. MICHAELSON: So do you want them to check first and see about Route 9?

MR. SWIGGERS: Well, I'm curious as to why that one was abandoned and if you happen to know why.

MR. MICHAELSON: They'll have to get back to you on that one. Thank you.

MR. SWIGGERS: Also are agricultural reserve lands being considered on this route?

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes.

MS. BLANCHARD: And the agricultural impacts, too.

MR. SWIGGERS: Okay. Because most of the new route they propose up through Mesa Grande, which is like a snake trail up through there, instead of going a direct route, is crossing almost all agricultural preserve lands in that area.

MR. MICHAELSON: That is one of the areas they would look at, one of the resources. Yes.

MR. SWIGGERS: Okay. That's my concern.

MR. MICHAELSON: Let me see if they've figured it out.

MS. LEE: I see what your question is, but I'll have to look it up afterwards. I see that it that skips from 6 to 8. These are the numbers that were given by SDG&E. It's not necessarily easy to track where they came from, but we'll look it up as soon as we're done here, and if you're still here, we'll let you know.

MR. SWIGGERS: It looks like they conveniently left something out.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, sir.

Anyone else?

Yes. Come forward.

MS. CARSON: Linda Carson.

I just was concerned about the whole issue of undergrounding. I hear various stories about what can and cannot be underground, and it would be nice to get some sort of clear, concise information that's understandable by the general public about what can and cannot be underground and where. We've heard various stories about that. I don't know if you have an answer for that now or not.

MR. MICHAELSON: There may not be a definitive answer, but we'll see what we can do.

MS. LEE: On previous projects, we have presented a fairly detailed description of the undergrounding of a 230 kV line versus a 500 kV line, and we have a fair amount of text. Unfortunately, we don't have it here, but I can point you to it, and we will certainly include it in this document as we prepare it.

Just in an overview, 230 kV lines are easy to underground these days. It costs quite a bit more than an overhead line, but it's done regularly by the major utilities including SDG&E. SDG&E is just in the process of undergrounding a line downtown past Petco Park and the Otay Mesa Project, so that technology is definitely accepted.

Undergrounding a 500 kV line is much more complicated because of the heat generated by lines of that voltage, and there are a few examples, and, in fact, the one that was referenced in that Greystone letter — the 25-mile line in Japan is, to our knowledge, the longest kV underground.

The question that we need to look at in the alternatives for this project is: At what point can the 230 kV and the 500 kV conversion occur? Can it be 500 kV up to a point, for example, maybe east of the Park and underground 230 kV through the Park — is one alternative we're thinking about.

500 kV underground you really wouldn't want to do in an open-space area because the disturbance along the surface in the Park, for example, would be so extensive that you'd have much, much greater environmental impacts than you would by having isolated towers, so the environmental impacts of the disturbance for an underground corridor, if you can't underground within a road, are really extensive. So that's one of the things we look at in comparing the two options.

MR. MICHAELSON: I thought I saw another hand for a question. Either of you come forward. Thank you.

MR. RAFFETTO: It's Joe Raffetto again. I'm just curious. It's the EIR and the EIS process, and then both of your agencies come up with the final decision, but then it goes to decision makers, correct?

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes.

MR. RAFFETTO: Who are the decision makers, and if they make their final decision, can SDG&E appeal it? How final is final, and who makes the very final decision?

MS. BLANCHARD: I can go over that briefly. The final decision would be made by the commissioners of the California Public Utilities Commission. Then there is a process where they take a vote on the decision. SDG&E can go through a re-hearing request process, and the commission can decide to hear its application again or not, but there are certain rules about what legal aspects can be reheard or not, and then there is an appeal process to uphold the appellate court, I believe.

I'm not totally sure about that, we could get more information for you, but there is an appeals process. I know we enter re-hearing request processes fairly often. But as far as appealing from there, that is not a regular thing.

MR. ZALE: On the federal side, decisions that need to be made by the Bureau of Land Management would be the Plan Amendment that I mentioned before. That decision has a protest period associated with it. Then the other decision that BLM would have to make is whether or not to issue a right-of-way, and that decision could be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals by parties that thought that they were adversely affected by the decision.

MR. MICHAELSON: At what level? Where within the BLM structure is that Record of Decision made? Who signs that?

MR. ZALE: Well, I think the Record of Decision is signed by our field manager Vicky Wood in the El Centro field office.

MR. MICHAELSON: Come forward.

MR. WEBB: My name is Sam Webb, and I promise this is the last time I will approach. Mike Wells, our district superintendent, wrote a really great article on what impact this transmission line would have to the park, and he talked about the view shed and how do you place a value upon it. I think an example he used is, you know, people talk about "Well, that's a million-dollar view." Well, the view shed we have in our park is priceless. I mean, you can't place a dollar amount on it, and I guess my question is: How do you mitigate the destruction of that view shed?

MS. LEE: I guess the answer to that, and maybe to other impact questions here, is there are a lot of impacts that cannot be mitigated, and we haven't started any analysis on this project yet, so we can't say which those would be, but we have, on previous projects, identified visual impacts that literally cannot be mitigated. We call them out as being significant impacts that cannot be mitigated. Those are factors that are high-priority issues that the decision makers really will pay a lot of attention to.

MS. HARTMAN: Jeanette Hartman.

Can you tell us what you know about the fairly new federal — I believe it's Department of Energy law that allows the federal government to declare an energy emergency? In the event that the CPUC denies this application, it could go to a federal decision.

MR. MICHAELSON: Anybody have any information on that?

MS. BLANCHARD: I'm not very familiar with that.

MS. LEE: I don't think FERC has actually defined the procedures. It is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission part of DOE that's responsible for promulgating regulations related to the Energy Policy Act. They haven't really gotten very far in defining. We have asked these questions as well because a lot of people in California are concerned, and the last time I asked the DOE person the status of the action on that, they said they had not yet figured out how that will be implemented.

MS. BLANCHARD: That's about it. She's referring to Section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

MR. MICHAELSON: That has not been worked out yet.

Anyone else with a question?

MR. RAFFETTO: Joe Raffetto again.

I was just curious if any of you have visited, say, Font's Point, which is really like Ground Zero, the most intense focal point of what's at stake in this park, and it's basically the overlook that is really California's Grand Canyon and would be tremendously impacted by these power lines. Basically, we go from showing people the majesty of this incredible view to an advertisement for Sempra Energy, so I think it's very important that you folks, yourselves, see that vista point, and it would even be my honor to be able to take you there and show you what that looks like.

MR. MICHAELSON: There have already been a lot of people on the team who have been throughout the entire area, and the transmission core is looking at those, but I know there's a lot more to come, so I'm going to let Susan respond to that.

MS. LEE: I don't actually know where that point is, but maybe when we're done here, you can show it to us because I don't know if we've been there or not. I don't know the names of the places we've been. If it's the overlook right above us on S-22, we've been there.

MR. MICHAELSON: Let's take that offline after the meeting and see where that is.

Yes. Come forward.

MS. PEQUINA: My name is Linda Pequina. I'm a part-time resident in Borrego Springs. I would like to invite people to think outside of the box. One of the previous speakers mentioned that she had solar panels on her roof, and she suggested this alternative form of energy might be what we're all aiming to go towards in this day and age. She talked about putting solar panels on all of those homes that need the power. Don't forget what she said. I don't know how practical that is, but it sounds good to me. I just wanted to reinforce what she said earlier.

Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, sir. If you've got a question, come forward.

MS. PRINCE: Katalina Prince, with a K, and I'm a resident of Borrego Springs. I would like to make a comment, not only on the previous speaker regarding alternative energy, but to utilize this time, perhaps, to consider utilizing this opportunity to encourage the approach for alternative energy and renewable resources here in San Diego County.

This very well may be an opportunity for San Diego to become a leader in the area of alternative energy and support for other areas of the community. I know that one of the aspects of SDG&E's proposal is the need to have some run-off energy for supporting our community, such as to the north. We have Los Angeles. Should they have any energy problems, we need to be able to support within the network grid of our nation.

If this area can be a representative, in terms of the power of — literally power from what we have, clean energy from the sun, then I think that that would be a stronghold and something to build upon in this corner of the United States to be known for, grow upon its own industry, which we are at a precipice for the need in this country and, therefore, self-sufficiency within our country.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

I think we've collected a few things where some individuals maybe have some specific things they want to point out to the staff here, and as you probably well know, we have another meeting this evening for those people who would prefer to come at that time. Someone is going to remind me of what time that's at -- 6:00 to 8:30.

So if you want to come back for like triple or quadruple helpings, you can do that, too, if you want to sign up to speak here this evening.

I do want to let you know that all of this does become a part of this meeting, and whether it's said once or whether it's said ten times, if it's a comment and it has merit, they're going to look at it regardless of how many times they hear it. So one person saying it one time is a good thing. It gets into the record and is something that will be taken seriously.

Did you have a last question? I have to ask you to come up to the mike.

MS. GRANQUIST: Laurel Granquist from Julian.

I think everybody will remember when Dick Cheney had a private, closed energy meeting with the big energy industrial people of this nation. We still do not know what went on there, and that could very well be a problem if the PUC approves the Sunrise Power transmission line. How do we know what the federal government has already initiated or instigated?

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Thank you very much. We appreciate very much — Sir, yes. Do you have one more? Come forward, please.

MR. LENDEMAHN: Just a final comment. I want to thank you for doing an excellent job in setting up and conducting this meeting. I think it's been fruitful.

MR. MICHAELSON: And your name is?

MR. LENDEMAHN: Jim Lendemahn.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for that feedback. We appreciate it.

We are adjourned. Thank you.

(Proceedings adjourned at 4:00 p.m.)

**SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT  
Reporter's Transcript of the CPUC/BLM Scoping Meeting  
for Preparation of a Draft EIR/EIS**

Held 6:30 p.m. October 4, 2006  
At Borrego Springs, California

Reported by:  
Michelle McLaughlin, CSR No. 13025

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Lewis Michaelson - Katz & Associates, Public Facilitator  
Tom Zale & Lynda Kastoll - Bureau of Land Management  
Billie Blanchard - California Public Utilities Commission  
Susan Lee - Aspen Environmental Group

Presentation: pages 2 to 9  
Public Comments begin on page 10  
Q&A begins on page 23

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

Charles Bennett.....	10
Joe Rauh.....	10
Judith Withers.....	11
Scott Martin.....	12
Llouise Jee.....	13
Joe Raffetto.....	13
Paul Johnson.....	14
Kellie Hamilton.....	15
Tom Stemnock.....	15
Esther Rubin.....	17
Ryan Henson.....	17
Sandy Burnaman.....	18
Robert Staehle.....	19
Kelly Fuller.....	20
Lori Paul.....	20
Maris Brancho.....	21
Cristina Warren.....	22
Joanie Cahill.....	22

**Q&A, BY SPEAKER**

Mike Hussey.....	23, 31
Scott Martin.....	24, 36
Judith Withers.....	24, 33
Robert Staehle.....	25, 31
Charles Bennett.....	26
Joe Rauh.....	28
Lori Paul.....	29, 35
Joe Raffetto.....	29
Peggy Hurley.....	30
Ted West Townsend.....	31
Cristina Warren.....	31
Kelly Fuller.....	27, 33
Ryan Henson.....	34

## STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work for a firm called Katz & Associates. We have been hired to provide support for all of the public meetings that are being held, and I have been hired to serve as a neutral moderator for all of the scoping meetings that are being held.

As you probably know, this is one in a series of seven meetings being held this week, El Centro, Ramona, Borrego Springs, and a couple of locations tomorrow in Mission Valley and Rancho Penasquitos in San Diego County, so we're a little bit past the halfway point here.

We had a great meeting here this afternoon, excellent comments. I would just say, personally, that I have been doing this for about 22 years, and I cannot remember a more fruitful, constructive, useful scoping process in terms of people really having done their homework and bringing forth relevant and useful comments for the scoping process, so you all — your community and others — are really to be commended for that. We look forward to more of the same tonight.

This meeting is being held to satisfy two laws, a state law, the California Environmental Quality Act, for which an Environmental Impact Report is prepared in a case like this, as well as a federal law, the National Environmental Policy Act for which an EIS, or Environmental Impact Statement is prepared. We're taking comments to satisfy both of those processes tonight.

Some of you may be unfamiliar with that process, so I just want to walk you through a little bit of what to expect tonight, and others on the panel here will provide you more background on that.

I'm going to explain very briefly, in just a second, the purpose of scoping. Susan Lee, seated directly to my right, is going to talk about the proposed project, just give an overview of that. Then to her right is Billie Blanchard with the California Public Utilities Commission, and she will be talking about their process and schedule for the EIR.

And then we have with us Lynda Kastoll and Tom Zale with the Federal Bureau of Land Management, and they will be talking about their role in the process and schedule.

Then we will go back to Susan Lee briefly, who's going to go over just a few slides that deal in more detail with what to expect and the steps in the process and what kinds of things are produced during an EIR/EIS process.

Then we will get to what is the most important part of the meeting, which is an opportunity for all of you to provide input to the people who are seated here before you. And I just want to be clear. As you'll see shortly, if you did not know already, scoping is at the very early, front end of this process. They are not decision makers. They are not here to make a decision tonight about this process. Okay? This is scoping. In fact, let me go to the next slide.

The purpose of this meeting and of the scoping process is to inform you and responsible agencies about an upcoming project for which this document is being prepared, to inform you about the environmental review process, to solicit your input. This is key: at this point in scoping, the most relevant and useful comments are ones about the potential alternatives to the proposed project and the scope of issues to be studied in the Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement.

Of course, we'll also use this as an opportunity to identify issues of concern and areas of potential controversy, and you should know that a Scoping Report, after all of the scoping period ends, will be prepared that will provide a summary of all of the comments received, both oral and written, from all of

the meetings. So if you're not able to attend all of the meetings, you're still able to be aware of all of the issues that were raised in different locales. So the main purpose for these people being here tonight, representing these agencies, is to hear your comments firsthand.

Just to be clear, the California Public Utilities Commission is the lead agency under CEQA. Bureau of Land Management is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act process. One of the other key roles or participants is the applicant, but the applicant at this point has handed over their documentation, and this is now an independent review that takes place by the related regulatory agencies.

Aspen Environmental Group is represented by Susan Lee — but there are several of their team here with you here tonight probably talking to you at some of the stations out there. They are the contractor that was hired specifically to help these agencies prepare the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Review.

So that's what we're going to be doing tonight, and with that I'd like to turn it over to Susan Lee.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Lewis.

I'm going to describe the proposed project fairly briefly tonight because there is a much more detailed description in the Notice of Preparation that you should have received either in the mail or back here at the door. Let me just point you to a detailed verbal description of the project Link by Link, starting on Page 4 and continuing for five pages after that. Each of those Links is connected to a map that's presented in the back of the Notice of Preparation.

The two maps that are most relevant to where we are today are the ones called Figure 2 — and that shows the Desert Link, which is the entire project starting at Imperial Valley Substation and continuing through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park — and the map right after that, Figure 3, which is a close-up of the Anza-Borrego link itself. So those are the two maps, and I know a lot of you have had a chance to look at them in the back. Let me just step back a moment and describe the process again in a fairly big-picture way.

There's a 500-kilovolt portion, which is the high-voltage portion starting at the Imperial Valley Substation just down west of El Centro. The 500 kV portion is about 90 miles long and continues all the way through Imperial County, up into San Diego County, through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, and into an area just south of Warner Springs, where there will be constructed, if the project is approved, a major substation at which the 500-kV line would be converted to a 230-kilovolt line. The 230 continues, then, through Santa Ysabel, south of Ramona, and on all the way to the coast.

One other ownership issue, as far as the Imperial County portion, is that the application that's submitted right now to the CPUC was submitted by San Diego Gas & Electric, but there is a Memorandum of Agreement between SDG&E and the Imperial Irrigation District under which the IID ultimately would build and operate this line if it's approved. So despite the fact that the permit may be issued to SDG&E, IID, under that existing MOA, may be the entity that ultimately builds and operates it. That's a component of the Green Path Project you probably heard them talk about.

The other system upgrades are internal substation upgrades at some of the other substations within the SDG&E system that are fairly far west of here, so I won't spend time on that.

The need for the project as described by San Diego Gas & Electric is based on three main principals. The first one is that they want to maintain reliability of their electric system. The second one is that they want to promote renewable energy, and this is part of the State's requirement that utilities

provide a certain percentage of their electricity as renewables. There's a large renewable resource in geothermal power out here just south of the Salton Sea — and also a proposed solar field that you probably heard about, the Stirling Energy System field down near the Imperial Valley Substation. Those are resources that SDG&E has identified that it would like to have access to. A third goal is to reduce energy costs overall for SDG&E rate payers.

SDG&E has also presented a series of eight objectives, and these objectives basically are just more detail on the three main goals we've already heard. They relate to renewables, to energy costs, and then the last two relate to the ways that SDG&E plans its transmission siting in terms of trying to avoid high-density population areas.

I will now turn this to Billie Blanchard of the CPUC.

MS. BLANCHARD: Billie Blanchard, the CPUC project manager for the environmental document.

I just want to go over the review process that we have and the schedule that we have at this point in time.

Basically, there are two parallel review processes for the SDG&E application for Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessities known as a CPCN. There's the general proceeding process, and there is the environmental review process for the NEPA/CEQA document that I am most involved in.

The general proceeding for the CPCN is being led by the Commissioner Diane Grueneich and the Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman. The scope of the proceeding is directed by the Public Utilities Code Section 1002.

The three main items are the determination of need for the project — in this proceeding, they'll have to do a lot of work on that — and to consider community values, aesthetic values, park and recreational areas, historic values, and of course the review of the environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA.

The general proceeding schedule that we have thus far — there was a first Pre-Hearing Conference in Ramona in January of 2006 and a second Pre-Hearing Conference with a Public Participation Hearing that occurred on September 13th, 2006 in Ramona.

Where we are now, the ALJ has to prepare a scoping memo for the general proceedings, which will lay out all of the issues to be addressed in the proceeding along with the schedule of events including our CEQA/NEPA schedule. He is supposed to be preparing that within the next several weeks in October. The testimony, hearings, and all of that has yet to be determined at this point in time.

On the Environmental Review Schedule, SDG&E filed an application December of 2005, but not the PEA, and then in August, SDG&E filed the amended application and the Proponent's Environmental Assessment, known as the PEA.

There was a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement under NEPA in the Federal Register on August 31st, 2006, then this Notice of Preparation that Susan has been referring to was released for the EIR on September 15th, and the public scoping period for the document goes until October 20th, 2006.

Right now we don't have a schedule for the release of the Draft EIR/EIS, which would be a 90-day comment period, because there's been some issues that we've had to consider. But at a point in

time when those issues are concluded and discussed and we make decisions, we will send out a card to all on the CEQA/NEPA mailing list to indicate when those dates are.

I'll pass this on to BLM.

MR. ZALE: Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are here tonight representing BLM's El Centro field office. BLM is involved in this process because the right-of-way application that San Diego Gas & Electric filed involves approximately 33 miles of public lands, primarily in Imperial County but also a short stretch of public lands in San Diego County.

In addition to that, when the patent was issued for Anza-Borrego Desert State Park back in the 1930s, it included a reservation to the United States for the existing power line right-of-way, so there's been some discussion that continues in BLM about what our role might be in terms of issuing right-of-way for that portion as well.

In addition to making a decision on whether or not to issue a right-of-way, BLM's other involvement in this would be to consider amending the land-use plan. The California Desert Conservation Area Plan identifies utility corridors, but this proposed project has an alignment that's outside an existing designated utility corridor. We'll be considering whether or not to designate a new corridor to accommodate that route that's been proposed.

In addition to that, BLM will be responsible for conducting nation-to-nation consultation with interested tribes. Also we'll have the lead in doing a Section 7 consultation with Fish and Wildlife Service in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

MS. LEE: As Lewis mentioned earlier, really the two goals in terms of reaching people and entities during scoping is to talk to the public and also to talk to affected agencies. There's a large list of agencies that have to issue permits or have some other jurisdiction over parts of this project. At 150 miles long, you can imagine it's quite a long list, and we've presented some of them here just so you understand the extent of the involvement that we will have with agencies. We hope to get comments from them, and we're going out to meet with many of these agencies directly ourselves.

These next few slides cover the EIR/EIS process and the contents of an EIR/EIS, and to reiterate what Lewis pointed out earlier, this shows you where we are in the process. The yellow box right there, which is EIR/EIS scoping, is the very beginning of the process. The only thing that has happened before this is that the two lead agencies made a decision, which is documented in the NOP and the Notice of Intent, that they will prepare an EIR/EIS for this project, so we are at the very beginning stages.

We will be working on preparation of the EIR/EIS over the next several months. Ultimately, we'll issue a Draft. We will be back here to hear public comments on the Draft, and as both Billie and Tom mentioned, we'll have a 90-day public comment period at that point. After that, the Final will be issued, and I will talk about the process after the Final in just a little bit.

These next couple of slides illustrate the contents of an EIS, and the reason we present this to you is we want you to understand the kinds of things that are included in an EIR/EIS. That way, you can give us comments that will help us elaborate on either impact issues or look at different alternatives or components of the EIR, so I'll describe just briefly what these components are.

We will include a description of the environmental setting, which is a description of what's here in the area already, along the entire route. This includes all the resources that are here, the land use, biology, cultural, and visual setting.

We'll describe the impacts of the project itself and the impacts of the alternatives that are ultimately chosen, and I'll talk more about alternatives in a minute. We'll include mitigation measures for both the proposed project and the alternatives.

The purpose of all of this is to allow decision makers at the CPUC and the BLM to have the information they need before they can decide whether or not this project should be approved or an alternative should be approved.

This slide just summarizes the components of an EIR/EIS that give you a feel for the major sections, in addition to the Project Description which essentially is the project that San Diego Gas & Electric has defined for us. We also elaborate on that with all the detail we need in order to complete a thorough analysis.

We'll describe the impacts of proposed project and alternatives and the mitigation measures, and we'll include a discussion of mitigation monitoring. This list of environmental disciplines gives you a feel for the range of issues that we would love to hear about today.

If you have comments on any of these issues with respect to impacts of the project, impacts of alternatives, values that you have in this area that may relate specifically to the project that's proposed or to alternatives here, then we would love to hear about these issues.

I'll talk in a little more detail about alternatives. We know that alternatives are a very important issue to the public. It's also important to the agencies. It's a responsibility under CEQA and NEPA to do an alternatives analysis under those guidelines. For those of you who may have been at the Pre-Hearing Conference a couple of weeks ago in Ramona, the assigned Commissioner from the CPUC, Commissioner Grueneich, specifically asked SDG&E to provide information on an alternative that would not pass through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, and they did identify that just this week. I know there were a couple of articles in the paper yesterday and today.

Maybe at this point, I'll just refer you to the map because we got questions on this earlier. The last map in the NOP, which is Figure 8, is called SDG&E Alternatives Considered and Eliminated. The alternative route that SDG&E identified in the required filing that the Commissioner ordered them to file is the one that's called Alternative D on this map, which would involve following the existing 500 kV Southwest Powerlink to the west from the Imperial Valley Substation and then going north through parts of the Cleveland National Forest. There's a B, C, and D going from east to west, and the D route is the one that goes almost due north ending up very near Santa Ysabel. We can describe that later on the maps that are detailed in the back, or you can ask questions. I just wanted to let you know that was a recent filing that just came out this week.

On this slide, we show the way we look at every alternative that we consider. There are three steps. The first requirement is that it has to be consistent with the project objectives, but it doesn't have to meet all the objectives. The second thing is that it needs to reduce or avoid impacts of the proposed project, so we won't include an alternative that has greater impact. The third thing is that the alternative must be feasible: you have to be able to build it and you have to be able to get it permitted.

Here we list the types of alternatives we expect to be considering in this process. Generally, people think about routing alternatives as being the major component of an alternatives analysis when you look at a linear project like this.

We definitely are looking at routing alternatives, which are essentially different ways to import power along a transmission line from the Imperial Valley into San Diego, but we're also looking at alternatives like in-basin generation. There's a proposal now to re-power the South Bay Power Plant. We're looking at that. We had a speaker last night from the Encina Power Plant.

We're looking at non-wire alternatives, which include demand-reduction energy efficiency issues. We will reconsider the alternatives that SDG&E eliminated, shown on Figure 8.

We will also look at the ones that SDG&E did consider in their application and decide whether we think those need to be pursued. No decisions have been made on alternatives at this point. We start basically from square one looking at alternatives. That is definitely one of the things we would love to hear about from you tonight.

One last slide, just to let you know what happens at the end of this process. The CPUC and the BLM each have a different process after the final EIS. The CPUC is a five-member commission that's appointed by the governor. That commission ultimately will vote on the project after receiving a recommendation that Billie described earlier. That will include consideration of the environmental information and the need.

The CPUC's decision will also require mitigation monitoring, which is having people in the field making sure that the mitigation measures that were adopted actually were implemented.

The BLM has a different process. They have a 30-day comment on the final EIS, which doesn't happen on the State side. They have a 60-day Governor's consistency review, and then they prepare their document. It is called a Record of Decision, issued out of the El Centro field office.

I will turn it back to Lewis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for your kind attention. That serves as the orientation to what we're here about tonight. We leave this slide up during the comments. We find it's useful to be able to reference it.

Again, because we're at the early stages of this process, the types of comments that are going to be most relevant and useful — and people really paid attention to this — are those identifying the location and extent of environmental impacts or potential impacts of the proposed project that you want to make sure get analyzed, as well as recommending alternatives that would avoid or reduce impacts of the proposed project.

We have been using a three-minute time limit at all of the meetings we've held so far. But because of the number of speakers, we've been able to go back and take what I call second helpings. So if you can't fit everything into three minutes, I'd rather you go slow enough that the court reporter can record it, and come back a second time, rather than to try to rush through.

She is seated over here, and there will be a verbatim transcript, so everything that you say will be recorded as long as we can get you to come up to the mike to say it.

If I didn't mention it already, written comments are another very good way to provide comments. In fact, often if you have more detailed comments, it's actually the easier way to do it, and they are given

the same weight and consideration. So for those of you for whom public speaking is the worst possible thing you can think of, don't feel like you're being left out of the process. We're glad you're here tonight, and the panel would certainly love to hear from you. But if you've got thoughts, please feel free to share them in writing, and they'll count just as much and will be given just as much attention.

So I'm going to start calling several names ahead so you'll know where you are in sequence and be ready to come up. That just makes it run a little bit more efficiently.

I have a very high-tech way of letting you know when your time is up. After you've been speaking for two minutes, I'll put up my index finger, like this. So if you occasionally look up at me, it's helpful. That means you have one minute to wrap up your comments. When three minutes are up, I'll put up my closed hand, like this.

We appreciate your cooperation, and again, we've been able to accommodate everybody coming up a second time if they have something that they want to add.

After we finish comments, there will be a short opportunity for some question and answer with the panel. Obviously, there're some questions that they can't answer now, like "What are the impacts of doing this?" They haven't done that analysis yet.

But if you had a question about the proposed action or what kinds of things they look at or analyze, they're happy to answer that for you. If you have specific questions about, you know, very specifically "this particular location, where my house is, a neighborhood," that's kind of hard to answer at this level. They'd prefer to do that at the stations afterwards, so that's what we're about to undertake.

I apologize in advance if I mispronounce anyone's name. The first five speakers I have are Charles Bennett, Joe Rauh, Judith Withers, Scott Martin, and Llouis Jee.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

So if I could ask Charles to start us off — if you would come up to the microphone, please. If you'd just start with your name, we'd appreciate it.

MR. BENNETT: My name is Charles Bennett. I'm with the Anza-Borrego Foundation. We're the cooperating association with the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, and we have a long history with the park. We celebrate our 40th anniversary with them next year. During those years, we've acquired and transferred in excess of 35,000 acres of land to the state park. That land is valued in excess of \$20,000,000.

We don't believe that the project, as it's proposed, explores adequately the alternatives that avoid state park lands. The project is completely at odds with the objectives, goals, and mandates of state parks.

The easiest — or most cost-effective alternative for SDG&E is going to be a disaster for state parks. We really need to have some viable alternatives explored.

Parks should not be viewed as a place where we store lands for some future non-park use. Parks are meant to be forever. They're meant to be held as a sacred trust. The proposed route of this will run through wilderness areas. These wilderness areas have been set aside, and to try to change them from a wilderness area to permit this power line to run through would set a dangerous precedent. This has never been done in the past.

Wilderness areas are, by Public Resources Code, untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. The erection of massive towers 130- to 150-foot high which can be viewed over approximately 90,000 acres of this park — about 18 percent of this park, you'll be able to see those towers from — that is just unconscionable.

We propose that there has to be a complete analysis of visual impacts of the Powerlink Project. We think this is absolutely necessary. State Highway 78, which parallels the route, is a designated scenic highway that certainly wouldn't be scenic with all of those towers next to it.

We need to evaluate very thoroughly the impacts on endangered species. Bighorn sheep inhabit this area. They're a federally endangered species. We have no idea what the impact of this is going to be. You need to look at the impact of the recreational activities of park visitors. A 500-kV line going over Tamarisk Grove Campground and Yacui Wells Primitive Camp is going to discourage the use of a lot of people.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, Mr. Bennett.

MR. RAUH: Hello. Thank you very much for coming out. I really appreciate it.

My name is Joe Rauh. I'm the Realtor in Ranchita. I sit at a desk all day long there and sort of watch over the neighborhood. Ranchita is a unique little high-desert community at about 4,000 feet. We have a mini continental divide there. Water in half of Ranchita flows towards the Pacific. The other half flows towards Baja California.

One of my major concerns to be added to the scoping document is while we sit there at our desks, we notice the aircrafts from Miramar flying out to do their maneuvers and studies in the Naval Training

Warfare area to the east of us. That's great. We enjoy the pilots. It does not bother us. All of our horses and animals appreciate the noise, keep us awake in the morning.

But we have a concern that these guys and gals who are flying these jets — they come right across. Today at 4:15, I was painting a house, and they were right on top of us, and right where the continental divide is is where the proposed Powerlink is going to go over, and we worry. With 150-foot towers right there, there's a good chance of one of those guys hitting it, and that's my major concern there because we've already been burned out of Ranchita once by the Pines fire four years ago, and back in the '70s we were burned out again. We really don't want another fire. The Pines fire was caused by a clipped power line.

Secondly, through the Grapevine Canyon in that area, we already have the 69-kV and 15-kV power lines. If they add a 500 on there, our worry is they might need more than one easement to facilitate both the 15-kV and the new 500/69 poles. So we don't know if that was incorporated into the scoping also.

Thank you very much for your time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. WITHERS: Hi. My name is Judith Withers, and I'm a homeowner/small business owner in the area.

I would like to address issues concerning the proposed preferred route of the Sunrise Powerlink and the location of the Central East Substation, specifically. I won't address the consequences of allowing the route to go through the Anza-Borrego State Park. I'll leave that to others more knowledgeable than I.

The Sunrise Powerlink proposes a Central East Substation in my neighborhood, which is historically known as the community of San Felipe. The new proposal is extremely more harmful than the previous proposed use of the existing substation on Highway 79, as this is in the heart of our community.

SDG&E is doing great disrespect by referring to us and the new location of the proposed Central East Substation as an undeveloped rural area. Not once in the application process nor in the scoping process information are we ever referred to by our name of San Felipe, leaving those who are not familiar with this area to assume there is no one living there.

If you refer to the maps on Figure 8, you'll see that a proposed Central East Substation is proposed by the San Felipe Hills Wilderness Area, Santa Ysabel Indian Reservation, the San Felipe Wildlife Area, and vista irrigation land. Tucked into the middle of all this wilderness is our small but historical community of San Felipe, and that is where SDG&E has staked its claim.

There is a limited amount of private land for sale, of course, there, and most of it has been held by families for generations. It's one such plot of land that they have managed to acquire right in the heart of our community, and they plan to trample our neighborhood with this giant facility using the existing road in our neighborhood and pass it off as virtually uninhabited.

I would like you to observe on the map, Figure 8, that once the Sunrise Powerlink leaves the park, the entire area is either all the wilderness, BLM land, Indian land, and enclaves tucked here and there of small unincorporated communities, like mine, with names like San Felipe, Ranchita, Santa Ysabel, and Mesa Grande.

This area is some of the most beautiful, untouched, pristine wilderness left in Southern California and San Diego County. To quote Supervisor Diane Jacobs recently, this area is a national treasure and the reason that people pay the big bucks to live in San Diego.

All who come here are struck by its beauty, and it's the last area in San Diego County that remains as habitat to the wild creatures and birds where civilization has not yet encroached.

The communities of San Felipe, Ranchita, and Julian four years ago were burned in the Pines fire, which was caused by a power line. When a wildfire breaks out in this wooded wilderness, it is so inaccessible, no one can put it out. Firemen can only help nature help itself. The Pines fire burned 68,000 acres. For nearly three weeks, it jumped every highway — everything.

MR. MICHAELSON: Why don't you come back, and you can finish?

MS. WITHERS: Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Scott Martin.

MR. MARTIN: My name is Scott Martin, and thank you for letting me talk to you again. I would like to — I'm going to give this to you. I only have one copy, but this is the Opportunities and Constraints page that SDG&E — this is actually from SDG&E. I don't exactly know who decides what the Opportunities and Constraints are, if that's a standardized form or if this is something that SDG&E made up, but, basically, there were two opportunities.

One is that it is a designated utility corridor, and one is that it is an existing transmission line corridor, 69-kV and above, so those are the only two opportunities that they came up with for putting this line in.

Then there are an incredible amount of constraints for putting this line in, which include designated critical habitat. Again, I'm not sure who made this up, but they list federal wilderness area as a very high priority and state wilderness area as a high priority. I would argue that they're both extremely high priority.

They also indicate a very high constraint for a national historic landmark, which we don't necessarily have, but we do have a national natural landmark, which is all of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. That was designated in 1974. We have traditional cultural property.

Then we go into the high constraints. We have Bureau of Land Management land. We have designated recreational use area, existing and proposed wilderness area — which I argue should be a very high constraint — federal and state sensitive management area, geologically sensitive area, regional and local parks, designated open spaces and/or preserves, state park, 100-year flood plane, agency-designated use shed.

Now, state parks doesn't actually have that because we're not — or because state parks is not a multi-use agency, but there are definitely impacts to view shed — to wilderness view shed.

There's archeological sites, essential habitats, fault zones, intermittent lakes — and I'm stretching that, but we've got Lake Cahuilla, which dried up about 500 years ago — potential species status habitat area of 640 acres or more, scenic highway, and state land.

I think I'll stop at that and hopefully come back afterwards.

MR. MICHAELSON: Scott, it's useful to have that list, but that's also something you can give them a copy of. Maybe when you come back, you can talk about what you think the significance of that is or what you'd like them to take into account. Okay?

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

The next speakers, just so you know who's coming up next after Llouise Jee, is going to be Joe Raffetto, Paul Johnson, Kellie Hamilton, and Tom Stemnock.

MS. JEE: Hi. My name is Llouise Jee — that first L is pronounced — and I am speaking to — on Page 18, you say "land use." I have lived in this community since 1977, so I am speaking to the historic and current use of our air space by the military.

First off, the military flight paths cross the park, the entire park, and they end up in the bombing area southeast of the Carrizo impact area. That's one point.

The second point, which many of us have all experienced, is the stealth or under-detection radar flight practice, where you go on wing tip, up canyon, over mountain, and down the other side under the radar. We have all seen this who have lived here. There is nothing to stop them from going under the 500-kV line — under.

And then I blew my brother-in-law out of the water when I informed him that his secret practice for the Mideast conflict was no secret. I said "You're all in the air all over us." Every time there is increased activity in the Mideast, we see practice.

Keep that in mind when you set up the location of a tall tower that bears electricity.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Joe Raffetto.

MR. RAFFETTO: Thank you, everyone.

I got to ask a couple of questions earlier. I appreciate that, and I kept my comment period to tonight because I'm here with my counterpart, who has the other tour company in Anza-Borrego, Paul Johnson, and I thought it would be good if we spoke together.

We're both regulated also by the CPUC. We're kind of at the lower end of the scale. We have to follow strict guidelines, and I just think that if you look at like what the Environmental Impact Statement and Report are supposed to cover, it's aesthetics, agriculture such as ranches, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, environmental justice, geology and soils, hydrology, land use, noise, paleontology, public health and safety, recreation, socioeconomics, transportation and traffic, utilities, and wilderness of all things.

To determine if any kind of a project of any scope has to go through these same guidelines — it's like this, to me, is like a no-brainer. It's like why in God's name would anyone even consider running the biggest power lines known to mankind through an area like this? And I don't care if they bury them, or they run them through with their 130-foot location — at their height. It's still —

As other people have said, this is an area that was set aside for everyone, and SDG&E and Sempra are doing a good job of trying to spread propaganda through their full-page ads. They've got that

cherubic-looking guy who runs his business who needs energy, and it's us folks out here in the back country and the desert that are keeping that poor guy from getting the energy that he needs, and that really steams me because this park and even the back country — the towns of Santa Ysabel, Mesa Grande, Warner Springs, Julian, San Felipe — they are places that people go. Whether they live there or visit there, they are there for refuge. The park is for the people that live here and the people that visit, and the people that visit are from all over the world, so it's not just the people in San Diego that already got stung by Sempra in the past.

So I just think that this is the last of anything in San Diego County. It's the most sensitive area probably in Southern California, and I just think we've already faced the three-headed dragon of the apocalypse, which was the super highway that we stopped from going down Coyote Canyon, the international airport — the new international airport. I don't know how they thought about that. And now this.

My hope is that logic will prevail, and that, if not, this will lead people to see the folly of this 20th century boondoggle, and maybe all of us could switch over. Maybe Borrego Springs could be a springboard of just getting on-site solar energy and win.

Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: There's no way I can compete with that.

I've lived in the Borrego Springs area for 33 years.

MR. MICHAELSON: Your name?

MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry. Paul Johnson, local resident, tour guide, photographer, photography instructor. You can call me a few other things, but I'll leave it at that.

I came here in 1973. I make my living as a tour guide, so the aesthetics of this park will have a huge impact on how I make my living. I have five or six different designated tour routes. Five of them are right along Highway 78, so the power line — the huge impact of that power line will have a great impact on my business and what I show people.

I don't know that anybody's discussed this, but San Felipe Creek is the second largest water shed in the park. There are huge flash floods that come down San Felipe Creek right along the right of this power line, and it has taken Highway 78 completely out. It took them six months to repair Highway 78 because of a flash flood coming down San Felipe Creek, and that is the water shed, literally, that this power line will be built along.

The last thing I would just like to suggest is that we look at something really benign, like solar power as an alternative to building all of these power lines. There are a huge amount of houses out here in Borrego Springs that have 375 days of sunshine. We get a couple of extra days. We could produce a huge amount of power by having photovoltaics and solar systems on our roofs throughout this county. This is one of the sunniest counties around. I think there's other ways to do it besides building this line.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Kellie Hamilton.

MS. HAMILTON: Hi. My name is Kellie Hamilton, and I'm a resident here in Borrego Springs.

The Borrego Valley is a very unique place, and for the residents who live here, we absolutely cherish its uniqueness. We do not have a Starbucks here or a Carl's Jr. We certainly do not have an all-night pharmacy or a movie theater, and there are many, many people who have come here before and said "How on earth do you people possibly live in a place like this?" But for those of us that have made Borrego Valley our home, it's one of the most beautiful and pristine places that some of us have ever seen. It's special to the people who live here, the wildlife that roam here, and the vegetation that finds some way of surviving here.

So concerned are we about our future that we have leaders in our community who are currently working on a plan to present to our County Board of Supervisors to designate Borrego as a Desert Conservation District so that we'd actually have a special designation in San Diego County, and that's in an effort to save the precious balance that exists here in this valley as we move forward. I wondered if you guys knew that. I wondered if you knew that we cared that much, that we're trying to get a special designation here.

Thus you can imagine how we feel when we hear that a utility company wants to put 130-foot steel transformers along our southern skyline. The damage that would create to the balance that exists here would be irreparable and the consequences far reaching. That's my heart talking. I wanted to make sure you knew there were actually people who live here and that this matters to us.

I'll close with a comment from my head. Should the utility company be granted permission to further enter and violate our state park, we would be perpetuating a belief that land that is considered protected and land that is considered wilderness doesn't mean anything, and that would be a huge tragedy.

I can appreciate that the utility company is trying to do its job. You need to provide additional power for additional demand, and I understand that you need to complete that with a budget. But in the world that we live today, I expect them to also put as much time and thought and energy into the environmental impact that that will create. We are very educated people here, and we deserve the right to know that those studies were done completely, fairly, and that that information is passed back to us so that we know that those efforts were taken into consideration.

Thank you.

MR. STEMNOCK: Good evening. Tom Stemnock.

MR. MICHAELSON: After Tom will be Esther Rubin, Ryan Henson, Sandy Burnaman, and Robert Staehle.

MR. STEMNOCK: Thank you.

We're part-time residents. We've been coming to Borrego since 1972. We live in Los Angeles half the time. We live here half the time, year round. We don't come just in the winter. We come year round. Almost every weekend of the year, we're here.

I want to comment on a couple of things. One, timing of the whole process. This is an extremely complex process and an extremely complex set of issues, and the timing that, in effect, creates our opportunity to speak is in a time when — this is our downtime.

The resident population of Borrego triples from roughly the 1st of November until about the 1st of May, so you don't have the true population of Borrego here to comment right now.

The idea that the draft EIR/EIS circulation period should be only 90 days I think is extremely short for this kind of a project. Whatever that period should be, it should be, in my mind, at least 180 days, and it has to be during a time period when that winter population of Borrego has an opportunity to consider and comment on the report.

If that six-month period or that three-month period occurs during the summertime, most of the population of this area, both the resident population and visitor population, are not going to have an opportunity to comment whatsoever, and you will have missed 90 percent of the people who will be impacted.

Our land here is state, federal park land, BLM land. A great majority of it is privately owned rural and wilderness land. You've already heard about the values and the gem that we have here. Part of it is preserved by law. The other part of it, I think, by the EIR process should have a greater value.

I saw one of the — I think it was one of the goals that the power company had as their identification, and it was to keep the power lines away from the areas of high population. To me, there should be an equal goal to keep the power lines away from the areas that are preserved and intended to serve that high population in the future. Additional alternatives — certainly routes — I can't believe — and I guess now we have, within the last week, one or two additional routes.

It seems to me that there's got to be many, many more routes along I-8, out of the federal lands, out of the mountain areas where the forest fires could occur and cause damage.

There also, I think, needs to be alternatives as to other power sources, such as producing power in west coastal San Diego County to serve that high population, not producing it out here and then spending the dollars and affecting the environment to bring it from this area back to where the population is. I think there should be consideration of other power sources in their location.

Finally, in the EIR process — I don't think we are talking about tonight long-term, gross-inducing impacts. When I look at the alternatives, I don't just see power going from one part of the state to the other part. I see a distribution system being set up to provide for extreme growth in the future, which I think we need to consider and needs to be part of the EIR process.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Esther Rubin.

MS. RUBIN: Hi. My name is Esther Rubin, and I am an ecologist working for the Conservation of Biology Institute, and I want to express some of my concerns about the Powerlink.

In addition to the negative impacts that we've heard about today as far as the aesthetics, health issues, the Powerlink with its infrastructure, maintenance and activity, and many unknown influences will clearly have an impact on the natural environment.

Proposed Powerlink routes will go through the habitat of numerous endangered and sensitive plants and animals. Have these impacts been properly evaluated? I would use bighorn sheep as an example, as this is the species I am most familiar with, having studied them for over a decade. Questions remain about the potential influences of the Powerlink on this federally endangered bighorn sheep population that live here in the Peninsula Ranges.

For example, will the activity of construction, which will involve blasting, grading, helicopters, et cetera, cause them to abandon habitat? Will the presence of the Powerlink disrupt their movements and

patterns? What if animals are hesitant to move around, past, or under the Powerlink? This could sever the conductivity of the population, leaving some groups isolated from others, and this could be a negative effect of the genetic well-being of this population.

Will the building of Powerlink jeopardize important water sources that the sheep rely on? Will the presence of maintenance roads encourage an increase in offroad traffic, whether it be legal or illegal, in bighorn sheep habitat? This, in turn, would increase disturbance to this very sensitive and federally endangered species. Will the increased road and maintenance vehicles increase the invasion of exotic plants in key forging habitats and in our water sheds?

These are just a few of the questions that can be raised. We don't have clear answers to all of these, and that is my point exactly. The bighorn sheep are actually a fairly well-studied species, and we don't know what the influence of the Powerlink would be on this population.

Building the Sunrise Powerlink will cause increased risk to an endangered species, and if we don't know how large these risks are, are we wise to proceed? Will we be sorry later? Shouldn't we take a precautionary approach?

The bighorn sheep are just one example. Numerous other species and habitats could be put at increased risk also. And why should they when we have other alternatives? I urge you to strongly consider options that do not include building the Sunrise Powerlink. We've heard about some of the options today, and I really hope that you will look into and consider carefully other options for clean and affordable energy, especially those involving more local renewable energy sources, energy conservation. Demand management of energy efficiency.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Ryan Henson.

MR. HENSON: Good evening. My name is Ryan Henson. I'm the policy director with the California Wilderness Coalition. Our office is based in Oakland, California, and I work and live in Redding, California. I might have come the longest distance today.

I'm replacing Brynn Jones, our desert program director, who unfortunately has moved across the Colorado River into Arizona. She has done all the work on this issue prior to my coming along.

Since Brynn moved to Arizona, I've had to get acquainted with this project, and, frankly, I find it pretty appalling. The idea, for example, that the project proponents would try to make the public choose between preserving cultural resources or wilderness is simply outrageous.

We request that all the routes proposed for Sunrise Powerlink avoid Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, designated wilderness areas, BLM wilderness study areas, Forest Service wilderness areas, and all proposed wilderness areas.

The social and ecological values of these irreplaceable wild lands will only increase over the years as Southern California continues to rapidly develop, and I must say as a Northern Californian who's spent most of his life in rural areas, whenever I come down here, I'm shocked at the sheer pace of urban development, and I'm really reminded of the value of our public lands and that they shouldn't be just a dumping ground for utilities and roads and all sorts of other activities.

You should know that the D designation of either state or federal wilderness to accommodate this project would be truly unprecedented and would, in my view, be similar to the construction of Hetch

Hetchy Dam in Yosemite. We Californians should have learned by now that such appalling irresponsibility should never be contemplated again.

There is no public interest or need that is so compelling as to warrant the obstruction of habitat, recreational values, and scenery that would result in power line construction in state or federal wilderness areas, BLM wilderness study areas, Forest Service wilderness areas, Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, or proposed wilderness areas. Please do not consider any alternatives that would damage these valuable wild places.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Sandy Burnaman.

MS. BURNAMAN: Hi. My name is Sandy Burnaman, and I live in Ocotillo Wells and have for about 30 years, moved from Fallbrook. When Fallbrook got its first red light, first McDonald's, my husband and I decided we were out of there. We had come out here camping and all. I have a home in Ocotillo Wells. I'm nervous as all get out.

If this Powerlink goes through along where the old power line is, it's going to be terrible. There is the cactus garden that blooms most beautifully in the springtime. We go up there. All the residents go up there, and it just like takes you away, and to see that big — all of those massive things is just going to — it's like ripping your heart out. Even National Geographic has seen — they have a whole article. Can you imagine this beautiful country and looking out and seeing those massive poles? It's just — please, please just put it somewhere else. We like our peace and quiet. It's our country, and like I say, it's just ripping out my heart.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: The next speakers after Robert Staehle will be Kelly Fuller and Lori Paul.

MR. STAEHLE: Good evening. My name is Robert Staehle. First of all, I'd like to go on record saying that as a landowner at the mouth of Tubb Canyon, I've received actually no official notification that this Powerlink might affect my land.

You heard about the 90,000 acres of state park whose view shed would be affected. Well, I own another 50-some acres, and many people around me own other acreage that's in addition to that 90,000 that's in private hands that would also be significantly affected.

This afternoon I had the privilege at about 1:00 o'clock of going up Palm Canyon and showing to our Australian visitors 17 peninsular bighorn. My understanding is that that's a pretty significant fraction of the endangered population here, and, of course, Palm Canyon and Tubb Canyon are two of very few permanent water sources available to that species.

I can't imagine what's going to happen to them and all the other fauna that are less well-studied with the construction that you heard other folks talk about going up Tubb Canyon or, for that matter, across just about any segment of Anza-Borrego State Park. I think that needs to be examined much more carefully than I've seen.

I've also worked as an engineering manager on a federal space exploration project that considered sterling power of the same kind that's being proposed as one of the reasons by SDG&E for putting in this power line over this particular path to the particular terminis in the east.

While I haven't studied in detail this particular application of sterling power, it's my professional opinion that the technology readiness for full-scale implementation at the needed reliability is vastly overstated.

So I'd like to know what is — my expectation is that the San Diego Gas & Electric engineers have much more insight that I do into this and have probably come to the same conclusion.

So what is it that San Diego Gas & Electric really wants to do at that eastern terminis of this line? I don't think it's to connect to a Sterling Power Plant that has only a small chance of being successful at a commercial level. So what's going on? What are the deals with power plants in Mexico and other locations?

There were three objectives stated for this project: Maintaining reliability, promoting use of renewable resources, and reducing energy costs for SDG&E. I think an unstated goal is to increase the profits of SDG&E and its Sempra company, and I think that ought to be investigated very carefully.

Reliability would be better served and promotion of the renewable energy and, in fact, I think, cost to rate payers over the longer term, that is the term beyond ten years, by doing what I did up in Los Angeles County, which is installing 6 kilowatts of solar rays at my residence. That would create a much more reliable network, not susceptible to the kinds of dangers of any single or dual or even five power lines coming in.

So I would like to specifically propose that an alternative be studied, not an alternative route but an alternative to putting in the power lines that says over the next five years, what if the CPUC and the State incentivized so that roughly 100,000 homes put in that kind of power generation along with 10,000 small businesses and parking lots that would generate something over twice that amount of power at peak.

I'll bring up some other suggestions in my repeat session here, if we have time for that.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Staehle.

MS. FULLER: Hi. Kelly Fuller from the San Diego and Imperial County Sierra Club.

The comments I have tonight are going to focus on the California Desert Conservation Area and Desert Link section proposed transmission line. I probably have more than three minutes, so I'll go as far as I can, and we'll see if there's more time.

First, I wanted to let you know that I asked the other night about whether there would be scoping meetings for the Southern San Diego back country since the Alternative D and the other previously rejected alternatives appear to now possibly be back on the table. As a result of SDG&E's response earlier this week to Commissioner Grueneich's request for a route that goes around Anza-Borrego, the Sierra Club has begun its legal analysis of this issue, and I'd like to say that right now our preliminary — and I want to stress preliminary — conclusion is that under NEPA, ordinarily what would have happened is there would have been a preliminary process that would have determined who would be impacted, what areas would be impacted before the scoping even started, but now we're kind of thrown off that because suddenly there are new areas that could be impacted while we're in scoping.

To be fair, we think that the CPUC and BLM should schedule additional scoping meetings for those southern back country communities including Boulevard, Descanso, Pine Valley, Campo, Guatay,

obviously not in all of those places but something they can go to, and SDG&E should notify people along those potential alternate routes.

We know that this is a great concern to those people. The Boulevard Sponsor Group is going to be discussing it this Thursday. I understand that Pine Valley Planning Group is thinking about when they can talk about it, so these people will have opinions and scoping information they need to give as well.

Some other things that we think need to be studied: Following up on my comment at the El Centro scoping meeting regarding ground water impact, the Sierra Club feels impact to desert pupfish in San Felipe Creek need to be looked at in terms of ground water changes that could stem from the project. So if changes to ground water occur because of this project and it affects San Felipe Creek, what will that do to the pupfish there?

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Lori Paul will be followed by Sita Antel.

Lori?

MS. PAUL: I don't have any letters to read, so I can speak a little bit slower.

There is an article that was published that says the SDG&E unveiled non-park routes for power transmission line, and Gregory Barnes, the attorney for SDG&E, in a 19-page letter says, to the CPUC, that as many as 50 homes would have to be torn down to make way for the proposed \$1.3 billion Sunrise Powerlink transmission line if one of the alternatives was chosen, but preferred route would not uproot any families.

Of what species? That's what I'd like to know. We seem to be placing homes, which are somewhat ephemeral — I think there's very few homes that are well over 100 years here in California. There needs to be evaluation, as other people have said, for our particular area and scoping on this project that includes evaluation that's very high for the wilderness and habitat that we have.

There are unique resources here. I don't tell anyone where there are, but I have pictures here in my package of yellow Ocotillo, and we've got an integrated form of Gambel and California Quail, and we've got Borrowing Owls.

We have resources here that you have to realize, as you do your study, a lot of residents know about and won't tell anyone until someone shows up with a shovel, or someone shows up with a front loader and decides to bury it.

So when you do your investigation, I think it's very important to speak with local residents on a personal level because many of the studies, even by the state park and by others, will not reveal some of the resources, including some of the Native American artifacts and so forth and fossil sites, that some of us know about. Stealth and quiet is the best way to protect these areas except when a project like this rolls through a particular region. We assume, of course, the state park and resources on our own properties will be protected. Obviously, that's not the case.

There has been a serious failure on the part of SDG&E — not you folks — to post appropriate materials on the website so that people can download them, as I have said, and I will say it officially. We go there, and there's giant PDF files that you could get gray hair waiting to load and print out. They don't print out. We call. We don't get calls back. I still, as a landowner, as Rob mentioned, have not received a formal notification that they want to go across my land because I own across Tubb Canyon, and that's

some weeks after the Ramona meeting where SDG&E certainly, like some of you, heard me say that before.

And there's a serious problem with scoping of public input in areas and getting supporters to write in who don't live in the areas where the power lines are going.

Lastly, I also want to state something that someone else I don't think has said, and that is that when you propose undergrounding of some segments, which may, in fact, be technically feasible, what I think that does is it manages to sabotage some of the opposition. It pits one constituency and community against another, and I think it's important that this not be perceived as an attempt to buy off key areas of opposition to get the whole project put through areas that have less population.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Sita Antel.

MS. BRANCHO: Hi. This is Sita Antel. She's two years old, and she represents the future of California. I'm here to talk on her behalf tonight.

She's lived in Borrego Springs her entire life. We appreciate your being here in Borrego Spring to hear our concerns. We appreciate you already asking for a route that goes outside of Anza-Borrego. Sita's concerned that too much discussion is focused on the routes rather than whether or not this line is needed at all.

And I'm very concerned for her for global warming. I understand that there are coal-burning fossil plants and also liquid natural gas plants being built in Mexico that will potentially be serviced by this line. I think it should be illegal to bring Mexican power into California. Perhaps your commission can address that.

I also would ask that you please come to a decision quickly. I'm worried about the Federal Energy Corridor that the Energy Policy Act put into place. Potentially, it says if you do not act within a year's time, the feds could step in and approve this line.

So please act against it. Act quickly. Consider the alternative of making the local power plants more efficient and also requiring rooftop solar on all new developments so that there isn't a need for such a line, and just please consider the children of California in your decision.

MR. MICHAELSON: If you don't mind, for the record, can you tell us your name?

MS. BRANCHO: My name is Maris Brancho.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Cristina Warren will be followed by Joanie Cahill.

MS. WARREN: Hi. I spoke earlier about some other issues, and also at the earlier meeting a lot of people talked about the night sky here and the impact of the red lights on the towers, but I would like to just make a plug for our daytime sky. In fact, I would like those of you who will be here overnight to get up tomorrow morning at 6:30, step outside, and take a look at the beautiful sunrise that we experience out here, and that will give you some sense of what it is that we are fighting so fiercely to protect.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Joanie Cahill.

MS. CAHILL: My name is Joanie Cahill, and I have lived here in Borrego Springs for 12 years now, and I agree with some of the purposes you have in mind. I think we'd all like to have reliable service. That's certainly something we aren't familiar with here in Borrego Springs. I know we're all in favor of renewable energy and using our resources to the best of our ability, and we're certainly all in favor of reduced costs.

Although, this last one, I just have to point out to you — I have two things I want to say, and one is that coming to Borrego Springs and asking us to believe that some project is going to reduce our energy costs — it's actually offensive to us because when deregulation happened, we were the ones that got it first, and my husband and I living alone in a three-bedroom house, our bill went from 280 a month in July to over \$1,000, and half of the businesses in this town went out of business that summer after deregulation, and it wasn't until San Diego started paying their winter heating bills that anyone did anything about it.

So there's no way anyone in Borrego Springs is going to believe for a minute that this project or any other is really going to affect our pocketbook in a positive way, so you might as well just forget that.

Secondly, and more importantly to me, is the idea of wilderness. I speak about Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, in particular. Wilderness is set aside as a space to be untrammelled by man, and there's just no way you could put power poles through it without trammeling it. There's just no way.

We need this space. We need this space apart from civilization to regain our psyche. Wilderness needs this space — or wildlife needs this space, as you've heard from a lot of people in this room already. As the mother of the other noisy two-year-old that you were hearing back there, I worry about what we're going to leave for her. She needs wilderness, too, and I ask you to save some wilderness for her.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Daniel, do we have any more cards?

Is there anyone who has not spoken who would like to before I give people a second chance?

Yes, sir. If you would, just come forward and give us your name, please.

MR. HUSSEY: My name is Mike Hussey. I own property out there in Ocotillo Wells.

If you were to try to go through the forest with this, you would be cutting down old growth. Nothing has ever been done out there. It's been just like it is since God made it, so you've got to keep that in consideration. This new soil — it's not like the dirt up there. It's crazy. The chairman of the PUC has already come out and said — and he's having a little conference over there — that it's a done deal. Powerlink is going to go through because they said "Well, when it goes through" — so I think he should recuse himself when it comes up for a vote. That's how I see it.

The power plants in Mexico right now don't have a permit to send electricity across the border. They may be doing it now, but it's not a given because they didn't put scrubbers on the power plants, and they just tear up — they're just putting out pollution down there, so there's not a piece of paper that says forever they can do that. If they say there is, they're crazy.

When you're putting up these poles here, they're putting up the same kinds of poles and using the same kind of wire they've used for 200 years. A computer went from a block square seven stories high down to a microchip, and we're to believe there's been no new technology on electrical transmissions. That's crazy. What the hell?

San Diego Gas & Electric came out here. Like this one woman said, she had \$1,000 bill, and they wanted to go to IID, and San Diego Gas & Electric said we are not in business to give our customers or our territory away. Then a year ago, they turned around and gave their territory away from Ocotillo Wells to the Narrows to IID. The reason they did that is because IID doesn't need the PUC's permission to put that power line in through that desert. That's why they did that.

If you go underneath those power lines that are down there by Tecate now that run along Highway 8 and you take fluorescent light bulbs, you can stand out underneath there and have a Star Wars fight. They'll light up. You can read by them. And if they're saying that EMF — those electromagnetic fields aren't good for you, why are they putting them along the freeway at ten-mile stretches where you can't get away from them, and you will be physically impacted by it? Because they told the people in Ocotillo Wells that they couldn't build any permanent structures if they bought their property — from the property line, that they couldn't put a structure within 150 feet because if you stay within 150 feet of those power lines for two minutes or more, it will impact your body.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Is there anyone else? If not, this would be your opportunity, if you were already here once before, to come up for a second chance.

Come forward. All I need is your name again. You were talking to us about all the constraints.

MR. MARTIN: Yes. It's Scott Martin.

I don't want to spend too much more time on the constraints and opportunities, but I think that it's pretty clear that there are an incredible amount of constraints that — it kind of is amazing to me that we're even talking about this right now based on the amount of constraints that there are with this, and what I'd really like to talk about is Page 12 of this NOP and how it relates to the Energy Action Plan of the State of California. I, unfortunately, don't have the Energy Action Plan with me, but it specifically talks about a loading order for how we're going to deal with our electricity, and that we're going to work on energy efficiency and demand response and right on down the line, and there's a very specific order of that.

If you look at Page 12 under System Alternatives Considered and Eliminated By SDG&E, they basically eliminated energy efficiency because it would not meet reliability or renewable objectives. They rejected demand response. Distributed generation was eliminated. Rooftop solar was eliminated. In-area generation was eliminated.

Now, I can't really believe that they actually eliminated all of those, but they pretty much stated it, and I really think that if we took the time to put into place the objectives in both the Energy Action Plan II and the San Diego Regional Energy Strategy 20/30 Plan that we wouldn't even need to be here talking about this transmission line; that we could find a more effective kind of 21st-century solution to a 21st-century problem instead of a 20th-century solution, which I think is what SDG&E is proposing.

Thank you.

MS. WITHERS: Everybody pretty much touched on what I was talking about, but I just wanted to finish talking about the fact that I, myself, and all my neighbors were burned in this Pines fire that was started by this power line and that the wilderness areas up above the park —

MR. MICHAELSON: Could we just get your name?

MS. WITHERS: Judith Withers.

— and we lost a lot in this 13-mile wide inferno of destruction that burned for three weeks. It burned through the communities of San Felipe and Ranchita and Julian and Banner also. We no longer, most of us, can either maintain a fire-insurance policy or afford the \$5,000-a-year policy that I was quoted, and I know people that have had like five cancellations in a row — or I've just been flat turned down. "You are in a high-risk fire area. Forget it." So I urge you not to subject all the unincorporated wilderness communities here to this high risk.

I touched on the Top Guns. Everybody talked about Miramar. I experience that, too. Our valley shares the same valley as the Palomar Observatory. From the top of Teofulio Summit where I live, you can see all three observatories there. The night sky is beautiful, and we want to keep it that way for everyone.

I want to say that there are far better alternatives than desecrating a national treasure in this great state of California. We don't need to trample precious wilderness areas to accomplish our goals. Our nightly news broadcasts repeat the worries of global warming, and they speak about our addiction to oil and the fact that it's limited. That's why on Page 12 of the preparations for these meetings, that in-area generation and rooftop solar was completely eliminated by SDG&E — well, Governor Schwarzenegger signed the rooftop solar initiative. He thinks it's valuable and viable enough to have signed it, and I know a lot of locals that are planning on taking advantage of that, and I would urge you to consider alternative energy, as well as a route that is a direct — a shorter route than going through wilderness areas and precious desert.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Is there anyone else that would like a second chance? Come on up.

MR. STAEHLE: Thank you.

Robert Staehle again. I have four specific proposals for the coming work, one of which I started on, which was — I mentioned that I had put in 6 kilowatts of arrays up in Los Angeles county.

I'm not a wealthy man. A lot of people would say this is too expensive, but I earn wages like a lot of other folks. I don't have any great inheritance. It's about a ten-year payback period for me. It's quite reasonable. After that, I'm going to start getting electricity for free — or for the cost of the bill.

I think the real reason that SDG&E doesn't look at that alternative is they don't expect to make a very big profit out of it. It's not the Public Utilities Commission's responsibility to ensure profits for SDG&E.

MR. MICHAELSON: Could you all just do me a favor and let them go through their comments and save your applause to the end? That would be helpful.

MR. STAEHLE: So anyway, whether it's going on new or existing homes, I would like to see the alternative investigated of 100,000 homes over the next five years outfitted with rooftop solar and 10,000

small business buildings or parking lots, and that would, as I said earlier, put out about 2.6 gigawatts of power at peak.

Obviously, it's less when the sun is lower in the sky. The heat load and air conditioning load is also less when the sun is lower in the sky, and I think you'll find out the numbers will work out reasonably well.

My second proposal is for another alternative that should be investigated, and that is by implementing in a much wider way time-of-use metering and giving the utility the option to shut down air conditioning at individual residences remotely for, for example, an hour at a time during peak loading periods to smooth the load. They already do this with businesses. An hour at a time in personal residences, except in a few cases which could be allowed that exception, would not endanger anybody. It would hardly make people even a little uncomfortable. I think it's well worth the risk and something that should be investigated.

Then there are two questions I would like to be investigated. I see what I believe is specious argument about vulnerability to terrorist attack. That's why we need Sunrise Powerlink up through Anza-Borrego Desert and not just another corridor down I-8. Well, I'd like to see an analysis of the vulnerability to terrorist attack of a line that goes across extensive remote areas, where instead of 100 pairs of eyes an hour driving by on some road, there's nobody, maybe even for days, seeing somebody who might be up to no good. I don't think that analysis has been done.

Finally, in light of the Pines fire, I'd like to see a quantitative analysis of the relative risk of range fire forest fires started by aircraft collision with the Sunrise Powerlink over the route through the state park and remote areas, forested areas — again, where there aren't too many eyes to see when something happens.

Those are my four specific proposals, but I'd like to ask, in light of the last one: Who's liable for the cost and damage of those fires? Is it SDG&E? Is it the California Public Utilities Commission? Is it the individual landowners, like me? I suspect that the first two of those don't have the financial capacity to carry the liability insurance for the kind of damage that would be caused by something like the Pines fire.

So I go back to the mountain sheep, the peninsular bighorn that I saw this afternoon, and just remind you all that Borrego means sheep. That's Anza-Borrego. That's why this place is here and named what it is, and I noticed that one of the maps that was up where we came in here that over the Tubb Canyon corridor where this line is going to come in right past my property — I don't know what this means, but it says final critical habitat for peninsular bighorn on Page DW-S21. That sounds kind of ominous to me. Again, I go back to — we ought to be looking at all of these impacts a lot more carefully than we have been.

Thank you very much.

MR. BENNETT: My name is Charles Bennett, and one point that hasn't been touched on very much, I don't think, adequately is the impact of cultural resources. The proposed route travels through some very, very rich archeological areas. From Tamarisk Grove Campground as you head west, that area is the ancestral home of the Santa Ysabel people. You can't walk more than 15 or 20 feet without finding some evidence of past inhabitants there.

I'm virtually certain that adequate exploration of that area by qualified people will turn up cremation sites and burial sites. This is a very, very rich area archeologically, and to come in with a power line through that area where they're going to be in there with heavy equipment preparing the sites for

these 130- to 150-foot tall towers is going to really desecrate some vital archeological resources. I think that that needs to be very, very carefully considered.

I think that the people in the Santa Ysabel tribe should be able to have some considerable amount of say as to whether or not they want their ancestral home desecrated in a fashion like this. It's very vital that we preserve these links to our past, and I think that — I know that from things that I have personally seen when SDG&E crews come in to do their maintenance on the existing 69-kV line that they have absolutely no sensitivity to plants, animals, archeological sites. They run their trucks. They run their bulldozers. They do what they damn well please and hang the consequences. I can only imagine what's going to take place if they come in with their equipment to build this line. It's going to be a disaster.

As to alternatives, I fully support the earlier speakers who have recommended solar. We have an unprecedented — absolutely unprecedented opportunity here to show what can be done with solar. If the \$1.3 billion that SDG&E proposes to spend on this travesty were put into solar power in the city and county of San Diego, it would really make a difference. Put that 1.3 billion where it does some real good.

Barring that, if they don't want to do that, if they have to go ahead with a power line, then the federal government has just approved 700 miles of fence along the border. Build the thing along the border. You're going to have the border patrol watching the power line so it's going to be well-guarded, so they don't need to worry about any damage there. They're going to tear the land up anyway putting the fence in. You might as well use that same corridor for a power line.

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller, San Diego and Imperial County Sierra Club.

SDG&E has put out a Preliminary Environmental Assessment, and we have some comments on that that we would like to see you look at as you work on the final environmental documents. We think the PEA's assertion of no significant impact for the flat-tailed horned lizard and the Colorado fringe-toed lizard needs to be reexamined.

The PEA repeatedly lists factors that could have impact on those two lizards and then lists mitigation measures for those impacts and then draws the conclusion that the impacts will not be significant. One of those impacts is increased predation from increased avian perches, but there is no mitigation for that impact listed. Since one of the impacts appears to be unmitigated, we question the PEA's conclusion that there will be no significant impact.

Further, the PEA also says that one of the impacts to these lizards is construction traffic and says that will be mitigated by having reduced speed during construction. But who is going to enforce speed limits on the new access roads built for the project once the construction crews have left? I believe the BLM currently has one ranger enforcing rules on approximately 1 million acres of lands Algodones Dunes.

That's what I've heard. I don't know if it's correct. Lynda and Tom, you'll know if it's right.

But who's going to do the enforcement? The PEA also states that reduced construction speeds will allow for dispersal, which I interpret as saying lizards can get away, but the flat-tailed horned lizard is known for staying still when approached and even burying itself in the sand.

Similarly, the Colorado fringe-toed lizard also sometimes buries itself in sand as an escape strategy. So how much of these lizards actually are going to run away when something approaches? And how much are they just going to bury themselves in the sand and get run over?

The PEA repeatedly mentions avian death due to collision. It says the number of deaths is not quantifiable and then draws the conclusion that the impacts to bird will not be significant. How can you do that if you don't know how many birds are likely to die? This is of particular concern since many birds are legally protected under the Migratory Bird Act and other legislation.

We're also concerned about visual impact for the portions of the proposed route that do not currently have power lines in the desert specifically, especially the alternate route segments near the Coyote Mountains Wilderness and the Fish Creek Wilderness areas. They are beautiful areas, remarkably unspoiled, and I've got to say they're very dear to my heart because I spent a couple of days in that area when I was walking the desert portion of the route last April. It's gorgeous out there.

We're also worried about impacts of construction noise on wildlife in the adjacent Coyote Mountains Wilderness and Fish Creek Mountains Wilderness areas that would be for that far western alternate route. Noise really carries in the desert.

We are concerned about impacts of the line on desert hikers, especially in the sections that do not currently have power lines, which would be especially the alternate route section near the Coyote Mountains Wilderness and Fish Creek Wilderness areas.

Desert hikers typically hike without trails because trails are few and far between in the desert. So the absence of trails in the desert should not be interpreted as an absence of hikers.

Finally, we are concerned about impacts of the line for that alternate route to the far west in Imperial County, impacts on the Carrizo wash and Coyote wash. As near as we can tell from the maps, both would likely be used for construction access.

We are particularly concerned about the possibility of introducing additional tamarisk into those washes. Desert washes are known for often having greater species diversity or different species than the areas immediately around them, and those washes need to be carefully examined for plants and wildlife and not just assumed to be the same as the surrounding areas. It does not appear to us from the Preliminary Environmental Assessment that that distinction between the washes and the areas around them was made.

Thank you for your time.

MR. RAUH: Quick comment. Joe Rauh from Ranchita again.

Being a Realtor and selling areas close to Anza-Borrego, we're sort of surrounded by Anza-Borrego, BLM, and this irrigation where we are, and many of my properties are located near the fringes of these properties. People always ask me "Well, what do we do about power?" SDG&E quotes a power pole costing between 6- and \$8,000. So whenever someone talks to me about power beyond three or four poles away, I recommend to them they look into alternative power. Some of them do look into alternative power and also wish to be hooked up to the grid.

As part of the scoping, I talked to several of these people who are hooked up to the grid who do have solar panels. They tell me they do not get paid for any excess power that they might generate. They get refunded for any power that they use but do not get paid for any excess power.

As part of the scoping document, the effect of this non-payback to people — if I was building a solar place, I might want to put up extra panels and maybe sell back some of the excess power, but as it is now, SDG&E does not pay for any excess power beyond what you use, and this might have a significant

impact for people who are putting up panels at this time because they only put up what they will use and nothing more.

If there was incentive for people to be able to get a little bit of money back for excess power, people might go ahead and put up two or three extra solar panels at each installation for long-term usage.

Thank you very much.

MS. PAUL: Lori Paul again.

Following on the other comment by another biologist, I want to let you all know that I actually have pictures of — I think it's San Diego Coast horned toad, which is federally listed and quite clearly in one of the preferred routes for this particular power transmission line.

Also following on concerns about impact on species, I don't think there's been 500-kilovolt power lines, except maybe coming out of Boulder Dam and a few other areas that are somewhat mountainous, that go right through prime bat habitat as well. You've got a phenomenal electromagnetic field and buzzing effects that may or may not attract or damage insect populations that feed bat species.

I don't know what the answer to that question is, but I think it needs to be explored because you have federally listed Yuma Myotis and brown bats, Mexican free-tail Pipstrelles. We see them.

Through all of these mountainous areas, I think that bats often get the short end of the stick when it come to a lot of studies. They're not around, quite frequently, when a team sweeps in to do impact studies, and quite a few species have been left out of reports that I know of. So please add bats to your list of species of concern.

Some of your nocturnal — the adverse impacts of this power line with the blinking lights, the power line perhaps could even impact owls and so forth. Some of the nocturnal species require some additional investigation when you put a power line of this magnitude in place across wilderness areas.

MR. MICHAELSON: I know the court reporter missed all of those bat species. Could you say them real slowly?

MS. PAUL: The federally listed species that we might have locally is Yuma myotis, and I can get species later.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

MS. PAUL: And Mexican free-tail, little brown bats, and Pipstrelles. I know, in fact, that Pipstrelles have quite a few colonies in, for example, the split mountain areas.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Yes, sir. Come forward.

MR. RAFFETTO: Thanks, you guys, again for acknowledging me.

I asked earlier about the I-8 corridor, and I've heard before about this terrorism issue, and I don't know if that's something that — I've never read it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can I get your name? I'm sorry.

MR. RAFFETTO: I'm sorry. It's Joe Raffetto.

I'm not sure if it's something that Sempra and SDG&E have actually mentioned as a reason not to do the I-8 corridor, but as the previous speaker had said, to me, that's ridiculous because there were two twin towers. You get two power lines — I don't see — and the remoteness of it — and if that's truly what terrorists are going to do, why put up with using a flashlight and eating canned soup for a few weeks if they're going to blow up our power lines? Frankly, I don't think that's even going to happen. It's going to be something worse than that.

If that is the reason that we're not talking about the I-8 corridor, well, then, thanks, SDG&E, because that means that we should all have rooftop solar panels. Terrorists can't blow that up on a mass scale, so they gave us a great idea.

I think that when you look at this map of all of these alternate maps that they considered and are now on the table again, it's, again, trying to pit people against each other. I don't think everyone down in Campo and that beautiful area down near the border should have to look at this stuff either — or up in North County.

The thing is archaic. They're talking about pulling the switch on this, this great glorious thing of electricity for all of Southern California in 2015. Well, in 2015, good Lord — are we talking about power lines and generators and all of this stuff in 2015? I mean, we should really be looking at the things that previous speakers have talked about, and I think that if this angers enough people, that they go out there, and they get solar things on top of their roofs, that, God, that would just be a great silver lining to this whole thing, if we could get these guys and cut ourselves off the grid and do something like Kennedy did in '63. He said we'd land a man on the moon by the end of the decade.

All of the things SDG&E looked at and said "We can't do that. We can't do that." Why not? The thing is it's up to us individuals. Frankly, I plan to get my business — we're going to start off with bio-diesel for the trucks, and then we're going to move to solar and wind because that's the two great things that Borrego Springs has is solar and wind, and then I can say "See you later, SDG&E." Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: I also would like to provide time for some Q and A, so if we're ready to move into that —

Did you already speak once? Come on up if you haven't. We just need your name.

MS. HURLEY: My name is Peggy Hurley.

I keep hearing about the solar option, but one thing that hasn't been mentioned with the solar — when I visited Yuma, Arizona, they had solar carports at the public buildings, and that kind of made me start thinking that if SDG&E would go into a contract situation with some of the buildings around and put their own solar panels on it so that the private people aren't obligated with the cost, then they would also be gaining the electricity that came from it, too.

There's an awful lot of public buildings around that they could probably use anyway and then also contract with other buildings that might be available to do that. Then you don't have to worry about people feeling that they weren't getting the electricity back, and SDG&E wouldn't be losing money or electricity. They would be benefitting from doing that.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. TOWNSEND: My name is Ted West Townsend. I've lived in Borrego Springs since only February because of the threat of fires and so forth, and I haven't heard anybody say this, but I had my

house burned down by that fire, the Pines fire, in which the helicopter struck a power line. I think that power lines, as others have said, are a danger for that very reason, having aircrafts fly into them, whether on purpose or by accident, and solar and wind power is the only way to go, as far as I'm concerned. There's no doubt in my mind. Thank you.

MR. HUSSEY: My name is Mike Hussey, again.

I've got a question that I can't get an answer for. What about the wells? If they come out there and they start driving power or using dynamic compaction and some guy goes out there and uses his well and fills his tank on Saturday — they come by during the week. He goes out there next Saturday to use it, and it's ruined, what's he going to do? Is he going to get told to go down and see the legal department? The first thing they're going to say is "Oh, it wasn't us," but here he's going to have a collapsed well.

MR. MICHAELSON: Mike, you raised that question, I believe, in El Centro as well, and the team has taken that as a comment, something to look into, but that's not something they would have an answer to tonight.

MR. HUSSEY: Okay. I've got another one. I believe this is setting a precedent for Bush's Energy Policy. If they can get through this part, they can do his energy corridors across the United States. This is quite a big deal here, but it involves more than us. There's more here than just going across this park. They want to go across here so they can go across the United States and not have anybody giving them any crap. They'll just say "Oh, we went through Anza-Borrego, and that's just how it is." That's what I think.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. WARREN: Cristina Warren.

As a person with solar on top of my house, I just want to make a point here. It's kind of ironic, but the fact that SDG&E will not pay me back for all the extra energy that I make for them every year — at this point in time is an advantage for SDG&E. I mean, how much other electricity do they get for free? Who else do they not pay for the electricity? If us solar customers — I put an extra big array thinking I would be getting a little bit of payment back, but the fact is that right now they're getting free energy from us solar people, which I've made my peace with and said "Okay. I'm making energy for everybody else, so I can do without the money feedback." Anyway, it's just a point I wanted to make.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Is there anybody who would like to ask a question at this point?

Yes, sir. Again, they may or may not be able to answer it, but we'll at least try.

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MR. STAEHLE: Robert Staehle, again.

My question is: I would like to know: What is the statutory requirement, either in federal or California law, for notifying California landowners, within what distance, with what kinds of effects, at what point in this process, within what period of time of initiating consideration of a route alternative?

MR. MICHAELSON: That's a good question.

MS. BLANCHARD: From our standpoint at the CPUC, we have a general order, 131-D, that outlines the notification process requirements, which includes everyone on the proposed project line within 300 feet, newspaper noticing, and then anybody else that is an interested party that we also add to the list.

CEQA has particular minimum requirements, but we tend to go beyond that in terms of the amount of notification that we attempt to do. Everybody that wants to be on the mailing list gets on our mailing list. There are minimum requirements, but we try to go beyond those, and right now, we are at the stage that we started scoping, and that was our first notification. Then in the future, there will be notifications regarding the release of the draft.

MR. STAEHLE: Can you clarify what you mean by newspaper noticing for people within 300 feet?

MS. BLANCHARD: We did a number of notifications. I don't have all the lists in front of me, but we can get that for you.

MR. MICHAELSON: I think what he's asking you is: You don't mail that individually to every property owner?

MS. BLANCHARD: We mail to all of the names and addresses of everyone within 300 feet.

MR. STAEHLE: And what kind of communication is mailed? Is it something that says "You may be affected by" —

MS. BLANCHARD: The NOP, for instance, was mailed to everyone within 300 feet.

MR. STAEHLE: I didn't receive it, and I'm within 300 feet of what's on the map. Several of our neighbors to the east and west of us are also within 300 feet, and I know they've received no such notification.

MS. LEE: We sent out about 7,000 of these NOPs, and I have to say we got back several hundred already. We're having, I think, difficulty on mailing-list issues. There are a lot of things that came back "Post office unable to deliver." I don't know what kinds of addresses, but if you didn't receive it, if you would maybe asterisk your names or let us know because we got the list from SDG&E, who got the list from tax records.

MR. STAEHLE: I know in my case — you've got my name on record — I just received my tax bill. I've received it reliably every year since I've owned the property. There's no confusion about my address. Okay? I have neighbors to the east and west who get similar tax bills, and I think what I'm afraid I see going on here is a pattern of not notifying landowners.

I mean, if it were just me, I could understand. It could be lost in the mail. A tax bill could be lost in the mail, too. It never has been in my case, but it certainly could be. But when I find that we're the ones notifying our neighbors because we went to a hearing in Ramona and found a map going across our property and they go "What?" — no. I've never received anything like that in the mail, and neither have they.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can I suggest that individuals who are in that situation — that we talk to them after the meeting just to try to make sure we know which ones and see if there's a particular issue and make sure those people get added. I think they've answered the question as much as they can with what the procedure is. Apparently, there's an execution issue here that we need to get to.

MR. STAEHLE: There's an execution issue, and I believe — I suspect. I can't say for sure — that there's an intent issue here as well, and that's what I think needs to be explored.

MS. BLANCHARD: I just want to say it's not the CPUC's intent to not notify people within 300 feet. If there's an error in the names or if there's some outdated mailing list, then we need to get that corrected. But certainly from my standpoint, it's not our intent to not notify you guys.

MR. MICHAELSON: Any other questions?

MS. WITHERS: Judith Withers.

I just had a further comment on what he said. In my community of San Felipe, where the Central East Substation is proposed, the same thing has happened. I find myself calling all the neighbors and all the surrounding people who knew nothing at all, received nothing about it. They're shocked.

A lot of them have the route going right over their property, and, you know, they never received anything, so I do believe that there's a serious problem about that notification.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Any other questions?

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller.

These are questions for the BLM about the California Desert Conservation Area Plan because, as you know, you guys will need to amend it to put a utility corridor through should this project be approved. It's my understanding that the project would cross what are called Class L BLM lands, and from the California Desert Conservation Area Plan's website, they're described as managed to protect sensitive, natural, scenic, ecological, and cultural resource values. They provide for generally lower-intensity, carefully controlled multiple uses that do not significantly diminish resource values, as opposed to Class M, moderate use, managed to control —

MR. MICHAELSON: You're reading a lot of big words really fast.

MS. FULLER: I'll give it to you.

I'm just trying not to take up too much time, but I'll give her a copy.

MR. MICHAELSON: Perfect.

MS. FULLER: The Class M, managed to balance higher-intensity use and production, and that includes utility development. Okay? So I'm wondering — if we've got a bunch of Class L land out here, which from this doesn't appear to include utility stuff, and Class M does, are you going to have to change the Class L land to Class M in order to designate a utility corridor?

MR. ZALE: I think no is probably the answer, but that whole analysis that you're talking about doing is something that we're just at the beginning stage. We'll have to look at all of these alternatives and the impacts associated with them as part of the NEPA process.

MS. FULLER: Could I ask why you wouldn't have to change the L to M? Is there an answer for that?

MS. KASTOLL: Yes. If you further look at the plan, Kelly, under "Guidelines For Multiple Use Classes," Class L allows transportation facilities subject to NEPA. It doesn't preclude such uses. So as

Tom said, when we have the application, we have to look at all alternatives including the proposed action, but it would not require a plan amendment.

MS. FULLER: But the utility corridor would require the plan be — you just wouldn't have to do a land class change?

MS. KASTOLL: We would not have to change the land classification.

MS. FULLER: Thank you.

Also I was wondering — I know sometimes the ACEC, the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, have management plans that go with them. Are there going to be any management plans that would have to be — ACEC management plans that would need to be adapted for putting in the power lines? Because it looks like Yuha Basin ACEC is out there and possibly — I get confused with the maps. I'm not sure, but possibly one of the alternatives might affect West Mesa ACEC.

MS. KASTOLL: I don't believe any of our ACEC management plans actually preclude power lines or rights-of-way. It's just to make us aware that there are sensitive issues that would need to be addressed, but I don't think any of them actually preclude rights-of-way. Unfortunately, there is no West Mesa Management Plan. It was never developed.

MS. FULLER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ZALE: I was just going to add that, again, that's all subject to us doing additional analysis as part of this process.

MR. HENSON: Ryan Henson of California Wilderness Coalition.

Alternatives C and D pass through the Cleveland National Forest, and I'm wondering — have there been any Forest Service officials at any of the hearings that have been held within the last week or so?

MR. MICHAELSON: Or meetings held with them?

MR. HENSON: No. Were they at the public hearings like this?

MS. BLANCHARD: We think they were there, but they didn't speak. By the way, we had an agency consultation meeting, with them on Tuesday.

MR. HENSON: Are they going to be revising their recently approved forest plan to make these utility corridors possible, the plan they approved two months ago?

MS. BLANCHARD: I think that right now, we're very early in the process, and we went and had some initial discussions with them just to get a sense of facts and issues, but we're certainly not at that point with them at all.

MR. MICHAELSON: Anything else that we haven't addressed? A question?

MS. PAUL: I'm sorry I'm making a hobby of coming up here, but at the risk of beating a dead horse, in Tubb Canyon — and I can give this list over — as far as I know Tom and Chris Stemnock, who are here; Bill Collins; and the Reagan-Heart family; Barnaby, who lives to our north; the Wadsworths, Ginger and Bill; the Di Francescas at Beaver-Tail Ranch; Walter Boyce, DVM, who runs the cougar research program in the home to our west; Robert Johnson, Frank Gilman, and David Garmon, who are

our neighbors, have a little desert house right on the proposed alternative route that isn't listed or illustrated in any of the documents you passed out today; plus three property owners Bill Collins can identify.

And in Ocotillo Wells, Rod Hansen, Brian Serfini, and Jack Bennet — I don't know if any of them are here today. None of us received any notification. We all learned about this project approximately — well, just before the Ramona meeting a couple of weeks ago.

We received absolutely no information from SDG&E. We know it's not you folks, but we received no information that this project existed or that it was going across our land. Some of us are seasonal residents. Some are part-time residents. Some of us are absent remote landowners. We all have APN numbers. We all get, as Rob said, tax bills, and we all have addresses that are quite obviously available, simply through PO boxes in Borrego Springs or through our tax records. There is something fishy going on.

Further I wanted to mention what I've mentioned to some of you individually, and that is that we've had surveyors coming out to our land without our permission and trespassing. Two white SDG&E trucks — Bill Collins, who was here earlier. You've got his contact information — can tell you about it. He chased them off our land and the Stemnocks and off property adjacent. They come with staff. Surveyors seldom travel with two trucks and multiple persons. I suspect they've got some other investigative staff that are snooping around our properties for who knows what resources.

My property markers are uncovered, which are well buried, because I own across Tubb Canyon Road and then abuts the state park. If those towers are going on my land, someone dang well better tell me because I don't give my permission and won't ever.

Further, they also showed up at the Ocotillo Wells properties, according to Rod Hansen, Brian Serfini, and Jack Bennett. They showed up. The caretaker caught them on their 60 acres and other land over there in Ocotillo Wells, and apparently SDG&E threw a postcard out at the fence that the caretaker picked up and then told them they weren't welcome on their land.

According to someone who called me, a woman up in Grapevine Canyon tried to get a restraining order, and the sheriffs were told to escort the SDG&E trucks onto their property, and I don't believe they were just surveyors. Surveyors can check your corners, but they're not supposed to be wandering around in the middle of your parcel, and so this is an impropriety also, and I think we need to make sure that, in terms of proper process, you're aware of this.

MR. MICHAELSON: The timing here is a little strange because we theoretically have five or ten minutes left, but I can see my court reporter's fingers dying, so to speak. We've kind of pushed her to her limit.

I know you already had your hand up. Why don't we take one more question, and then I'd like to adjourn, if that's okay.

MR. MARTIN: Scott Martin.

I just wanted to know if you have been in contact with the Parks and Recreation Commission and discussed their statements of policy, in particular, Policy Number — I don't know — it's Roman Numeral 3.8 that talks about utilities through state parks.

MS. LEE: Not yet.

MR. MARTIN: Will that —

MS. BLANCHARD: We have been meeting with the state parks officials here and probably will be doing that again — or a number of times. No. We have not talked to the Commission, per se, but we are talking to the State Parks people.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Well, I would just like to make sure that you are aware that there is a State Parks and Recreation Commission —

MS. BLANCHARD: Right.

MR. MARTIN: — policy on utilities through parks.

MS. BLANCHARD: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Could we put the last two slides up?

Just to be clear, I hope, about the California Public Utility Commission and Bureau of Land Management's intent, they would like to hear from you. They've tried to provide as many avenues as possible. There is a postal address. There is an e-mail address. There is a fax number. Written comments can be sent to any of these. Remember that October 20th is the deadline for scoping comments at this phase of the process.

If we could go to the next page — there is a website that is run by the CPUC for this process that we recommend you become familiar with and use. In addition, we've heard at some previous meetings that not everyone has as easy or as much access to the Internet as they would like. Billie Blanchard has agreed that even more so than usual, they're going to try to provide hard copies and extensive information available at the actual libraries and offices which are information repositories so people can see them in hard copy, if they would like to do that. There is both an e-mail address as well as an 800 number that you can use in order to contact us if you need further information.

We very, very much appreciate all of you staying so late and taking your time to be here and express yourselves so articulately and eloquently.

With that, I will adjourn our meeting. Thank you.

(Proceedings adjourned at 8:27 p.m.)

**SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT**

**Reporter's Transcript of the CPUC/BLM Scoping Meeting  
for Preparation of a Draft EIR/EIS**

Held 2:00 p.m. October 5, 2006  
At Mission Valley (San Diego), California

Reported by:  
Shannon L. Marcos, CSR No. 8348

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Lewis Michaelson - Katz & Associates, Public Facilitator  
Susan Lee - Aspen Environmental Group  
Billie Blanchard - California Public Utilities Commission  
Tom Zale & Lynda Kastoll - Bureau of Land Management

Presentation: pages 3 to 10  
Public Comments begin on page 10  
Q&A begins on page 25

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

Marty Allenby.....	10
Pam Albers.....	11
Karen Mills.....	11
John Peterson.....	12
Brian Jennings.....	13
Sara Feldman.....	14
Nick Ervin.....	14
Bob Barelmann.....	16
Janis Shackelford.....	16
Jim Bell.....	17
Donna Tisdale.....	18
Bill Hoffman.....	19
Marsha Johnston.....	20
Kelly Fuller.....	20
John Raifsaider.....	21
Dennis Trafecanty.....	21
Bruce MacRobbie.....	22
Gary Hughes.....	23
Joe Raffetto.....	23
Marvin Patche.....	24
Pat Bianez.....	24

**Q&A, BY SPEAKER**

Donna Tisdale.....	25, 28, 36
Jim Bell.....	26
Marty Allenby.....	27
Rita Deutch.....	27
Merna Watts.....	28
Kelly Fuller.....	29, 35
Janis Shackelford.....	29
Pam Albers.....	29, 34
Harvey Payne.....	30
Paul Blackman.....	31
Sara Feldman.....	32
Ellen Shivley.....	33
Dennis Trafecanty.....	34, 36
Bob Barelmann.....	35

MR. MICHAELSON: Good afternoon. We're very glad you could join us today. My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work for a firm named Katz & Associates and we've been hired by the California Public Utilities Commission to support these meetings and for me to serve as a neutral moderator. This is the sixth of seven meetings that are being held this week. We were in Borrego Springs last night. We were in El Centro and we were in Ramona. Today we'll be here in Mission Valley and later this evening in Rancho Penasquitos.

This particular meeting is an essential spot in the rotation. It was advertised in the Notice of Preparation as specifically designated for people to provide input on routing alternatives avoiding Anza-Borrego Desert State Park; however, attendees at this meeting are also welcome to comment on any other topic related to the EIR/EIS. It should be noted that comments on alternatives were welcome at all the other meeting locations. This has been a tremendously, I would say, successful scoping process already so far in terms of the number of really useful, constructive, relevant comments that can be used in the process. We've already had a wealth of really good participation at this point, so we're looking forward to continuing that here this afternoon.

This meeting is being held, in case you're not aware, to satisfy both the State of California Environmental Quality Act requirements and the Federal National Environmental Policy Act. In a moment it will be clear why we're doing both.

Because some of you may be unfamiliar with that process, I'm going to go briefly through the purpose of scoping. Then Susan Lee, who is seated immediately to my left, with Aspen Environmental Group, a consulting group that's taking the lead in the preparation of this EIR/EIS, will talk about the proposed project. Billie Blanchard, seated next to her, is with the California Public Utilities Commission. She'll be talking about their process and schedule. Then seated next to her are Tom Zale and Lynda Kastoll with the Bureau of Land Management. They have a related and concurrent process, but with some differences that they need to speak about. Finally, we'll go back with Susan Lee for a few slides to describe in a little bit more detail what an EIR/EIS is, what it consists of and how it's prepared. Then we will reach the time for what is the really most important part of this meeting, an opportunity for public comment. I already have quite a few speaker registration cards, and that will be the time for your input.

We do know through survey after survey that one of Americans' greatest fears is public speaking. We'll be kind and gentle and we'll make this as easy and user-friendly for you as we can. But if you don't want to speak today and you do want to make comments, there are ample ways of making written comments. Written comments are also on the record and they have the same weight and consideration as oral comments. So don't feel like if you don't speak today, that you're left out of the process. Please feel free and please do think about submitting written comments as well.

You will not have to pay for parking if there was any confusion about that. If you will tell them on your way out, the person at the gate, that you are here for this meeting, you might want to mention Aspen Environmental and the EIS, and they should let you pass through. We didn't want to have anyone to have to pay for public comments.

So the purpose of scoping is to inform you and public agencies about an upcoming project for which an EIR/EIS is being prepared. It's to inform you about the review process, so that you can understand how to participate in it. It's to solicit your input, and I want to put a focus here regarding two primary things. We're at the very beginning of the EIR/EIS process. The analysis and evaluation haven't been done, the surveys haven't been done, the documents haven't been prepared. This is the part where you get to help them identify potential alternatives to the proposed project and the appropriate scope of the

environmental issues to be studied in the EIR/EIS. So those are the types of comments that are going to be most useful.

Of course, also through this process we identify issues of concern, areas for controversy. You should also know that a Scoping Report will be prepared after the scoping time period is over, which is October 20th. The Scoping Report will summarize both oral and written comments. So if you're not able to go to all the meetings, there will be transcripts. You'll be able to see what other people had to say at other meetings and then their written comments. Those will be placed in the information repositories in which there are 18, as well as on the project website.

I might mention that the website address is available on the slide and handouts. There has been some confusion at a couple of the meetings where people have actually been going on the SDG&E website, I guess, thinking that they're on the CPUC web site. Apparently when you Google it, that's what you're most likely to come up with. So we encourage you from this point forward as far as these deliberations and proceedings to consult the CPUC website for the schedule and proceeding.

Next one. Thank you. A couple of key players that you should know about, most of them are here today, the CPUC, that's the California Public Utilities Commission agency. They are the lead agency for the Environmental Impact Report that's being prepared under state law. And then the Bureau of Land Management is the lead agency for an Environmental Impact Statement which is being prepared under NEPA. San Diego Gas & Electric obviously is a key player in this in that they are the Applicant, but they are not a part of this proceeding. The people you see in front of you are the people that are being asked to review and evaluate that application, so that's helpful for you to know that. Not only is Susan Lee here, but several people on the EIR/EIS team from Aspen are here today. Some of them were answering your questions at the poster station.

So with that I'm going to turn it over to Susan Lee to give a brief description of the proposed project.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Lewis. I wanted to point you to the Notice of Preparation that I know a lot of you received in the mail, and also we were handing out at the entrance station. This document includes a somewhat description of the project itself. I'm not going to spend a lot of time describing all the ins and outs, but if you'll just note for your reference that starting on Page 4 and continuing for five or six pages after that is a Link-by-Link description of the project that describes the types of towers in each segment, the general land use within each segment. Accompanying each of those descriptions is a series of maps in the back. And the maps, again, are by each Link starting at El Centro and moving all the way to the west to Penasquitos.

I'll talk just briefly about the project. Figure 1 is the overview of the project itself. The transmission line that San Diego Gas & Electric is proposing is 150 miles long. It is about 57 miles in Imperial County and about 93 miles in San Diego County. It includes a 500 kilo volt transmission line, which is a high voltage line. That line would start at the Imperial Valley Substation, which is just southwest of El Centro and continue up through the desert primarily on BLM land. It would enter the Anza-Borrego National Park just west of the San Diego County line, pass through Anza-Borrego, through Grapevine Canyon, up to a major new substation that would be constructed by SDG&E as part of this project. That's identified on the map as the Central Link Substation, just southeast of Warner Springs. At that point the transmission line would convert to a 230 kilo volt line. That's the red line to the southwest. That line continues through two substations where the power would be delivered first to the Sycamore Canyon Substation, which is just on the north end of Miramar, and second to the Penasquitos Substation almost at the coast, near I-5.

While the project itself is being proposed by SDG&E, there is another future owner of this project, which is the Imperial Irrigation District. The portion of the project between the Imperial Valley Substation and the Narrows Substation, which is actually within Anna-Borrego, would ultimately be owned, constructed and operated by the Imperial Irrigation District. This would occur under a Memorandum of Agreement that's already been signed by the IID and San Diego Gas and Electric; however, the environmental review of the entire project is being done through this EIR/EIS.

The goals that San Diego Gas & Electric has defined as the reasons that it's building this project are shown here in three main categories. The first one is to maintain and improve reliability to the San Diego area. Currently San Diego is served by one high-voltage power line, the Southwest Powerlink that runs right across the very southern part of the state near the border. The goal is to bring in another high voltage line from the east. The second purpose is to import renewable energy from Imperial County. SDG&E has identified a couple sources of renewable energy that it's targeted for this project. One of them is the Stirling Energy project that is proposed. There isn't a final application in yet, but it will be addressed by BLM. The area just west of the Imperial Valley Substation is the site of a potential 900 megawatt solar facility. There's also the potential to bring in power generated from geothermal resources on the south end of the Salton Sea. So that's the second goal. The third one is to reduce energy costs by providing more efficient sources of power to the San Diego region and allowing a restructuring of the electric system.

SDG&E had identified eight separate objectives. Except for the last two, these objectives repeat, in a little more detail, the three goals that I just described. The objectives seven and eight are focused on their goal to minimize land use disturbance and stay away from high density residential areas.

Now I turn this over to Billie Blanchard.

MS. BLANCHARD: Hello, I'm Billie Blanchard. I'm the CPUC project manager for the environmental document. And I just want to go over a little bit the review process that we will be doing and including the schedule as the CPUC knows it at this point.

The CPUC review process: essentially, the CPUC has two parallel review processes for the SDG&E application for the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, known as the CPCN. There is the general proceeding process for the application and then the environmental review process for the CEQA/NEPA document, which I'm mainly involved in.

The general proceeding will be led by the assigned Commissioner Dian Grueneich and the Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman. The scope of the CPCN proceeding is defined by the Public Utilities Code Section 1002, where we will be looking at the determination of need for the project and also consider other things such as community values, aesthetic, historic, recreational, park, and other resources, and also the review of the environmental impacts of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA.

The schedule for the general proceeding: there was a first prehearing conference in January of 2006 in Ramona. And then there was a second prehearing conference and public participation hearing that was held also in Ramona on September 13th, 2006. The administrative law judge will be preparing the scoping memo for the general proceeding. That is supposed to be done sometime in the first part of October. In that scoping memo the judge will outline the issues to be addressed in the proceeding and will also have the detail schedule for the proceeding aspects as well as our final schedule for the CEQA/NEPA process. Right now I cannot tell you any of the dates for testimony, hearings, and all of that, but that will be coming out through the scoping memo soon.

As far as the Environmental Review Schedule that we have, again SDG&E filed an application originally in December of 2005. Then in August of 2006 they filed an amended application and the Proponent's Environmental Assessment, the PEA. In late August the Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register. The Notice of Preparation, which you have now, was released on September 15th. And the scoping period will go until October 20th, 2006. Right now we do not have the schedule for the release of the Draft EIR/EIS, which will begin a 90-day comment period for the CEQA/NEPA document. There are still some issues that we needed to address. As soon as we get that schedule finalized, we will send out a card to everyone on the CEQA/NEPA mailing list to show the dates for the release of the Draft and the Final EIR process.

So now I'll turn it over to BLM.

MR. ZALE: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are both here representing BLM's El Centro field office. BLM is involved in the proposed project, because the right-of-way that San Diego Gas & Electric applied for would cross about 33 miles of public land primarily in Imperial County, but also a 1.3 mile stretch in San Diego County.

In addition to that, we're working to determine what role BLM would play in administering a reservation through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. When the patent for the park was issued back in the '30s, there was a reservation for the existing power line right-of-way through the Park. We're working to determine what role BLM would have in continuing to administer that reservation.

BLM will also be considering the proposed amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, the land use plan for this area. A plan amendment would be required because the proposed right-of-way would deviate from designated utility corridors within the California Desert Conservation Area.

In addition to those roles, BLM will also play a lead role in conducting government-to-government consultation with interested tribes. We will also be the lead agency working with the Fish & Wildlife Service to conduct Section 7 consultation in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

The last thing I should mention is the comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR will be 90 days as opposed to the formerly shorter period of time, because there is a planned amendment as part of this process being considered. Thank you.

MS. LEE: In addition to the CPUC and BLM, which are the lead agencies under CEQA and NEPA for this project, there are many, many other agencies, federal, state, local, county, that will be involved in this project because they have the responsibility to review the project and to issue permits over many parts of it. We've listed on this slide a number of them, certainly not all of them, but we just want you to be aware that part of our scoping process envelopes consultation with a large number of other agencies. We've met with many of them this week. We'll continue to meet with them and we also expect to get comment letters from many of these agencies.

These next few slides I'm going to describe is the EIR/EIS process and what the contents of an EIR/EIS are, because we're hoping that this will help you define the kinds of comments, the kinds of things we like to hear from you, and how they will fit into the documents that we will be preparing over the next many months.

Here we show the flow chart basically for preparation of an EIR/EIS. What you can see in the yellow square over to the left is where we are now. The process starts at the far left which is where the two lead agencies have made a decision to prepare an EIR and a EIS. The first step after that decision is to

come to the public and look for comments on the project, comments on alternatives. That's the scoping process. So we're just barely getting started.

Everything that's been done in the past up to this point was completed by San Diego Gas & Electric. It was not done by us. We're taking all that and reviewing it independently and starting our process essentially just this week. We'll move on through this process over much of the next year. As Billie said, the schedule remains to be defined, but we will be preparing a draft EIR/EIS and coming back here to meet with people and get comments on the Draft. We'll have public meetings at that point as well. We will then incorporate responses to comments. We'll prepare a Final EIS and the agencies will make a decision at that point.

In a very broad way we define here the contents of an EIR/EIS. Initially it includes a very detailed description environmental setting, and you can imagine for a project like this there will be a lot of information in there, because this project covers two counties and a huge range of types of terrains and land use and biological habitats.

We will discuss the project as impacts of proposed components and the impacts of alternatives. I'll talk in more detail about alternatives in just a minute. The document will include mitigation measures. The purpose of all of this is to allow the two lead agencies and the other agencies, who will use these documents, to make a decision on the project based on a complete disclosure of all the potential environmental impacts. And at the same time it allows the public to be involved and understand what information is being prepared and to give us your input so we can be sure that we've got the best possible information included.

Here we've listed, again, just another breakdown of the types of sections that are included in the EIR/EIS, so you can get a feel for the way they will be divided. We'll address separately the impacts of the project, the impacts of alternatives. We will have a discussion of cumulative impacts, indirect impacts and the potential for the project to induce growth. Cumulative impacts are other projects that are in the area that might also affect the environment along with this one. The project will also include mitigation monitoring. If it's approved, there will be monitors who will be in the field to ensure that the mitigation measures are accurately implemented.

Here we've listed the long list of environmental disciplines that are included in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report, so you have a feel for the types of issues we would like to hear about. If any of these topics raise a concern in your mind or if there's something in here that you would like to comment on, these are all the issues we will be addressing in the document.

Okay. Now we go to alternatives, and even though we're not restricted to alternatives today, we know that that's the reason that many of you may have come. Let me just point out two of the maps that are included in your NOP in case you haven't noticed them. They are the very last ones in this handout, the first one is Figure 7 and the title of this one is "SDG&E Alternatives Fully Evaluated and Carried Forward." These are the alternatives that after evaluation SDG&E decided were worth analyzing in detail in its application to the CPUC and the BLM. That doesn't mean that those are the alternatives that the EIR/EIS will consider. We will look at the alternatives that SDG&E has provided and evaluate them as to whether they should stay in our system, which I'll describe in a minute, further consideration. If you'll look at the next map, which is Figure 8, these are the alternatives that San Diego Gas & Electric considered in its application. And the yellow lines on here are the alternatives that SDG&E decided not to pursue in any detail. So we are looking equally at these alternatives, along with the ones that they did carry forward, to make a decision as to whether or not these alternatives should be evaluated in the EIR/EIS.

What we list on this slide here is the process that we use to evaluate alternatives. Every alternative that's considered in our document has to pass these three tests. The first is that it must be consistent with the project objectives. Those are the objectives defined by SDG&E, but CEQA does not require that it meet all the objectives, so we have some flexibility in looking at alternatives as far as meeting most of the project objectives. The alternative must have fewer impacts than the proposed project or avoid the impacts by moving to a different route. The third requirement is that the alternative must be feasible. You have to be able to build it with today's technology and you have to be able to get it permitted.

Here we've listed the range of alternatives that we will be considering just in terms of broad categories of alternatives, so we would love to hear from you about any of these sorts of things. Obviously there's a lot of focus on routing alternatives. And as Lewis mentioned, the meeting that we have here today is one of the opportunities that you have to discuss possibilities for routes for the transmission line that would avoid Anza-Borrego.

To jump down to that last bullet. In the prehearing conference that was held in Ramona a couple of weeks ago, the commissioner for the CPUC, Dian Grueneich, ordered San Diego Gas & Electric to identify an alternative that did not go through the park. Of all the alternatives that were out there this was the one that was meeting their objectives as the best non-park alternative.

The alternative that they identified, if you look at this Figure 8, is the one that's identified as the D Alternative. It would follow the Southwest Powerlink west out of Imperial Valley to a point that is just east of Otay Mountain. And then it goes north through the Cleveland National Forest and on and off forest land. The forest land is green. The white is private land. D goes to the Boulder Creek Area, if you know the area, and then would rejoin the proposed route in the area of Santa Ysabel. So that's an alternative that's on the table and, again, one that we will be looking at.

The other types of alternatives we will consider are, for example, generation here in the basin, either renewable or using gas fire generation. We know that the South Bay Power Plant repower application is in now with the Energy Commission, so that's clearly an alternative that needs to be looked at. We'll look at non wires alternatives as in demand reduction.

As I mentioned, we will reconsider the alternatives that SDG&E looked at and the ones that they decided to eliminate. So we're wide open at this point. We've made no decisions and we're really looking forward to input from all of you on those topics.

Just briefly, so you know what the process is, at the very end after the EIR/EIS is finished, the CPUC and BLM have very different steps to wrap up their processes. The CPUC, which is a five-member board appointed by the Governor will vote on the project. They will reference the EIR. They have to make a decision that the EIR is adequate, called certifying the EIR. And if the project is approved or an alternative is approved, they will require mitigation monitoring and the adoption of mitigation measures.

BLM's process is very different. They have a 30-day comment period following the release of the Final EIR/EIS. They have a 60-day Governor's Consistency Review. Then they prepare their document called a Record of Decision in the El Centro field office.

I hand this back to Lewis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for your kind attention to that. Hopefully that's given you, if you were not already aware, a good orientation of what this process is about, where we're headed, and what's going to be involved.

The one piece that you're going to have to stay tuned for obviously is the precise schedule for some of the future dates. Billie Blanchard mentioned that if you're on the NEPA/CEQA mailing list, you will receive notice of that. Basically if you signed in today or filled out one of these cards, you're on the NEPA/CEQA mailing list. It's not a special list. You've satisfied that by signing in today, so you would get that notification.

I have a number of cards that have already been turned in to me. What we've been doing at all the other meetings, it's worked really well, we have a three-minute time limit for you, but because we haven't had an inundation of speakers, what we've been able to do is go back after everyone has had their first chance for people who want to make additional comments. We have what I call second helpings. So there will be that opportunity to do that. But that way we can give everyone their first chance equally in the order in which they signed in to speak. I know that at least one person had a time that they needed to leave by, so it will help us to get to that person by the time they need to leave.

I have a very sophisticated way of indicating the three-minute time limit. When you have one minute left, I'll put up my index finger like this, so occasionally you might want to look at me. And then when your three minutes are up, I'll put up my closed hand like that. That means it's time to wrap up your comment.

Again, what you may not have seen or noticed, there is a woman seated to my right. She is a court reporter and she is making a verbatim transcript of everything that's said into a microphone. And we're about to move one out there actually, if you could help me do that, for those of you to come up and speak. So I just need you to not talk way too fast. She's really fast, but she can't keep up if you really get going on a roll, so I may ask you to slow down if that's an issue. Usually it happens when somebody is reading from a prepared remark without taking a breath. So if you will work with me on that again, I will appreciate it, again because you will have the second helping. Everyone has been able to finish in that second helping if they didn't in the first.

Let's just put it right there close to Mr. Bell. And with that, I just want to again remind people that this is one way of getting your comments into the record. Written comments are given the same weight and consideration, so if you have a really detailed comment, that's usually the best way to do that in addition.

So I'm going to call the first several names. We're a little tight in the seating here, so that way it will give you a chance to start working your way forward so I don't catch you off guard, the first several speakers that I have listed in order are Marty Allenby, Pam Albers, Karen Norene Mills, John Peterson and Brian Jennings.

Marty Allenby, if you would come up, all we need is your name and we can go from there.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

MS. ALLENBY: I am Marty Allenby.

MR. MICHAELSON: Adjust the mike.

MS. ALLENBY: And I'm one of those millions of Americans who fears public speaking.

I do need to comment, Susan, that it's not an national park, Anza-Borrego is a state park.

MS. LEE: I'm sorry if I said that.

MS. ALLENBY: My name is Marty Allenby and I'm a trustee on the Anza-Borrego Foundation and Institute. And I serve as treasurer of the organization.

I am opposed to the route proposed by San Diego Gas & Electric through Anza-Borrego State Park, the largest state park in the United States, encompassing about 90 percent of California's state wilderness system, for the following reasons: The proposal would encroach and intrude on designated wilderness areas, which has never been allowed. San Diego Gas & Electric's plan does not outline the impact on habitat or wildlife, in fact, it seems to dismiss some species with an inadequate analysis and lack of mitigation proposals.

The increased height and extended footprint of the new poles would invade wilderness and sorely intrude on the natural beauty and view sheds of the park's approximately 90,000 acres, as well as pollute with the buzz of transmissions.

San Diego Gas & Electric concedes significant impact on known and unknown cultural, archeological, paleontological, and other resources. There is no study that can give evidentiary support to the extent of damage to these assets.

Further, and perhaps most damning, San Diego Gas & Electric failed to adequately pursue and thoroughly document alternative routes, other than through Anza-Borrego State Park. The offer seems to take the least expensive route for San Diego Gas & Electric, though the most expensive for the park and for the future of state parks and designated wilderness.

To quote Ruth Coleman, Director of California State Parks and Recreation, in her statement for the prehearing conference before the California Public Utility Commission, "Our purpose is to conserve and manage the resources on the lands we oversee, not accommodate development projects that do not benefit state parks and its mission."

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Pam Albers.

MS. ALBERS: Good afternoon. My name is Pam Albers. I live at 4547 Shirley Ann Place in San Diego. I'm here today to express my opposition to routing Sunrise Powerlink through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. Sacrificing our natural resources for the sake of corporate profits does not constitute progress. Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is one of the crown jewels of our state park system and we are fortunate to have it in San Diego County.

My husband and I have been camping and exploring in Anza-Borrego for almost 25 years. The park's beauty and unspoiled vistas hold great personal means for us, as they do for a myriad of our friends and acquaintances who also enjoy the park on a regular basis.

Most importantly, as a society it is vital to our physical and spiritual health to have plains of natural beauty that are protected against man's need to develop. It is the responsibility of major corporations, such as SDG&E, to be good neighbors and consider the value of preserving our environment. It is unconscionable that routing power lines through the protected wilderness area, Anza-Borrego State Park, could even be proposed, let alone seriously considered. This construction is an unfortunate and tragic presence for the future of not only Anza-Borrego, but for other states and national parks.

Pursuing other routing options for powerlinks such as a parallel line along the existing route that runs up from Ocotillo and through Jacumba will preserve the beauty and uniqueness of Anza-Borrego. SDG&E can and should be good stewards of our public spaces and a model for other corporations.

In closing, I would like to quote Ralph Waldo Emerson from his essay entitled "Nature." "Man's intercourse with heaven and earth, becomes part of his daily food. In the presence of nature, a wild delight runs through the man, in spite of real sorrows. Nature says, he is my creature, and meagre all of his impertinent griefs, he shall be glad with me."

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you guys.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Karen Norene Mills.

MS. MILLS: Hi, I'm Karen Mills here today on behalf of California Farm Bureau Federation. We represent farmers and ranchers in California throughout the state. More specifically, of course, this will impact land owners in Imperial and San Diego Counties. I feel like a bit of a party crasher because I'm not here specifically to address Anza-Borrego State Park. But I have a couple of specific things to call out about the PEA, and it certainly is an amazing document, it's very extensive, but even with my limited time to review the document, I wanted to highlight some of the things that I'm heartened to hear that you will be taking a look at as you review it for furthered documentation, because some of it invites further analysis. For example, in the Central Link area, the tables that are used to compare the impacts of the proposed project with alternate projects, some cases look like they're comparing apples and oranges, so it would certainly be helpful to the public and those that are trying to analyze the impacts of this project to truly understand how those things compare in land use and acres impacted.

And, also, it's sort of a nitpicking thing, if you will, in certain segments in that link, and perhaps other links as well, you categorize the land use impacts by types of land uses. And one of the categories used is vacant land and it doesn't appear that, in fact, it's really vacant, because my memories tell me in many aspects many areas are grazing land. It should properly be categorized as agricultural land. I'm not quite sure what vacant land in California means anymore. But, finally, a couple of more things. The impacts of the line will —

MR. MICHAELSON: Can you speak a little bit more into the microphone.

MS. MILLS: I'm sorry. The impact of the line both have permanent and, of course, construction impacts during the course of preparing the line. The agricultural operations, the land disturbed during construction may take years to recover. Thank you. And, of course, with the line's permanent places, you know, those changes are irretrievable.

Finally, the recent submission by SDG&E about the alternative that they've been requested to assess by Commissioner Grueneich reminds us that it's state policy to use existing easements that are feasible for obvious reasons. Impacts can be far less significant because the use is already in place, but we are also concerned about the fact that SDG&E's reluctant to consider existing easements, for example, on forest service land, because it might take longer to get through the review process. This is a long-lasting project that will be around for decades and we certainly don't want there to be short-sided planning for a long-term project.

MR. MICHAELSON: That's it. You can come back.

MS. MILLS: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Perfect timing. Thank you.

It's really as important that as much as possible that you try to speak directly into the mike so that everyone can hear you and so that the court reporter can hear you.

MR. PETERSON: I'm John Peterson. I'm also a trustee of the Anza-Borrego Foundation Institute. I commend Commissioner Grueneich for requesting the additional analysis in regard to the alternative routes for the power line. The project that is proposed originally had all power lines, all alternatives, going through the park, the Anza-Borrego State Park. CEQA certainly does require a range of alternatives capable of avoiding and substantially lessening all significant impacts of the project even if those alternatives may impede to some degree the —

MR. MICHAELSON: You need to slow down.

MR. PETERSON: — obtainment of project objectives were maybe more costly. I don't believe the project as originally proposed complied with that direction, and certainly, the direction as provided by the commissioner was very good to explore the range of alternatives.

Now, we do have a brief that was filed by SDG&E that you have, the October 2nd of 2006 brief. It did talk about the additional routes. And the main question in my mind is, well, does that then meet with the direction as provided by the Commissioner and also CEQA and NEPA. I don't think it does because of some facts. The original project approved all or placed all the routes through the middle of the park. Now the response places all the alternatives through one site, that being Santa Ysabel. That does not fully examine the full range of alternatives. What about the sudden route into the Miguel Substation? Also, therefore, the routes proposed within that brief, B, C and D, go to the heart of the national forest and other park lands within the central part of San Diego County. They appear to take the longest and most environmentally impacted routes possible.

Page 8 of that brief also concludes that alternative routes are bad because they have impact to sensitive plants and animals species. Well, dah, any of the particular routes in San Diego County is going to have those impacts.

The reports appear to you to be obvious as evidence against those routes. Also, the table within the report appears not to be objective or truthful. As, an example, on Page 11, it states that the proposed route through Anza-Borrego State Park would have no impact to regional or designated open space, while impacts to the state park would be mitigated. Not according to the state, wherever possible it probably would have significant unmitigable impacts.

In summary, CEQA requires an open process with an objective, unbiased analysis to provide information within the brief. I don't think — it does not do that and does not comply with the direction provided by the Commissioner.

MR. MICHAELSON: Let me read ahead again the next several speakers. After Brian Jennings will be Sara Feldman, followed by Nick Ervin, Chris Peregrin and Bob Barelmann.

MR. JENNINGS: My name is Brian Jennings. I'm not affiliated with any group. I read in the newspaper that this was about Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and so that's why I'm here. I don't have any alternatives, although it does seem to me like solar is really kind of exploding these days with new technology and rooftop solar. I've got several houses around me that — I would really love to have the solar rays that they have so that my energy could go back to San Diego Gas & Electric instead of the other way around.

First thing I would like to do is just express my disgust with the fact that anybody would propose a project like this through a state park like Anza-Borrego State Park. The fact that there are a few crooked

wooden poles there today, that fails in comparison to what is being proposed. My — I'm really committed to this park. An indication of that is the fact that my eight-year-old son is in a play right now and it's only the second time that I've ever missed one of his plays. I represent myself and my children and many of my friends that couldn't be here today. You know, this doesn't just affect people in Borrego Springs, there are hundreds and thousands of us here in the city as well. If you talk to people you meet out there on the trails, other cities, other states, other countries for that matter, that will be affected by this.

While I can't address any specific physical impacts there might be, I'm really just here to defend my favorite place on the planet. My parents have been taking me out there since before I could walk and I started taking my two sons out there since before they could walk. And I really wanted to take my grandchildren out there and let them see the same unspoiled beauty that I've enjoyed with my children. We go out there probably more than 10 times a year, several times, three generations, my parents and my children.

My concern is the reason that I go there, one of main reasons is for the vast views of just miles and miles and miles. And I talk to people from Europe and that's one of things that they're impressed with. My favor site overlooks where this powerlink will be and it will pretty much ruin what I go there for. I'm not going to tell you where that site is, I'm sorry. And there are many other of my favorite sites that are virtually under the route and there are many Native Americans sites with them.

I just would like to say we established these parks to give us a place to go to get away from development. And I just hope that we can maintain this park as such a place so future generations can enjoy it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Sara Feldman.

MS. FELDMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Sara Feldman and I'm the Southern California Director for the California State Parks Foundation. We're an active party in the CPUC proceeding. And I'm going to reserve specific comments for written materials later as we complete this scoping process, but I just wanted to make a few comments on behalf of our 75,000 members throughout California, that we oppose the routing of this line through the park.

I think that the speaker who immediately proceeded me, as well as practically everybody else who has spoken thus far today, has already expressed very eloquently and I'm sure many more will as the day goes on what their concerns are. And I think what it really boils down to is that our state parks are held in sacred trust, in sacred trust for our children and our grandchildren and all the generations to come. And to allow development through state parks such as this project is not tolerable, not permissible for the citizens of the State of California.

And there are viable alternatives. We'll be commenting in a much more specific way on those in the future as well as the impacts, but I just wanted to go on record about what the Foundation's position is on this. Our main concern is, in fact, the park. But inasmuch as alternatives will go through other wilderness areas and affect other private residences, we think that there are adequate mitigation measures. And we really want to see alternatives fully explored in an unbiased, fair and open way. So that's the Foundation's position and we will elaborate on that more in written materials.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Nick Ervin.

MR. ERVIN: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Nick Ervin. I'm the volunteer president of the Desert Protective Council, which for about 50 years or so has been an advocate for desert conservation and education.

Our primary focus is more recently, in recent years, eastern San Diego and Imperial County desert areas. For about 30 years myself I've been exploring, studying and advocating for California desert landscapes. I spent about six years in the BLM's California Desert District Advisory Council. It seems like a previous lifetime now. I've walked or driven most of this proposed route, not just through Anza-Borrego Park, but through the lesser known portions of western Imperial County which affects at least two federally designated wilderness areas, which were created under the California Desert Protection Act of 1994.

I think it's fair to say Desert Protective Council has grave concerns about this project as currently constructed. For me I have to say that this poses one of the biggest threats to the integrity to the desert landscapes in the 30 years that I've been involved. At a bare minimum we want to see that the environmental review of this project encompasses at least the following, which would be, No. 1, the impact on scenic view sheds. I mean, state park is the highest designation possible to protect things like scenic views, as well as the fact that it will affect views from at least, again, two federally designated wilderness areas. The noise impact on park visitors and wildlife, the noise study that's done so far is clearly inadequate. The impact on camping areas in the park, the fact that this park unlike most has open camping, so these enormous towers with the electric fields cracking and humming all day have an enormous impact on camping. The impacts on endangered species particularly the California Desert Big Horn. The park is privileged to be a critical habitat area for this endangered species and I'm lucky enough to have seen some of these over the years. They are extraordinarily rare and majestic.

We're also concerned by the impact potentially on scientific research within the park boundaries particularly by Anza-Borrego Institute and others. The degradation is bound to sort of impact the undeveloped areas that are necessary for legitimate scientific research. And ultimately also we're concerned with the economic impact on communities like Borrego Springs and maybe the income on the state park itself, because it depends on tourism for most of its income. And the inevitable degradation that would go with this project is almost incalculable at this point.

Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Next speaker is Chris Peregrin.

MR. PEREGRIN: My name is Chris Peregrin.

MR. MICHAELSON: You're going to have to speak into the mike.

MR. PEREGRIN: My name is Chris Peregrin. I'm here to comment on the Sunrise Powerlink as defined in the Notice of Preparation. And, specifically, my concern is with the regions that go through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and other public lands. I've lived in San Diego for about seven years. I have a degree, a bachelor's of science, in Wildlife, Fish and Conservation Biology from UC Davis. And I've worked professionally as an ecologist for 10 years.

I think this project will be a disaster for the ecology of the region. That we will incur significant, negative ecological effects from this project is a given. We can throw mitigations at it, but mitigations rarely make up for the loss. This project will have a huge and ongoing ecological cost, that's a given. Please consider that.

I'd like you to consider something else. We have a unique opportunity in this process. We need to use this opportunity to distinguish San Diego as a conservation forerunner. We've done the boomtown, now we need to make sure that we savior the resources that make this place so special. San Diego can be a truly great center for ecotourism in America. It has all the elements, but we need to make a commitment

to those elements. Creating a swath through pristine landscapes and habitats is not taking advantage of our opportunity. It's destroying the long-term sustainability of this region. Please do not support this project. There are better options. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Read ahead, after Bob Barelmann, we have Janis Shackelford, Jim Bell, Donna Tisdale and Jill Hoffman.

MR. BARELMANN: Hello, my name is Bob Barelmann. This past summer we went camping and traveling throughout the Cascades, Sierra Nevada and Rocky Mountains. Nearly half of those evenings were spent in the state parks, national parks, and national forest. All of us are so fortunate that our forefather's had the vision to set aside for future generations to breathe the desert and mountain air in a natural environment. These parks and campsites, hiking and biking trails, belong to all citizens of this wonderful country. And each and everyone of us on both sides of the table have a responsibility to our children and grandchildren to enhance, maintain, preserve the parks and national forest.

It is our opinion that the alternative showing the Sunrise Powerlink crossing the Anza-Borrego State Park wilderness areas should be illegal and unacceptable. Those lands were set aside for the wildlife and the use and benefit for people to enjoy nature forever. All of us in this country share those benefits. We should be responsible for protecting it.

Sort of comparing it to a baseball game, you have to hit the ball inbounds to score a run. It is our opinion that SDG&E already has struckout. Crossing the wilderness areas of state parks and national forests are foul balls and out of play. SDG&E has been hitting foul balls for all of its alternatives.

I have spoken at length with the right-of-way department at SDG&E. They are buying land and surveying as if the game is already over and already won. The umpires, that's the CPUC, as I see it, and the judges, are letting the game get out of hand. In my opinion the solution is simple. It is time for CPUC and the judge to dictate that the only project that gets on base is one that does not cross Anza-Borrego State Park, the Cleveland National Forest, designated open space, or other public areas for enjoyment and the use of our children. If SDG&E can find no other options, then the game is over, no project, and SDG&E would have to prepare for the next game.

Frankly, is there anyone who would be proud to show their grandchildren the location of those city-size transmission lines running in those wilderness areas? Would you take a hike with your grandchildren to admire those city-size steel structures in that project?

I need to shorten this, I think. Okay, in our case there is also human drama, too. My wife and I purchased acreage in Ranchita 20 years ago. The land offers exclusion and privacy and dramatic views of the surrounding valleys. In addition, it is surrounded on three sides by the Anza-Borrego State Park. It's our feeling that the park would protect those three boundaries better than any other neighbors and any other location. And to this date the Anza-Borrego State Park has protected those areas and continues to be a good neighbor.

My wife and I want to go on record in extreme opposition to this project due to the impacts of the Anza-Borrego State Park wild wilderness areas. Is the CPUC willing to bankrupt our protected wilderness to the benefits of profits for SDG&E and Sempra Energy? Where is the corporate conscience? No project is an option and a valuable lesson.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, sir.

MS. SHACKELFORD: Janis Shackelford. First I do not support the current route of the Sunrise Powerlink, but I'm speaking here today on alternatives. The Alternative D that was published in this

morning's paper is not an alternative. It takes the power line through the worst of our fire-prone back country. San Diego generally burns every 30 years, our county, in the back country. And even the route of the current Sunrise Powerlink is not assured in a fire event.

I question the validity of the Sunrise Powerlink in general. Initially they're proposing that this powerlink will bring alternative energy sources from Imperial Valley; however, those alternative sources are not even submitted to the CPUC yet. The geothermal plant was already planned to be accessed — transmission was already planned to be accessed by IID through their agreement, I believe it's called. So I would like to see an alternative where SDG&E is in partners with IID to find a way to transmit the power from the new sources through the IID system and then down to San Diego County from the north.

Regarding the alternatives listed on Page 12 of the NOP, left-hand column, Bullets 2 and 3. I would like to see SDG&E be required to evaluate improvements to the existing power plants in our county and not write that off as not reasonable. I would like to see expansion of rooftop solar in conjunction with the state program. My husband and I do have a solar system. We sell our excess power, or give, excuse me, our excess power to SDG&E for free. We would love to expand the system, but we would also need some financial incentive to do so, if SDG&E would pay us for our excess power. So I would like to see rooftop solar expanded.

Also on Page 12, the last bullet in the right-hand column, the LEAPS project is proposed, it is under review, yet SDG&E is writing it off as not to be evaluated as an alternative route for a 500 kV line. At the same time they're using the speculative project in Imperial Valley to justify the Sunrise Powerlink. So I would like those alternatives considered. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: I'm Jim Bell. This is about alternatives, and I think the only alternative should be not to build the powerlink no matter where it's routed. And why do I say this, because investing actually less money and efficiency improvements and renewable energy development could make this actually completely electricity metered out. And this would cost a lot less money than building a powerlink which will produce no power at all.

Also, with regard to the solar that SDG&E is always talking about, the further east the solar is set, the less it helps us meet our peak demand, because the sun is further east the sooner the sun sets. So I think this whole thing is just a smoke screen.

Okay. Then, okay, how does this work? Okay, first of all, if you're going to do this, you want to tie solar with efficiency. Efficiency pays back quickly, so initially you invest almost all your money into efficiency. That gets you out of debt. Then you shift the income from that efficiency to renewable energy development. And through that process it will cost much less than a powerlink.

Then there is — and this is how it works for the consumer. Let's say you have a house or business, a crew would come out and they would retrofit your house or business. And if you had a good roof, they would put solar on, but there would be some solar to represent your need either on a parking lot down the street or on somebody else's rooftop in any case. Your bill if it was \$100 a month before, would go down to \$90 a month, but after the retrofit you're probably only going to be using \$50 a month worth of electricity. So what you're actually doing is you're using less power, but you're paying for power you're not actually using, but you don't care because you're getting a ten percent positive cash flow. That \$40 is used to not only eventually pay off your installation and efficiency improvement, but it also rolls over to help everybody else become renewable energy self-sufficient as well.

Finally, there's the issue of trust. According to energy business, Sempra and Company are on the hook for 586 million dollars in fines and a reported 1.9 billion dollars in total costs because they've been stealing from rent payers. They don't admit guilt, but it appears that Sempra and SDG&E has decided that it is more profitable to steal from us whenever they think they can get away with it and pay the fines when they get caught and to charge us a fair cost. The strategy seems to be working even with fines and other costs, Sempra's profits in 2005 were a reported \$895 million dollars. Now Sempra, SDG&E comes to us to build a powerlink proposal and tell us we need it and it would be good for us. Given their past performance, why should we trust them about anything.

Then, finally, I brought copies of this book, if anybody wants one, and basically Pages 9 through 18 lay out the whole plan to make our county completely renewable energy self-sufficient. And I also have an opinion piece that basically shows that even if none of these environmental issues were involved and could all be solved, that the SDG&E plan still does not make economic sense.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, Jim.

MR. BELL: Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Donna.

MS. TISDALE: I'm Donna Tisdale. I chair the Boulevard Sponsor Group, but I am speaking today as an individual. People in our area of the back country just found out that the alternative routes that were previously eliminated are back.

MR. MICHAELSON: It's difficult to hear you. Could you just get a little closer to the mike.

MS. TISDALE: This issue is on our agenda tonight for our Boulevard Planning Group. And I have done my homework. I've been to the meetings. I've been getting information. I've met with SDG&E and I've met with the opponents. I've been to hearings. I'm also a 30-year resident of Boulevard, which is targeted for wind energy, 500 kV lines, 230 kV lines. I'm also a native of Imperial Valley where numerous blighting energy projects are proposed in sensitive areas but few have been approved. I vigorously question and dispute the stated need for this invasive obnoxious project at all.

When people blithely express support for Sunrise and its alleged sources of renewable energy, and I wonder if they really know the tens of thousands of acres of our treasured public open spaces and scenic vistas will be sacrificed with thousands of towering windmills, over 30,000 massive solar generators, and over 100 plus miles of huge transmission lines. Are they aware that it could all be a ruse for future, undisclosed, transmission of Mexican or other sources of power to serve the L.A. basin ultimately.

In talking to my farming family in Imperial Valley, it is clear that their community has not been fully informed of the planned sacrifice of their low-income rural neighborhoods to benefit the more affluent and politically influential coastal urban areas. How can this be right?

Also, maybe we're not fond of off-roaders, but I wonder if they are aware of the potential impacts on their activities. I was informed that over 5,000 acres near Ocotillo and Plaster City HOV areas is the new potential site for a massive solar field. How will Santa Ana forced sandstorms, which can strip the paint off cars and pit your windshields, impact those solar generators?

Regarding the alternate routes, the reasons stated in SDG&E's NOP and PEA for eliminating the routes B, C and D are all valid. And I will wait for my second round to finish.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Bill Hoffman is our next speaker. He will be followed by Marsha Johnston, Kelly Fuller, John Raifsaider, and Joshua Feathers if that person has arrived. And then, yes, thank you.

MR. HOFFMAN: Hello, I'm Bill Hoffman. I'm a lifetime resident of San Diego County. I've been going to the park for about 50 years camping there and spent a lot of time in the Cleveland National Forest as well. I have a strong concern for the environment. And I also own an in holding in the desert about 100 feet away from the power line that is going to be taking place in between the Narrows and Ocotillo Wells, so that's where I come from.

I'm feeling like we've gotten on a train that's going in the wrong direction here. And the only question is how quickly can we get off and on to the right direction? And there's a couple of things I want to talk about. One is an assumption on the demand. The other is alternatives. And then the players in the process, because if we are going to go through this, I think we all need to understand some of those things.

On the assumptions of the demands, some of the other speakers have talked about the alternatives, and I think that's being downplayed a little bit. I think there needs to be more focus on do we really need this line at all? For example, there's a number of little substations that can be put in. I know in Escondido there's a place up there I don't think they're using all their power. I think those issues should be examined as well as reducing the demand, which is, I think, key to everything.

The next thing was the alternatives, because I think the perspective, again back to that analogy of getting on the wrong train, the perspective ought to be let's assume, because the overwhelming opposition I think is that we're not going to build this line through Anza-Borrego State Park. So let's put the focus on the alternatives and not the strongman alternative that San Diego Gas & Electric came up with that moves the line up through the Cleveland National Forest past Green Valley Falls and Paso Pacacho. I mean, that's just — that's something that's just, look, here's something even worse, so therefore, you out to go with our bad idea.

The other is I think we need to look at from — if we are going to go down this process, I think — I know I would like, and I think others would like, an understanding of all the players throughout the process. I know you put it on some of the slides, but email addresses, because if we're going to be an effective part of this process, we need to be able to contact the right people at the right time. So if it's possible somehow to put it on your website or something, the players and the process and the time limit, I think that would be helpful.

And then the last is the critical issue. What is it going to take as we're going along, and I know, Bill, you were talking about the various steps, what is it going to take from what agency and do they all have sign-off approval or veto power to get this thing derailed away from the park? And I think that's a critical issue, because everybody that is opposed to it needs to focus on those issues.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Marsha Johnston.

MS. JOHNSTON: Hi, Marsha Johnston. I'm a writer and researcher. And, first of all, I was going to be — this being an environmental impact assessment meeting, because my argument's primarily economic at the moment. And what I would like to say, and a lot of other people have already touched on it, and in addition to the environmental impact, which I believe would be a terrible thing, but basically this project from some of the research I've been doing lately on co-generation and local on-site

generation, that is to say, distributed energy generation, is that the weakest link in the project is that it has so much remote transmission. I was going to give you some figures from some of the research, is that power plant utilities like SDG&E probably would tell you that central power generation is the most cost effective, okay, that there's cost savings. Well, yes, that's true if they count only the cost of generating. And according to the World Energy Outlook from the International Energy Agency, that's generation. In 2000 two dollars was 890 per kilowatt of capacity, which is 25 percent less than distributed generation, let's say, on site. But when you add the cost of transmission and distribution, which is the weak link and which causes all the brownouts and everything and the biggest problems around the world, not just in the United States, it shoots to \$1380 per kilowatt. So it adds an enormous cost to generation, the transmission. And so that's why putting this so remote from San Diego, what they're doing is they're jacking up the cost. And, in fact, a study by the Regulatory Assistance Project shows they studied 124 U.S. utilities from 1995 to '99, and they found that the cost for those utilities of setting up new distribution was \$50 billion dollars a year per all of them, it's like six billion per. And so what you got is that those — that investment that they have to have they say raises rates by six billion dollars a year. So essentially — and other people have touched on the idea that there are alternatives that are cheaper. And one of them is in this paper I'm going to leave for you. It talks a lot about recycled energy, which can be from industrial processes and also from electrical generation that already exist. It can be recuperated and the payoff is enormous, so I'll leave this for you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Kelly Fuller.

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller, San Diego Imperial County Sierra Club. And I've got a copy for you.

Thank you for this opportunity to inform you more about our concerns and our suggestions about the Sunrise Powerlink. Today's comments focus on the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park section. We will be providing yet more additional comments at a later date.

In regard to the alternative routes around the park that SDG&E presented earlier this week, the San Diego Sierra Club has not had sufficient time yet to examine them and consider whether they would present greater or fewer environmental impacts in the current proposed routes through Anza-Borrego. We would like an opportunity to explore the impacts of these potential new alternative routes in greater detail; however, we do not believe we can complete this exploration by the current end of scoping on October 20th, much less present coherent scoping comments on these new alternatives by that date.

Like many of the other groups who are concerned about this project, we are a grass-roots volunteer organization, not a powerful corporation with vast financial resources. It is very difficult for us to evaluate entirely new routes in less than three weeks, especially because these new routes were added while we were still compiling our comments on SDG&E's previously proposed routes.

We believe that others will also need additional time past October 20th. For example, it is our understanding that land owners in the potentially affected areas have not yet been notified that their properties could be impacted.

We also would like to note that no preliminary environmental analysis, much less a full EIR/EIS, has been completed for these new potential routes, yet SDG&E asserts that their previously proposed project through Anza-Borrego has significantly fewer environmental impacts than the new alternatives. Full surveys of biological, cultural, and other resources have not yet been conducted for the new routes. Thus, it is premature to draw any conclusion about the comparative merits of the new alternative and the proposed project.

I think with your permission, I'm about to hit another major section, I'll come back if there's time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. John Raifsaider.

MR. RAIFSAIDER: Hello. Yes, John Raifsaider. I recently moved from the City of San Diego to Julian about a year now. And I've become associated with a group called People's Powerlink up in that area. Can you hear me? Great.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. RAIFSAIDER: I on behalf of being aware of environmental truth, since I also have been working on behalf of Global Peace, and I want to link this issue to that, because I think the project proposed by the big corporation is an act of violence, doing violence to nature, disrupting the order of beauty that exist in nature, not just for us, but for itself. It's doing violence to humanity by the way it tramples upon the people's will and solicits a violent reaction from the people as you hear.

The world is changing and it's changing with a new awareness that the people, humanity understand that the big corporations haven't quite gotten yet, they have to catch up with us. So there's a wisdom in the human voice here and I want to speak on behalf of that, because this violence that's being done to both nature and human nature, I think many are waking up to the fact that it must end. This idea of perpetual war which is being promoted by the people, the top growing strings, I think it's due to end and we're here to end it. And I think that the irony of — the argument of transmission lines to bring solar power across a great distance to the desert is rather like we were — if you live next to a river, pristine river and someone said, well, I'm going to sell you water from hundreds and hundreds of miles away because you need this water, that's as if you're ignoring the river. The river is the sun which shines every where. Everyone has access.

And so everyone has access. And to the new vision I think that to support a project like Jim Bell's, which is solar rooftop to bring — let the sun come to where we are and let that be our source and let us go wireless.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is Joseph Feathers here? All right. Then is there anyone else who has not turned in a speaker card? Why don't you come forward, please. Good to see you again.

MR. TRAFECANTY: I don't understand it —

MR. MICHAELSON: Just give us your name.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Name is Dennis Trafecanty. I don't get it. It was an application that was 2,000 pages long by a multi-national corporation who when they talk about Anza-Borrego Desert they said regarding the view shed, "no significant impact." When they talk about my Santa Ysabel Valley — I don't know if you've ever been to Santa Ysabel, but if you go out of Ramona and you go east, you finally come to the last hill and you look down and there's that cute little town and on the left is where I live. And they said, "no significant impact," but that's where the power line, those towers are going to go through. So I'm not sure I understand what's going on here.

I thought, you know, state parks were land banks for future development. The note — you know, we're talking a lot about the desert, but what about all that land around the Anza-Borrego Park. It's so beautiful. It's — there's no growth. That's the way the county designed it for no growth. All those farmers and ranchers that have those cows that are munching the grass out there, they signed a statement that they wouldn't grow — they wouldn't develop their property for 10 years under the Williamson Act. That's a state mandated property tax relief act. They don't want to grow it. They don't want to develop it.

I'm also a co-owner of a business in Poway with about 20 employees. I'm not worried about a shortage of power in 2010, but I am worried. What I'm worried about is the so-called energy crisis of 2000 and 2001 where, as some of you gentlemen and ladies said, SDG&E manipulated the price of natural gas. They also misrepresented the quantities. You know, it's like the old Enron days, remember when the guy was quoted on a voice mail when he was talking about California rate payers, said "Burn baby burn." Remember that, don't forget it.

Let me tell you how this works, SDG&E doesn't make money if the Carlsbad Encina plant gets developed with new technology or the Chula Vista Plant or the South Bay gets developed. They don't get any money on that because those are other owners. The way they make money if there's a two-and-a-half-billion-dollar project, which this is an excess 1.3 billion for just straight costs, that project — contractors usually get 10 to 12 percent. That's two and a half billion, that's 250 million, 10 percent. I've been a financial officer for 25 years, 10 percent of what investors earn from those numbers that they're earning go to management in the form of stock options and bonuses. That's 25, 30, 40 million dollars that you're going to line the pockets of people that run this company. That's what's going on.

Okay, there's strength in numbers. Peoplespowerlink.org is something that a lot of you ought to look into that website. As the sign says in Santa Ysabel, the sign that was just put up, one of them says "Aren't parks forever," and the other sign says, "A blue sky or cold steel." Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: If you fill out a card and you want to add your name to the list, just come on up to the mike. Thank you.

MR. MacROBBIE: My name is Bruce MacRobbie. I live in Descanso. I suddenly got a fright attack, I'm sorry.

First of all, I question whether or not this powerlink needs to be installed at all. And the more I've heard here today, the greater my doubts. I came here because I read in the paper that this power line was going to go through one of my favorite places in Anza-Borrego — excuse me, damn — Grapevine Canyon. Anza-Borrego Desert State Park has a flaw in that it has the word desert in its name. And a lot of people they speak of desert, they think of the road from Yuma east, you know, out to Texas someplace and it's just desert, it's not attractive. But Anza-Borrego is more than that. Grapevine Canyon is more than that. You talk about a spiritual place, I just drove down through there to take some pictures. I don't know if you guys have a format that I can —

MR. MICHAELSON: Well, that's okay.

MR. MacROBBIE: I took most of them, including the existing power line that goes down through there and it's almost — it's almost easy to look past even in the photographs. Whereas, you know, your guys slides here show this monster, this thing that looks like it could walk around at night. And I read that SDG&E said it won't be so bad because for every pole that goes through Grapevine Canyon now, there will only be — well, for every two that's in the canyon now, there will only be one of those things. I can't imagine. I tried to imagine it in these pictures.

And then here today my other favorite place is violated. As you leave Julian and you come around past the Firemen's Memorial Point and you look out over Santa Ysabel Valley. You see, the seasons change there, spring, summer, winter. You don't see that here in the city so much, but up there it's magnificent. And to think that monster, a whole row of those monsters down through that valley, it's more than I can take.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. After the meeting stops, we'll get those photos from you.

MR. MacROBBIE: Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: I thought I saw a hand of someone else.

MR. HUGHES: Good afternoon. My name is Gary Hughes. I'm a private citizen. And I understand that one of the main reasons for construction of the powerlink is to have green sources of power generation. I also understand that SDG&E does not have any guarantees that especially geothermal energy will ever be available from the Imperial Valley. That said, if or when SDG&E goes to Arizona or Mexico for power, would other sources be guaranteed green by SDG&E? If not, why spend the 1.3 billion dollars on dirty power? When upgrades and modern expansion to current generating facilities in San Diego can be utilized.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who hasn't spoken who would like to for the first time? We have a number of people who have been coming to more than one meeting. I feel like we're becoming friends.

MR. RAFFETTO: Thank you very much for the opportunity. I appreciate it. I wasn't going to, but my name is Joe Raffetto. I'm a licensed concessioner in Anza-Borrego State Park. We take people out in the desert on excursions and try to get them away from this area.

I spoke enough yesterday I thought, but until today I've always thought that the answer is to reroute the line, just keep it out of the sensitive areas, but as I look at all these map, even up the I-8 corridor, I'm thinking like the transmission line itself, the whole project and the bogus reasons that we're being told it's being made. It's just not — it's tearing the heart out of this county. And whether it's people that are having their ranches infringed upon or their view sheds when they take their families to Anza-Borrego or just riding the highway and being subjected to all of that. It's something that's uniquely archaic and they may have gotten away with it 50 years ago, but everything is set in those maps. There's boundaries that aren't supposed to be crossed and something like a transmission line is ridiculous. And someone earlier mentioned a train going the other way and other people have mentioned, like Jim Bell, rooftop solar. I hope that this is an impudence to get us to do things, because it's always occurred to me when I was a kid, and probably you guys too, do you remember watching 2001 Space Odyssey. I mean that was like 1968. And I remember thinking like, wow, I'm going to be in my forties then and I'm going to be able to see that future and that's going to be amazing. And then I realized that something happened in the 20th century. Like if you took somebody from 1900 and brought them to 1950, it would blow their mind. They would see aviation and elementary rocketry and skyscrapers and super highways, horseless carriages, it's amazing. And then take somebody from 1950 and bring them even to today, they would be like scratching their heads going, hey, what the heck, this is all you guys have? Well, we've got the internet. I mean, it's really ridiculous. And why is that? I always thought it's because of the 800-pound guerillas like Sempra that are basically — this plays right into their hands. They want commodities. They want something that they can control. Rooftop solar, especially if you cut yourself off the grid, is just something horrifying to them.

And I just hope that this will be impudence to get people to do — at least have rooftop solar and other sources that are real, not out in the middle of the desert, like someone said drawing water in a pristine stream. I really hope that all the forces that would be would put a stop to this so all of us, all the people in this county don't have to suffer because we're all in this together.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else who would like to speak? Sure come forward, please.

MR. PATCHE: I'm Marvin Patche. I live about a block and a half from Anza-Borrego State Park. And I've asked in several meetings I attended what about the existing power line that you have for years? Why don't you just put a larger format and not disturb everybody with the plans there are now. And they say, well, it's dangerous for having a fire. Well, much of that link is in the flat desert where there is little chance for a fire and it doesn't take too many brains to figure out that you can provide a concurrent line with a fire proof bottom just like they used to have. It was the fire separations in the mountains. And it doesn't take too much of an engineer brain to figure out that they could produce the same line without disturbing the landscape and people by conducting if they must go on the same line that they have now and just improve it and make it fire proof. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. By the way, Daniel will approach each of you and try to get you to fill one of these out. I thought I saw a hand somewhere else. Yes.

MS. BIANEZ: My name is Pat Biane. And I may not have all the statistics exactly right, but I was reading an article where Walmart — a person that works for Walmart came up with this idea that if they bought energy efficient light bulbs and replaced just the display light bulbs in the fans in all of the Walmarts in the United States, that they would save enough electricity to be able to power Rhode Island, Connecticut and one other small state. And they have done this. They went to GE and they said, "We don't want to buy your other kind of light bulbs, we only want to buy energy efficient ones." And GE has decided to work with them. And that's now going to be standard for all Walmarts, because obviously Walmart is a very big, powerful corporation. They can do a lot of things. The bottom line is they figured out how to save a lot of electricity by just having these small light bulbs being changed in every one of their stores.

They also in the same article said that if everyone just changed one light bulb in their house, that it could — I don't remember the statistic, but it was just an incredible amount. And I remember San Diego Gas & Electric used to have programs where they really did encourage people to conserve. And they had programs where they tried to give people rebates if they bought certain kinds of appliances and they just don't seem to do that anymore. It's not part of the agenda. They may have small programs. It's not at all what you see that they seem to be pushing. And I just think that that's an alternative that should be really — I think we need to know why they're not doing that.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else before we go for second helpings?

Okay. I should mention that if there's enough time at the end, we also at the other sessions had some Q and A where people can also ask questions about some of the aspects that they didn't understand, like the proposed action, or the alternatives, or things like that. So just keep that in mind, we can do that if we have enough time. It doesn't matter what order we do the second helping. If you're ready to go, all I need is your name.

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. TISDALE: Donna Tisdale from the Boulevard area. I'm kind of disappointed in some people pointing to other neighbors, you know, saying it's better to put it there than over here. I grew up visiting the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and all the other desert areas, just like Boulevard, it's a spiritual place that gets into your system and you want to protect it no matter what.

So I was there when the existing power lines came through Boulevard. I'm still there. I had horses that would not — could not make them go under that line, so when people talk about expansion —

MR. MICHAELSON: We can't hear you, I'm sorry.

MS. TISDALE: When people talk about expansion, there are other neighborhoods that are equally impacted. So I wanted to go on where I left off before.

Negative impacts on the Cleveland National Forest, Cuyamaca State Park, sensitive species, habitat, panoramic view sheds and private residential properties along the alternate routes are all as real as those along the proposed route. There are also problematic Tribal lands.

Putting two 500 kV lines side by side through wildlands in the eastern San Diego County, it's not flat desert. Next to the U.S./Mexican Border would put all that power at risk due to the extreme fire danger. We also have an out-of-control border. I live there. Mexican cartels have come in. We live in a lawless state much of the time. Smugglers and others breach our border frequently undetected and pursued. I have family and friends that work in federal law enforcement, including my own son. We have some very scary types roaming our border areas on this side and sabotage is not out of the question.

Boulevard right now is carrying a heavy burden by hosting the 500 kV transmission line and one tribal wind farm and more to come. With the turbines they also have blinking lights and strobe lights that go on all night in these previously dark areas.

Blazing new corridors will only encourage and promote the industrialization of the back country, which does not comply with the community character or plans, and will pave the way for future expansion. Just look at the 395 corridor by Victorville where there's multiple sets of power lines.

Power should be generated as close to core urban basins as possible, such as the proposed rebuild of the South Bay and Encina Power Plants. Intensive conservation efforts and other forms of local generation should also be pursued along with replacing old lines with newer lines which can move more energy over existing transmission grids.

Just say no to Sunrise. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. BELL: Jim Bell. I just want to speak a little bit more about the economic implications of going with renewables and efficiency. I mean right now the county exports about two billion dollars a year to pay for the imported electricity that we bring from someplace else. That's a huge cash flow drain out of San Diego's economy.

The other side, if we're investing it in efficiency and renewables in the county, we're employing literally thousands of people that will be installing these devices, so basically taking money that we're already spending and exporting. And once we export it, we get no jobs, no business opportunities, no tax revenue from it. Keeping that money in the local economy and for every dollar you keep in the local economy, it basically — it at least decreases by another dollar. So if we're talking about two billion dollars being exported, bringing that money back in the economy would mean four billion dollars of actual local economic activity. And some people say the economic multiplier is much higher than two.

Even after all the solar is installed and all the efficiency is installed, whenever we pay for energy, all the money stays in the local economy because it would be going to some local entity that would be managing it. So it continues feeding cash into our economy, you know, indefinitely.

And plus in terms of just a minute ago the issue of terrorism was mentioned. If you have a system on roofs and over parking lots throughout the county, it would be very difficult for any kind of terrorist

activity to make any significant dent in our power supply. If we locate it to one location or have power lines crossing great distances, anybody who just got, you know, went nuts or whatever, could knock down that line at any time. You shoot it down with hunting rifles, simple explosives could knock down towers. So it's not secure at all.

Then, finally, why should we be basing our energy security on a non-renewable dirty resource like natural gas or any other non-renewable energy resource. It just does not make sense. Even if we produce the power locally with natural gas power plants, we have to — we have to import the natural gas, so that is not energy security at all. Those pipe lines are still going to be subject to terrorism, earthquakes, and other disasters.

And the price of a kilowatt hour in terms of the price of natural gas. At 10 cents a kilowatt hour, the price of natural gas represents almost 90 percent of the cost of kilowatt hour. So even if we're producing it locally, we're still producing the money to the natural gas suppliers.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Kelly, are you going to come up?

MS. FULLER: Thank you. Kelly Fuller, San Diego Imperial County Sierra Club.

It's our understanding that the environmental review documents the CPUC and BLM are preparing will address the responsibilities of the government agencies associated with this project. The section on California Department of Parks and Recreation should state that the Anza-Borrego General Plan would have to be amended before the Sunrise Powerlink could be approved through the park. In addition, the California State Parks Commission would have to approve the de-designation of state wilderness through some sort of public process that has yet to be created. And I don't think anybody knows what it would be.

SDG&E has incorrectly asserted in its alternative route filing that under Anza-Borrego's General Plan the powerlink is a permitted use and, therefore, SDG&E believes the general plan does not need to be amended, but the general plan recognizes only SDG&E's existing easement. The easement would have to be widened into designated wilderness before the company could build the powerlink. The widening changes everything.

We would like to remind everyone that there are alternatives that can provide San Diego's electrical needs without having to build the Sunrise Powerlink at all. We provided a list of them at the El Centro scoping meeting.

Today we would like to ask that the environmental review documents address the implications to this proposed project of SDG&E's request to the CPUC for authority to add 250 megawatts of new peaking units to come on line in 2007 and 2008. And this request is contained in SDG&E's response to rulemakings, and I'll give this to the court reporter because I know this numbers are hard, 05-12-013 and 06-12-013.

Thanks for this opportunity to share our concerns and suggestions.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to add to their original comments? If not, good, we have time for the Q and A. What we did is — again, just to emphasize where we are, the analysis hasn't been done, documents haven't been prepared, so there are a lot of questions that can't be answered at this point obviously, but if you have questions about the process or the project, the panel here will do its best. And if we can't, we may have to get an answer for you at a later time. Because

this is a hearing and there is a transcript, I need you to come up and ask your question at the microphone and just state your name.

MS. ALLENBY: My name is Marty Allenby. This may be an unanswerable question. But, Susan, you got a mitigation monitor. Who do you envision being the monitors, from where?

MS. LEE: I can't answer geographically from where, but I can tell you how the contract process works. The contract that Aspen has with the CPUC and the BLM includes mitigation monitoring. So we would propose to the CPUC and BLM a series of resumes of folks who are considered qualified. They review them and decide if they're acceptable to them based on local knowledge and monitoring experience.

MR. MICHAELSON: It would depend entirely on what's being monitored. It could be for biology, it could be a variety of things. Good question.

Other questions? Please come up to the microphone if you have one.

MS. DEUTCH: Rita Deutch. I have two questions. One is, I haven't read the material that I got today, I was wondering if any alternative considered increasing the power coming out of our existing San Onofre Nuclear Power Plant?

MR. MICHAELSON: The short answer I think is no.

MS. DEUTCH: Okay, thank you. And another is, I'm not familiar with the technical engineering of these towers, but will they have some sort of light or blinking light up on top or near the top as it goes through our very beautiful widely known dark sky Anza-Borrego State Park?

MS. LEE: That's a good question, and actually the question has been raised several times this week. We need to research it. We believe that the lights are only required for towers that are very tall, something like 160 feet. And these towers for the most part are less than that, but we actually need to research the requirements. We've worked on other projects through the desert including lines through the Mohave Desert along the I-10 and those towers do not have blinking lights.

MR. MICHAELSON: But if they were to have those, we've received several comments at other meetings about the the concern related to that in other areas.

Just come up to the microphone if you're going to ask a question.

MS. WATTS: My name is Merna Watts. I have seen a map introduced by SDG&E which shows transmission lines running from the Imperial Valley Substation, or whatever it's called, I'm sorry, into Mexicali and south of the border, and I want to know what kind of guarantee SDG&E has made to you people that under no circumstances are they going to get power from Mexico? That's it.

MS. BLANCHARD: I know of no guarantees at this point.

MS. WATTS: Thank you.

MS. TISDALE: My question is for Ms. Kastoll from the BLM. How many of the windmill proposals are actually in the Anza-Borrego State Park or in the Ocotillo area?

MS. KASTOLL: I have no wind proposals for Anza-Borrego.

MS. TISDALE: For the southern area down by S2 and down by the Jacumba wilderness?

MS. KASTOLL: No. Well, okay, I have three pending applications for towers in the Ocotillo area, but mostly north of the highway, north of Interstate 8.

MS. TISDALE: I thought there was one south of the highway, too?

MS. KASTOLL: I don't recall, but I don't think so. If there is one, there's one small piece that relates to the application, north of the interstate.

MS. TISDALE: I spoke to someone and she was concerned about one that was in the pristine area of the desert, and I was pretty sure it was south of Interstate 8, but I could be wrong.

MS. KASTOLL: I can check it for you. But if there is one, I think it's a very small application that no environmental assessment has been done, no work has been done towards it. And I will be sending out the environmental assessments as they are completed.

MS. TISDALE: And my other question is on the information I got on the location, potential location of the solar facility, was from Mr. Abers himself, and he said it was in a triangle area between Ocotillo and Plaster City. At another hearing I heard it was from the Sterling Company that they need 5,000 acres and from a third party they said it was 32,000 units. So how far has this gotten? Is there an actual application? Is there an actual site picked or is this still up for grabs total?

MS. KASTOLL: Stirling has submitted an imperfect application. Their plan of development is expected to be filed with us probably in February of '07. Their proposal is 300 megawatts in the first stage with 600 more added if that's successful, which would ultimately take 5,000 to 6,000 acres. Their current site is between Interstate 8 and Evan Hewes Highway south of Plaster City.

MR. MICHAELSON: Kelly, did you have something you wanted to add? Come up to the mike. I think it had to do with the wind energy.

MS. FULLER: Yeah, I think someone may have been asking about the Wind Hunter proposal for wind testing. I saw a map that they provided, I don't know, almost a year ago, and at that time it appeared to be adjacent to one of the southern borders, south eastern border of Anza-Borrego and kind of northwest of Ocotillo.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. I think, yes, why don't you come up.

MS. SHACKELFORD: Janis Shackelford. A 2004 document entitled, "The Energy Supply and Demand Assessment for the Border Region," that was submitted to the California Energy Commission. It described the Imperial Water Irrigation District's plans for improving their system. Do you know if any of those plans have occurred? Because they were going to expand their lines and substations to provide transmission capability for the geothermal plant at Salton Sea.

MS. LEE: I believe that for the most part those plans are related to the Green Path Project, which is the IID portion of which Sunrise Powerlink is a piece, but in addition to that there are a number of upgrades to the IID lines within Imperial County. I don't think they've been done. There has not been an environmental document published on it yet.

MS. SHACKELFORD: Okay. Because I was wondering, are they eliminating what was discussed in 2004 to replace it with their proposed MOU with SDG&E to provide that interconnect to the substation?

MS. LEE: I don't know for sure. But the MOA with San Diego Gas & Electric addresses only the 500 kV portion, from Imperial Valley to Narrows Substation. It doesn't address the IID upgrades which are a separate component and not part of this project.

MS. SHACKELFORD: If I may, a second question. On the LEAPS project proposal, SDG&E is saying it's not approved and faces regulatory hurdles. Is that project still in process?

MS. LEE: The LEAPS project has published a Draft EIS in, I think, March of this year. And they're planning on having their Final by the end of October. But the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission would have to approve it at some point after the Final, so its process is moving.

MR. MICHAELSON: Do you have a question?

MS. ALBERS: I wondered if these kind of towers —

MR. MICHAELSON: Your name?

MS. ALBERS: I'm sorry, Pam Albers. I was wondering if these were the kind of towers that pose electrocution risks to birds and raptors, and if so, what kind of measures are going to be taken to avoid that?

MS. LEE: Almost any kind of tower poses some risk to birds if the conductors are close enough that a bird can contact two conductors at one time, because that's what you have to do in order to create an electrocution hazard. The 500 kV towers in general are less of a risk, because the conductors are farther apart. But for very large birds, like Golden Eagles, you really have to check wing span. We have in previous documents had mitigation measures to reduce electrocution risks. For the most part you try to make the conductors more visible, which has obvious other concerns.

MR. MICHAELSON: Any other questions? Yes, sir.

MR. PAYNE: Good afternoon. Harvey Payne, Rancho Penasquitos Concerned Citizens. I will be making some additional comments tonight in Rancho Penasquitos.

My question for the energy division of the CPUC is whether you have retained any consultants to study the non-wires alternative?

MS. BLANCHARD: I have retained the Aspen Environmental Group to do the CEQA/NEPA work, and as part of that team we have people that can look at various aspects of this project including non wires.

MR. PAYNE: Such as comparing in-basin generation?

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes. Plus there are parties in the proceeding who also are going to be providing a lot of information into the whole process. We will review all of that as well for the purposes of our document.

MR. PAYNE: I understand that the benefit of the CPUC doing it is you perhaps get a more independent analysis of the two non-wires versus wires alternatives?

MS. BLANCHARD: That is our objective: to do an independent review and analysis of this project through a CEQA/NEPA document. The ALJ, Commissioner Dian Grueneich have the general proceeding and they have their roles to play as well.

MR. PAYNE: This is the part I've been struggling to understand all the way through, which is there seems to be somewhat of a crossover at least on that aspect between the CPCN part of it and the what we'll call at the CEQA part of it. And can you explain or tell us how do you see that crossover and what the focus is on one side versus the other?

MS. BLANCHARD: Well, for NEPA/CEQA our task is looking at all the impacts on this proposed project and identifying a reasonable range of alternatives to that project that would lessen the impacts, take care of some project objectives, and would be feasible. Some of those reasonable alternatives could be a non-wires type of alternative like in-basin generation, use South Bay or that type of thing. We will be looking at all of that. And as Susan had indicated in the slide earlier is is our task to look at a reasonable range of alternatives for this project. There's a lot of issues and there's a lot of alternative analyses that we have to do. It's not a small project.

MR. PAYNE: If you wouldn't mind, I would like to ask you another question on a completely separate topic. The question is, and I almost hate to ask the question, but I don't know much about mitigation. Can you explain what mitigation is all about within the CEQA process once a certain alternative is selected? Let's presume that some part of this project does move forward and then a transmission line is going to be built, how does mitigation come into play? What does that mean? What is done? Those types of things.

MS. BLANCHARD: I'll let Susan speak to this also, but generally speaking under CEQA we have this requirement to do mitigation monitoring implementation plan, and so on any of our contracts where we have a Draft EIR or the final, we go in, and let's say the Commission approves some physical type of line project, we would go ahead and develop a mitigation measure compliance plan. We would lay out all the adopted mitigation measures that deal with reducing a significant impact identified. We have to come up with a mitigation measure that has to actually take care of that significant impact. We will go through all of that process, identify all those significant impacts and identify mitigation measures. And if there are some impacts that cannot be mitigated, then they will become what we call a Class I significant impact, and we will probably have a few of those. So if they approve it, we have a mitigation measure in plan. Then at the Aspen Environmental Group we will have a number of people who will be out there monitoring the whole process of the construction on this project. And then if there's something that needs to be monitored after it's actually constructed such as restoration of a particular area, then we would do that as well.

Susan, do you want to comment?

MS. LEE: I don't know if it would help to give just a couple of examples of types of mitigation that would normally be recommended in a document like this. An example for air quality possibly is dust control, certainly in the desert and any area that's dry. This is usually done in accordance with the regional APCD, looking at what their requirements are to water roads, to keep speed limits during construction that reduces dust. Usually we have specific requirements even on the types of engines that are used during construction, because they have different levels of emissions. We have requirements for biological surveys immediately prior to construction and also sooner, so that you make sure if there are, for example, burrowing owls within the right-of-way. There are procedures for relocating them before you go and dig up habitat. Requirements to revegetate an area that has been disturbed for construction, but is not required later on. And we get even into design issues. If there's an area where SDG&E has proposed the towers that look like that and our visual expert believes that the singular tubular pole tower would look better, we would recommend that as mitigation measure in order to improve visual impacts.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else have any questions? Come on up.

MR. BLACKMAN: Hi, my name is Paul Blackman. I'm with the San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club. And following up on a comment Harvey Payne asked. Just an initial comment, if the CEQA process is somewhat parallel with the CPUC's process, the problem we have is that we'll have some alternatives analyzed through environmental process, that there isn't any technical impact analysis by CPUC. And it would seem pretty much impossible for the CPUC to adequately evaluate a project that had all the economical environmental analyses, but none of the economical technical analyses. So I think there needs to be some parallelism between the CEQA process and the CPUC.

Now, getting to the question, for example, on Monday SDG&E filed their southern routes document and the question is, well, now what do we do with it? I don't know.

MS. BLANCHARD: I won't tell you what we're going to do with it. First of all, what they talked about is their alternative, not a partial alternative. It is essentially right out of the PEA that was done, and so it's not really anything new. I mean, I think if anybody was looking at the PEA and saw the final. I think you'll see that it's pretty similar to what's in the PEA. Now, for us it's nothing new than what we already know about. We have to embark upon this whole alternative screening analysis in terms of what we decide should be carried forward or not under CEQA/NEPA and in the light of our discussions with BLM. We will go through a long process of alternative screening analysis as Susan indicated in the slide. So we're at the beginning of all of that really. And we will relook at some of what SDG&E did, but probably we may not agree with it or we may come up with something new. And there's a lot of information coming in through the prehearing conference statements and through other people, that we're going to utilize all of that information and get out there. We've already been talking with a number of agencies down here and we'll have more of that. All of their great input is coming into this process as well. So we have a lot of work to do, but we understand the need to have a very extensive analysis of alternatives in this case.

MR. MICHAELSON: And eventually that's going to be in a Draft document and that's all going to be there for review.

MR. BLACKMAN: Right. The concern is — I understand the CEQA and NEPA process pretty well. The question is, is how does the CPUC evidentiary hearing process where they're going to analyze all the models, you know, the models, figure out, well, whether — all the environmental issues aside, whether it means technical, economical, these are two distinct analytic processes.

The question is, on the CPCU side how is that going to be made parallel to the CEQA side so they're analyzing the same sorts of alternatives?

MS. BLANCHARD: Well, we haven't worked all of that out yet actually because we haven't done the scoping memo, which we will hopefully attempt to resolve our two processes so that they're sort of working together with each other. So I'm not sure I could really say anything definitive about that right now. But obviously we want to make sure that information out of the ALJ proceeding is put to use into our document, that the timing is correct on that. And we haven't really finished the discussions on all of that in terms of those responses, but we understand the need to do that.

MR. BLACKMAN: Well, I just want to make sure that the process is metrosexual.

MS. BLANCHARD: Right.

MR. MICHAELSON: Did you have a question?

MS. FELDMAN: Yes. I had a prior question on what was just brought up which was, you know, the —

MR. MICHAELSON: What's your name?

MS. FELDMAN: Sara Feldman, California State Parks Foundation. The Foundation is concerned primarily with the park. Of course, we are also very concerned with surrounding areas and impact of alternatives on the view shed and other national forests, et cetera. So what I want to know is that — the alternatives that SDG&E put forth, they put forth three alternatives, which as has been pointed out are nothing new here, they're the same, but they did. And all of those run through national forest and scenic areas, even if they do avoid the park. So what I want to know is specifically can SDG&E be ordered — can they be told none of these alternatives are sufficient and you have to come up with some different ones, some completely different new routes or new alternatives? I mean, is that possible or does SDG&E — are they the ones who determine the alternatives? And if none of them are good, there's no power to order them to do something different?

MS. BLANCHARD: I don't want to speak for the ALJ.

MS. FELDMAN: I just can't figure out. Is it possible?

MS. BLANCHARD: I know from our standpoint what we will do is to look at alternatives. They all have issues. Our role will be to present reasonable alternatives and try to find something which has less impact, including non-wires alternatives as well, which may be the ones that have the least impact, right? So that's what our role will be. I've been down here all week, I'm not sure how the Commissioner's office and the ALJ are responding to this recent filing. I haven't talked with anyone up there. I've been busy down here, so I'm not sure what is going to happen from their standpoint. But I know we have to proceed ahead and we have to evaluate and look at alternatives and do the best we can to be objective, try to find some alternatives that we feel have less impact than the proposed project.

MS. FELDMAN: So you're not bound by the alternatives that SDG&E has put forth?

MS. BLANCHARD: No. No. I'm sorry, I may have misunderstood. I mean, no, we look at the PEA, we look at the alternatives, we look at what they've said. And then our environmental team will go about the process of verification, of discovering more information, of deciding whether what they've said is correct or not correct. We may look at new alternatives, we've may decide to take some of their alternatives and carry them forward, or we may decide that most of them are not worthy of being carried forward and that we have to develop new alternatives, and we go along in the process. So we're not bound by any of their alternatives and we're not bound with the proposed project in that if we find something that is a better project, less impact, we will make those statements in the environmental document.

Susan, do you want to say anything else?

MR. MICHAELSON: That's it.

MS. FELDMAN: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: She's coming up with a question.

MS. SHIVLEY: Good afternoon. Ellen Shivley (phonetic) from the San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club. I know you are not talking technicalities here, but looking at these towers, I'm very impressed with the size of them and the weight of them and my frightened concern is that weight will grossly impact the groundwater. And, as you know, the desert is so precious that it seems to me like 100 or so towers of this nature may permanently impact the ground water, so I hope you have in place a hydrologist, a geologist who will very seriously consider these impacts.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. ABLERS: Pam Albers. This question might have been answered earlier, but there were a lot of acronyms being thrown around and I didn't quite understand. So when you consider all these alternatives, do you also consider cost as a factor or is that beside the point and you just make your recommendation, and how does that fit into the process?

MS. BLANCHARD: As far as under CEQA and NEPA, you can carry an alternative forward that may be more costly. Costs and various options or alternatives are a factor in the general proceeding.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. Dennis, do you have a question?

MR. TRAFECANTY: One of the things I wanted to ask is I know you've been down here all week and I know you've met certain agencies or groups, and I was wondering if — I don't know if you're willing to disclose who you've met to try to help you evaluate the decision that you're going to recommend, but have you done any investigating with the Encina people to see what it would take to get that on line, moved away from the ocean and put inland, and also the one in South Bay, which are two of the critical in-county generation sources of power? And — well, that's one question I have, maybe if you could answer that. I'm Dennis Trafecanty.

MS. LEE: Our meetings this week have focused on public agencies, the counties of Imperial and San Diego, Anza-Borrego State Park and the Cleveland National Forest, so those have been our focus. But we had a speaker actually at a previous hearing from Cabrillo Power Encina. He gave us some comments. I'm not sure if you were at that meeting. We definitely are looking at an in-basin generation alternative in which we will gather information from all the proponents of in-basin generation. There's no lack of information regarding South Bay. They have an application on file with the Energy Commission that's multi-volumes and we have copies of that.

MR. TRAFECANTY: And then my other question, at the prehearing conference one of the things that I heard loud and clear was, it was kind of like a threat to those several of the 500 people that were there by the SDG&E attorney, when he said, "We got to move this thing along because the lights might go off," or something to that. And I was just wondering what kind of pressure do you have? What is the timetable for what you have to do? And if all these new alternatives are coming up, is there the ability for you to increase the amount of time you have to make your decisions?

MS. BLANCHARD: We're still trying to determine the time frame for getting the draft EIR/EIS out, as I indicated earlier. And there's a number of issues related around that. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and Fish & Game are requesting we do protocol surveys before we release the draft. I think we — we have a lot of information and we can go ahead and we'll do the alternatives as necessary. But, again, we have to work with the scoping memo and the ALJ to figure out the whole process on how we all dovetail with each other and get everything done.

MS. LEE: One more thing, as you know, the SDG&E application states that the project has to be on line by 2010 in order for the lights not to go off. However, in response to some questions that we had asked in the pre-application process, SDG&E did add a fair amount of information in its application in light of the South Bay application. And, in fact, they state in the application that they did provide to the CPUC, that if South Bay is repowered and goes on line, as it's expected, and I think it's 2010 or 2009, that, in fact, the need for this project could be extended to as much as 2016.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, sir.

MR. BARELMANN: I have two questions.

MR. MICHAELSON: Your name?

MR. BARELMANN: Bob Barelmann. The project at Otay Mesa that's been delayed for years and no one seems to want to pay for it or wants to start it and it's got permits and it's ready to go, why haven't they taken that into consideration? The first question. And my second question is, how can SDG&E's necessity be complete when they bring a 500 kV link through the desert, through everything, and they dead end it into Central Link Substation in the middle of nowhere and from there they can go with a 230 kV link, I mean, where does the other 270 go?

MS. LEE: That's an interesting question and that's been raised before. One of the issues we will be looking at in terms of looking at alternatives is the configuration of the project and to what extent the 500/230 substation can be located in different places. I think that the application actually states that there's the potential for a future expansion of lines out of the Central Link Substation, but it's not expressed very clearly and it's an issue that we need to look at in terms of potential future impacts.

The first question was about Otay Mesa. I know there's an ongoing proceeding for Sempra to purchase the Otay Project from the approved developer. And, honestly, I'm not sure of the status of that. I don't know if anyone else knows about it. So we don't know whether it will be built, but part of our research related to in-basin generation will be to research that whole situation.

MR. MICHAELSON: Kelly.

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller. Getting back to what you said earlier about there's a possibility that you might come up with a completely different alternative, say a completely alternate route, nothing that we have seen before, what would be the process for that so that the people living in that area would be notified? Would they get scoping meetings like this? Would there be other kinds of meetings? How would that proceed?

MS. BLANCHARD: I think that's something that you mentioned before. And basically we've been talking amongst ourselves about it and, quite frankly, we have to go back and talk up in San Francisco as far as how we would review that process. We had some talks about it, but I understand what you and I think the rest of the people are saying, but I just need discuss it with others. So that's all I could say right now, but we have received your comment and we are going to look into it and figure out how to do that, because I understand.

MS. FULLER: Thanks. I was just hoping maybe it had magically been figured out the last couple of days.

MS. BLANCHARD: We have been talking and talking to people, so quite frankly, we haven't had time to think about anything.

MR. MICHAELSON: I just want to wrap this up to one more question.

MR. TRAFECANTY: In July I think in most of California there was quite a heatwave and, of course, SDG&E took advantage of that, made a big announcement in Horton Center here in San Diego about we got to get this thing going. My question relates to Encina, I understand that that plant, even though it's a dirty plant, and we all know that they want to improve it technologically and make it clean using natural gas and take it inland, but my understanding is it's there in reserve right now. But my thought is that during this terrible July heatwave when SDG&E was starting to talk about blackouts, wasn't it still not being used or maybe minimally used, in other words, it wasn't used on an emergency basis to get us through that July heatwave for about two weeks?

MS. LEE: I don't know. I don't know if anyone else knows. But what we will be looking at in this application is the Cabrillo folks have issued a press release stating their intent to repower Cabrillo which would allow it to essentially be rebuilt with the new style of power plant and many, many fewer air emissions. So part of that I think we will be looking at the historic generation and in-basis generation, so we will have a lot more information as we move through this process, but at this point I don't know what its operation has been.

MR. TRAFECANTY: My concern is that there's a trust issue here, a couple of people brought it up, with SDG&E and I was one of them obviously. But the issue is they've got a lot more money than a few of us in Santa Ysabel putting up a few signs, you know, to try to counteract some of their advertising. But, you know, there's — I think that, you know, we got burned once by SDG&E back in 2000, and I think people ought to be educated, that the rate payers as to, you know, should we let them burn us again. You know, my dad told me, "Someone wrongs you, shame on them, but if they wrong you twice, shame on you." And so I'm really worried about all this — I don't know who pays for all this advertising. I can't imagine. I'm sure it comes out of our pockets somehow, but I hear it every morning and it just drives me nuts, so thanks.

My question is is basically how do we — how do we establish trust? Maybe that's not your function, but I have a real concern about that.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yeah, I think that's in a category of rhetorical question. I'm not going to ask them —

MR. TRAFECANTY: Another question similar to that is, are you still beating your wife?

MR. MICHAELSON: Yeah, exactly.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Try to answer that one.

MR. MICHAELSON: Do you want to come up?

MS. TISDALE: Well, it's more of a comment that's informational. When the Kumeyaay wind farm went up on the Campo Reservation with SDG&E, the location of the wind farm was redacted from the public documents. And also they failed — SDG&E failed to tell us that our community was going to be taken off the grid, or anybody, for 12 weeks and put on emergency generators. So this is who we're dealing with. And we also have a trust issue. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Well, as you probably know, we have another meeting to go to up in Rancho Penasquitos. Given the unpredictability of freeways this time of day, we're going to thank you very much again for coming and participating. This particular scoping process has been extremely useful to the CPUC and the BLM. We've received very constructive and informed comments. We appreciate your participation, and with that we're adjourned.

(The scoping meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.)

**SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT  
Reporter's Transcript of the CPUC/BLM Scoping Meeting  
for Preparation of a Draft EIR/EIS**

Held 6:30 p.m. October 5, 2006  
At Rancho Peñasquitos (San Diego), California

Reported by:  
Claire A. Wanner, CSR No. 12965

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

Lewis Michaelson - Katz & Associates, Public Facilitator  
Susan Lee - Aspen Environmental Group  
Billie Blanchard - California Public Utilities Commission  
Tom Zale & Lynda Kastoll - Bureau of Land Management

Presentation: pages 3 to 9  
Public Comments begin on page 9  
Q&A begins on page 20

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

Martha Sullivan.....	9, 12
Marijo Vandyke.....	10, 23
David Regendardt.....	11
Mike Vildibill.....	11, 23
Keith Ritchey.....	13
John Callahan.....	14
Grazyna Krajewska.....	14, 21
Robert Reich.....	15
Laura Copic.....	15, 21
Tom Kluczynsia.....	16
Harvey Payne.....	16, 20
Helen Dominguez.....	17, 22
Michelle Ritchey.....	17
Mark Schmidt.....	17
Weixing Chen.....	18
Aurele Gilleran.....	18
Demian Dorrance.....	18, 22
Glenn Halchadorian.....	19
Tad Braun.....	19

## STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. My name is Lewis Michaelson, and I work for a firm called Katz & Associates. We have been hired to help support these meetings, and I've been hired specifically to serve as neutral meeting moderator at all of the meetings that are being held. As you may know, this is the seventh and last of a series of meetings that have been held throughout Imperial and San Diego Counties. We've been to El Centro, Borrego Springs. We've been to Ramona. We were down in Mission Valley earlier today. And, actually, we're in my neighborhood today. I live in Rancho Peñasquitos, so it's good to be here close to home finally.

In any case, this meeting is being held to satisfy two environmental laws. One is the California Environmental Quality Act for the state of California, and the other is the National Environmental Policy Act known as NEPA. That's because there are two different agencies, one state and one federal, that are involved in the eventual decision that will be made.

Some of you may be unfamiliar with an EIR or EIS process or the Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement. So I just want to familiarize you with the process so you know what to expect this evening and how you can participate. If you will go to the agenda, I'm just going to go over the purpose of scoping, and then Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental, seated to my right, will give a description of the proposed project. Billie Blanchard next to her, will be talking about the California Public Utilities Commission process's schedule. Then we have Lynda Kastoll and Tom Zale from the Bureau of Land Management. Tom will speak to their process and schedule in relationship to the national schedule. And then we'll go back to Susan Lee briefly for a few slides so she can give you more detail on exactly what's contained in the documents, how the analysis is done, and what types of comments are helpful at this point.

So let's go to the purpose of scoping. It's important to understand that we really have at the front end of what can be a very lengthy process. No decision has been made or will be made tonight. The document has not been prepared. The analysis has not begun. And the purpose of scoping is so that you, the public, and public agencies at the front end can help them with the preparation of that document. For our part what we try to do early on in scoping, and part of that will be tonight, is to inform you and agencies about the upcoming project for which the EIR/EIS will be prepared, to inform you about the environmental review process. After that, what we would like to do is solicit input. And those are the two most important things of scoping.

At this stage if you can give us comments regarding potential alternatives to the proposed project or which types of environmental issues you think are appropriate to be studied for this proposed project, that's the type of comments the are most helpful. As I said, we've had six meetings already. They've been extremely fruitful and productive. People have been providing cogent, focused, and relevant questions. So this has been a great scoping so far, and we're looking forward to continuing that this evening in Rancho Peñasquitos. We also expect to identify — we certainly have already — certain issue areas and issues of potential controversy.

And then, importantly, the scoping process ends October 20th. That's the deadline for all comments. The Scoping Report will then be prepared. That will summarize all of the comments received, both written and oral, at all of the meetings. And that will then be available on the project web site as well as 18 information repositories where hard copies are available of much of the background information.

I do want to mention that at a couple meetings there was a confusion about the web site. There is, of course a web site that's run by SDG&E about this project. But for the purposes of the environmental

impact review process and the proceedings that are being handled by these two agencies, it's important to know that there is an additional web site of the California Public Utilities Commission which is really the one from this point forward would be the best one to pay attention to if you're going to pay attention to this process. That's something in handouts and also will be on a later slide.

It's important to know who the key players are again in this process. The California Public Utilities Commission is the lead agency, as I said, under the California Environmental Policy Act for which the EIR is being prepared. The Bureau of Land Management is the lead agency under NEPA. There also is another very key actor, and that's the applicant, San Diego Gas and Electric. They are not part of this proceeding, obviously. This is the part where they've made their application and these agencies are now asked to independently review and go through and do the analysis of potential environmental impacts. And then Aspen Environmental Group, not only Susan but several of her team, are here tonight listening to your comments. And they've been hired by the CPUC and BLM to be the people who help do the analysis and provide the subject matter experts.

So, anyway, with that, I think I'll turn it over to Susan to go over the proposed action.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Lewis. We've included in the Notice of Preparation — and I think you all have copies from the mail or received a copy at the door as you came in — a fairly detailed description of this project as it's been proposed. So I'm going to give just an overview today, and I'll let you look through the description here. The project is large. It's 150-mile transmission line. I know because we're at the western end today I'll focus a little more on the Coastal Link as it's called. If you want to look at the verbal description in here in the text, it's on pages 4 through 8. But just for the overview, if you want to turn to Figure 1 of the Notice of Preparation, it's called Proposed Project Overview.

What you'll see on here is a transmission line that starts at the far eastern side at the Imperial Valley Substation at the southwestern edge of El Centro. You can follow the blue line up to the north and then to the west end through Anza-Borrego State Park. The blue line represents the 500 kilovolt portion. That's the highest voltage of the project. That part is over 90 miles long and extends into San Diego County to a large substation where the blue and red lines meet, called the Proposed Central East Substation. That's in the area of Warner Springs. At that point the project becomes a 230 kilovolt transmission line which is similar in voltage to the larger lines that you have through here. And that portion of the project continues down through the area of Santa Ysabel, south of Ramona, through part of Poway, Peñasquitos, ending at the Peñasquitos Substation just out west of us here.

As you know, the project is proposed by San Diego Gas & Electric. There's another component that you should know about. While they're not a proponent of the this project at this point, the Imperial Irrigation District has a memorandum of agreement with San Diego Gas & Electric under which ultimately IID would own and operate and, in fact, construct the first portion of line between the Imperial Valley Substation and the Narrows Substation which is actually in the center of Anza-Borrego State Park.

One other map you may want to take a look at — I think most of you saw this in the lobby out there — is Figure 6A. That's the one that zooms into the area where we are today. It's called the Coastal Link. It shows the route from the Sycamore Canyon Substation which is within Miramar, continuing to the west from Miramar past the Chicarita Substation which is not part of this project — the project actually goes past that substation without connecting to it — through Peñasquitos in an underground segment. And that's what you'll see in this map in those dashed lines. The overhead segments are the solid blue and the underground with the dashed lines. And then overhead again down into the Peñasquitos Substation.

Here are the three goals that SDG&E has presented in its application for why this project is needed. No. 1 they're saying that it's needed to enhance reliability for the San Diego system in terms of being able to provide electric power in the future as need grows. The second one is to access proposed renewable energy. You saw on Figure 1 the project starts in Imperial County. SDG&E has identified a couple renewable resources out there where they would import solar power from a project that's being proposed from Stirling Energy, which would be built down near the Imperial Substation and also possibly geothermal power for which there's quite a few resources identified along the south edge of the Salton Sea. The third goal that SDG&E has identified is to reduce energy costs in general for SDG&E rate payers.

This next slide is SDG&E's objectives. And they presented quite a few objectives. They again follow these same three goals, but they're much more specific. The reliability, renewables and cost is the basic theme here. The last two objectives really are land use principles that relate to how they decide to site transmission lines.

I'll hand this to Billie, and she'll talk about the CPUC.

MS. BLANCHARD: Good evening. I'm Billie Blanchard, CPUC Project Manager for this environmental document. And I just want to go over real quickly the CPUC review process and the schedule for the general proceeding and the EIR/EIS. Basically, the CPUC has two review processes for the application. One is this for the general proceeding, and the other is for the environmental review for the EIR/EIS which I am mostly involved in.

The general proceeding for the CPCN is being led by assigned commissioner Dian Grueneich and administrative law judge Steve Weissman. The scope of the CPCN is determined by the Public Utilities Code Section 1002. And in that proceeding, the determination of need for the projection would be assessed. Also, we look at community values, issues, aesthetics, parks, various other aspects of the project including and also the review of the environmental impacts of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA.

As far as the schedule for the general proceeding, so far there was a prehearing conference held in January in Ramona, and then there was a second prehearing conference in a public participation hearing that just happened in Ramona on September 13, 2006. There is a scoping memo that will be prepared for the general proceeding by the ALJ Steve Weissman. That has not been prepared yet. I understand that he will be working on that in the first half of October. That scoping memo will lay out the issues that will be addressed in this proceeding and also will address the schedule for the proceeding and then will also include our EIR/EIS schedule as well. So right now I can't give you any dates on the hearings or briefings or any of that at this point, because we don't have the scoping memo done.

The environmental review schedule: SDG&E had originally filed an application in December of 2005. And then in August they filed an amended application and also filed the Proponents Environmental Assessment known as the PEA. There was a Notice of Intent published for the EIS in the Federal Register and that occurred in August 31st of 2006. The Notice of Preparation — which we have sent out copies to everyone — for the EIR was published on September 15, 2006, and the scoping period will end on October 20, 2006. At this point in time the dates for the release of the Draft EIR/EIS have not yet been determined as we are still trying to assess some issues. Although when it does happen, we will go ahead and send out a card to everybody on the CEQA mailing list so that you will know the date of the Draft release and the date of the Final and that would be a 90-day comment period when the Draft EIR/EIS is released.

I'm going to hand this over to BLM so they can talk about their side.

MR. ZALE: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are here tonight representing the Bureau of Land Management, El Centro field office. The Bureau of Land Management is involved in this process because San Diego Gas & Electric has filed a Right of Way Application that would involve, as it's currently proposed, about 33 miles of right of way on BLM-administered lands. Those lands are primarily in Imperial County, although there is a 1.3-mile stretch in San Diego County that the BLM is responsible for.

In addition to that, BLM is currently working to determine what role we would play in the administration of a reservation that was attached to the patent for the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park back in the 1930s. It is the reservation for the existing power line that crosses the park. And the staff at the BLM is working to determine what role BLM would play in continuing to use that reservation as part of this process.

In addition to that, BLM will work on an amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan. That's the land use plan that BLM uses to govern how we manage the public lands in this area. An amendment to the plan would be required because the project as it's currently proposed would deviate from BLM-designated utility corridors in the California preservation area.

In addition to that, BLM will also be responsible for conducting government to government consultation with interested tribes and will also have to lead in completing Section 7 consultation with Fish & Wildlife Service in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

Because there's a plan amendment involved in the process, the public review period will be 90 days as opposed to the normally shorter period that's associated with EIS/EIRs. I think that's it.

MS. LEE: One of the other things we do during our scoping period is, in addition to consulting with the public directly, we also talk with the key agencies that have responsibilities for issuing permits or providing input to the decision that needs to be made by the CPUC and the BLM. So we've listed here for you just a few of the many, many agencies along this 150-mile route that have some jurisdiction over the project. We've met with several of them this week, and we will be meeting with others as the process moves along. It's just for your information to know that there's an agency scoping process as well as the public — a question I guess?

MR. MICHAELSON: You know, we'll have time for Q&A later on. One thing I didn't mention — because usually public comment hasn't started yet — there's a court reporter over here. We have to make a verbatim transcript. So unless things are on the mic, it doesn't get picked up. So if you could hold onto that question, I'd appreciate it.

MS. LEE: Okay. And to reiterate what a couple people have described already, this time a little more visually, this is a flow chart that illustrates the NEPA/CEQA process under which we're preparing an EIR and EIS. And just to show you where we are, the decision has been made to prepare these two documents. And we are now in that yellow box where we are out here for scoping, looking for input from the public and these agencies. We are then going to move into actual preparation of the document, identification of alternatives, and I'll talk more about that in a minute. After we publish the Draft, we'll be back here to talk to the public and hear what your comments are on the Draft EIR during the 90-day comment period that Tom mentioned.

I'm going to show just a couple slides that summarize the types of things that are included in an EIR/EIS, because we're hoping that this will give you a feel for the types of issues we'd like to hear about today. In general, an EIR includes a very descriptive and detailed environmental setting which is a description of what is in the area now, what are the land uses, what are the biological resources, cultural

resources. We'll describe the environmental impacts of the project that is proposed and also for the alternatives. And for each of those, the project and the alternative will have mitigation measures that are feasible to reduce impacts.

And the purpose to all this is to provide information to the decision makers that ultimately need to decide whether the project should be approved and if the project or an alternative should be approved.

Here we list just some of the major components of an EIR/EIS and, again, so you can get a feel for the types of issues that are covered and the way a document is normally broken down. In addition to the proposed project and alternatives, we'll look at cumulative impacts based on an assessment and a list of other projects that could also affect the environment along with this project, either geographically or regionally depending on the types of impacts they may have. And we'll look at growth inducing impacts as well. EIR/EIS also addresses mitigation monitoring. This comes into action if the project is approved. There's a process by which the mitigation measures that are adopted by these agencies are monitored in the field to make sure that they're actually implemented.

Here we list all of the environmental disciplines that an EIR/EIS would cover so you have a feel for the range of issues we'd like to hear about today. If any of these are issues that you know about or impacts you're aware for the project, then that would be great comment.

I'll talk in a little more detail about alternatives because there's been a huge focus on alternatives as you may have read in the paper or heard at the prehearing conference. Commissioner Dian Grueneich asked SDG&E to submit an alternative that would avoid Anza-Borrego Desert State Park so that would be on the record as their stated preference for a nonpark alternative. SDG&E did submit that just a couple days ago. Then I'll just show you which one that is although, it doesn't affect the western end of the route. The route that SDG&E identified in their filing if you look at the map called Figure 8, which is the very last one in the set of maps attached to this Notice of Preparation, what SDG&E identified was an alternative that would begin also at the Imperial Valley Substation, follow the gold line which is the existing Southwest Powerlink with another transmission line, and then would turn north along this line that's labeled D. That's a route that actually goes into the Cleveland National Forest. It would pass through both private lands and national forest land and would rejoin the proposed route in the vicinity of Santa Ysabel. So everything west of there would be unchanged by that proposal, just so you know.

What we're showing here is the process by which we evaluate every alternative. And this applies to both regional alternatives as well as to an alternative that may avoid a couple blocks of a city street. In any case, we look first to see whether the alternative meets the project objectives that have been identified by SDG&E. They don't need to meet all of the objectives. CEQA specifically allows that most of the project objectives be met but not all. The alternative must have fewer impacts or avoid impacts of the proposal project. And, thirdly, the alternative must be feasible, which means you have to be able to build it in a technical way and you have to be able to permit it based on existing laws and regulations.

The types of alternatives we're looking at are very broad in this case. We're looking at everything from routing alternatives which, again, are different ways to get either from the Imperial Valley to western San Diego County, or different ways to get from one intersection to the next. The scale of a routing alternative can be large scale or small scale. We're looking at generation as an alternative. As you probably know, there's an application in for the South Bay Power Plant to be repowered, which would change the inbasin situation pretty dramatically within San Diego. And there are other power plants that are expected to be repowered or constructed within the basin in the next few years.

And we're looking at nonwires alternatives which are methods to reduce demand, efficiency measures, new metering possibilities that would allow a reduction in demand. The last two maps, one of

which I referred to a second ago, Figure 7, shows the alternatives that SDG&E has proposed in its PEA, its Proponents Environmental Assessment. Those alternatives we will take another look at and decide independently of them whether or not we believe those should be carried forward and whether they meet our criteria. And, separately, we will look at the alternatives that SDG&E considered and did not pursue and those are the ones shown on Figure 8. We will reconsider all of those and see when we believe some of those should be pursued and, separately from that, we look at all other alternatives we come up with. We're not bound by what SDG&E has done up to this point, but we will look at what they've done.

One other point. There's a workshop you may have heard about a week from Friday, tomorrow, that will be held by SDG&E. It's for the formal parties in this proceeding that Billie mentioned earlier. It's a workshop the public can listen to but not participate in. People who are parties to the proceeding will be discussing alternatives. The feedback from that meeting also comes to us. So if you have alternative suggestions you're absolutely free to give them to us here. There's no reason that you would also have to go to the other workshop.

Just quickly, I want to show you what happens at the end of this process so you have a feel for what you may expect. After the Final EIR/EIS is published, the process for the two lead agencies are very different. At the Public Utilities Commission, a commission of five members that are appointed by the governor, will vote on the project. They'll include the environmental effects in this decision as well whether the project is needed. If the project is approved, they will require mitigation monitoring, and they'll identify which mitigation measures should be implemented.

The BLM has a 30-day comment period of the Final EIS, which is different than the CPUC. They have a governor's consistency review period of 60 days and they prepare a Record of Decision, which is a different sort of document than is prepared out of the El Centro office.

We will now give it back to Lewis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. This is the part that is really the most important of this meeting. This is an opportunity for you to provide oral input. I do want to make it clear, though, study after study shows that one of the greatest fears Americans have is public speaking. So we understand that. And if for whatever reason you're not comfortable in public speaking, we don't want you to think you've been left out, because written comments can be submitted or provided in a variety of ways. And written comments are given the same weight as oral comments. They are just as much a part of the record. So if you decide not to speak tonight, please make sure if you do have thoughts on this, that you provide them to us in writing. And if you want to make oral comments, you can still provide the written comments as well. Again, very detailed comments is a good way to do it and make sure you get the point across.

I just want to reiterate this is a scoping process. And, therefore, the two types of comments that have the greatest relevance and impacts at this point are ones that either identify the location and extent of environmental impacts that you think the proposed project might have, and the second is recommendations on any alternatives that would avoid or reduce those. If you can address those in your comments, that's what will have the greatest impact at this point in the process.

I'm going to read the first several names so you know who's coming up. We've used a three-minute time limit. But because we've had sufficient time, what we've been able to do is after everyone has their first chance at three minutes, we'll go back and have what I like to call a second helping if you can't fit your first comments. So don't worry about it. Don't try and speed through them so my court reporter can't get it. Know that you'll have a chance to come up. It happens particularly if you are reading from prepared comments: you have a tendency to get on a roll and go too fast. It's just because I want to make sure we get it on the transcript.

And then after we finish the comments, we do have a Q&A. We've been spending anywhere from either 20 to 30 minutes doing that as well where you can ask any kind of question. Of course, certain questions can't be answered at this point. For example, they haven't done any analysis so they can't tell you what the impacts are going to be. That is something that still has to be prepared. You say it's important for you make your comment, so you can come up to the microphone and quickly state your full name and ask your question. I'll make a small exception here.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

MS. SULLIVAN: I'm Martha Sullivan, and I'm from Poway. And what I want to understand — and I may have missed it in your description, and I apologize if I did — but I want to mention, I want to be clear about what the BLM jurisdiction in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is.

MR. ZALE: Well, we're not really clear what our jurisdiction is.

MS. SULLIVAN: I sort of got that.

MR. ZALE: We're continuing to administer that reservation that is attached to the patent when the patents was issued for the Park back in the 1930s.

MS. SULLIVAN: So you don't yet know exactly what --

MR. MICHAELSON: Their jurisdiction will be.

MS. SULLIVAN: — permitting associated with that patent.

MR. ZALE: Correct.

MS. SULLIVAN: And when is that going to be resolved?

MR. MICHAELSON: That's three questions now.

MR. ZALE: I hope very soon.

MR. MICHAELSON: They'll let us know when they have an answer. They're not there yet, okay?

MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: That's one of those ones that we're not there yet. I'm going to list the first several speakers so you have an idea of when you're coming up. And I apologize in advance for mispronouncing anyone's name. I got three choices on this one. Marijo, Marijo, or Marijo Vandyke. Or not even that. Maybe I'm totally off. Maybe it's Marijo. David Regendardt, Mike Vildibill, Martha Sullivan, and Keith Ritchey.

One more thing. In a very sophisticated way of indicating time, when you have one minute left, I'll put up my index finger like this. And when your three minutes are up, I'll put up my closed hand like this. But remember, you're going to get a second helping.

I'm going with Marijo Vandyke.

MR. VANDYKE: Very good. Thank you. Good evening.

MR. MICHAELSON: You need to start with your name.

MR. VANDYKE: My name is Marijo Vandyke, and I live in Poway. And I'm here to ask some questions and make some observation about the NOP that I reviewed. The purpose of the Sunrise Powerlink project is threefold. It's to ensure reliability of services, utilize renewable resources, and reduce energy costs. In speaking about reliability, I'd like to look at the possibilities for service interruptions. The draft EIR/EIS should examine in particular I feel that a potential for wildfires and also earthquakes.

Wildfires are frequent in the back country of San Diego and Imperial counties. The proposed new line, in particular this one segment, I'll just call out for an example. The line that extends from San Vicente Road to Sycamore Canyon Substation is following the route of the Cedar fire. The possibility of severe damage to transmission lines and equipment above ground are very high. And, therefore, that's just one area that could be affected and cut the link that San Diego County will grow to rely on for its energy.

The other natural disaster that's very frequent in southern California and in the Imperial County specifically is earthquake. From El Centro, Calexico, to Mexicali that area — the Imperial Valley and the Vallecitos Mountains are the most active seismic fault area in California today. If you open the newspaper on any given day and look to see where the seismic events of any consequence are, they're always in those areas. The potential of a magnitude 7 or greater event or multiple events is also very high. Service interruptions should be anticipated and should be planned for.

When addressing renewable energy sources, I question when the use of geothermal sources will cause subsidence in the Imperial Valley. I also question whether any sources of power will be located in Mexico. Specifically, I'm referring to page 17 of the NOP under Potential Impact for Air Quality." What is meant by "power plants provided imported power"? Is the purpose of this project not to utilize renewable energy resources primarily?

Generated capacity for San Diego region is being hotly debated. We know the South Bay power plant is due to come back online. And it is right now characterized in the NOP as outdated and ineffective. It is, however, undergoing a complete overhaul, so it should be included in the calculation for power generation in the area.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, Marijo.

MR. VANDYKE: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: David Regendardt.

MR. REGENDARDT: Hi. My name is David Regendardt, and I live in Rancho Peñasquitos. And I'm here for two reasons. One, I live in Rancho Peñasquitos and I live across the street from the current power lines. There are three reason 13 years ago my wife and I decided to move across the street from the power lines. And every time during the summertime we go to the neighbors pool and we understand why we didn't live on the canyon. It's because of the buzz. It's because of the only thing you can see from your backyards are these lines that are there. That's what it is. The concept of burying cables coming through and adding underground appeals to me, you know, personally. So that's my PQ part of this.

Next, you all heard from my cousin out in Borrego. We have land that you all want to cross. We're surrounded by state park, and the concept of bringing new wires and new towers through the state park across our land and up and above just frightens me. First of all, the ability to be able to build within the state park is something new, you know. What's next? Is Old Faithful going to have towers over top? There should be a line drawn. Our state parks are for everyone to enjoy.

We are the keepers of our property. We have 800 acres over there. Through the years we've opened up our property to universities, to various groups to come and study the Native American artifacts

that we have. We have kitchens, bones, burial sites. We have actual marked trails where they walked hundreds of years ago. It's an incredible thing. And in my family's opinion, we take better care of our property than the park would. And we have talked through the years about someday when we can't afford to pay the property tax or something happens, the first thing we would do is either donate it into the park or to a conservatory to maintain what it is.

We have no intention of building. Dropping in those towers through our canyon would have such an incredible impact between the workers, the helicopters, the steel, all the things that go with it. The impact on the animals. We have mountain lions. We have endangered long horn sheep. And I bet you a dollar, if I look carefully I could find a small tsetse fly that exists on our land.

Again, my thing is I really really oppose going through the state park for everyone's sake. And, of course, personally, I really don't want you coming through our land. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: It probably was just a misspeak, but I do want to be clear that SDG&E is not sitting up in front of you. So when you say "you all want to cross" and "you want to do this," I want to be clear that this is CPUC and the BLM, and it's not their proposed project.

Mr. Vildibill.

MR. VILDIBILL: My name is Mike Vildibill and now that I pronounce my last name I used my three minutes.

MR. MICHAELSON: I don't count that.

MR. VILDIBILL: Okay. Thank you. I live at the southern edge of the city of Poway and I currently have 437 kilovolt lines going adjacent to our community. This is the Rolling Hills community in Poway. And the Sunrise Powerlink project proposed to increase that the 667 kilovolts directly adjacent to these homes. And when you compare the 667 total kilovolts that this community would have compared to the 200 kilovolts that are being proposed to some new communities there's a stark contrast between the impact of the community that's sharing the burden or carrying the burden of a large set of wires going through their neighborhood as opposed to a neighborhood that's dealing with a mere 230 kilovolts.

So I ask that the environmental impact study include recommendation to install incremental lines under the ground for those communities that are already shouldering the burden of having overhead lines already in their backyards. By not considering the undergrounding of these incremental lines, the CPUC — the CPUC is really telling every citizen in San Diego that's impacted by Sunrise Powerlink that once you get a transmission line installed, that there's no end to what will come in next. And that there should be, I think, serious consideration taken to undergrounding incremental power lines even through communities that currently are shouldering the burden of having overhead lines.

Which, finally, I wanted to pointed out that some communities — and Rolling Hills in Poway is one such community — had a very difficult time engaging SDG&E during the planning process through unreturned phone calls, broken promises of returning phone calls, and whatnot. And we look at the SDG&E proposal that does have undergrounding through some communities and not ours, and I ask that you and your planning take into consideration that that wasn't our intent. And it wasn't a result of our lack of interest or attempt but some communities simply were unable to engage and to influence those — that proposal as it went in. So don't take the proposal that SDG&E put in as a reflection of what the community's input into the process.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Next speaker is Martha Sullivan.

MS. SULLIVAN: Hi. I'm Martha Sullivan, and again, I live in Poway. Just a brief interruption, I did work for the day Public Utilities Commission for almost 20 years, and I was at that table for a number of years managing so I know how you feel when they talk about "you all."

With that, briefly a few things I wanted to mention. One, it seems like to me that there is basically going to be surplus capacity at the north ends of this 500 kV lineup in Warner Springs or wherever it ends up ending. So I would assume a cumulative impact or some kind of analysis of growth including impacts whatever that surplus provides the pathway for.

And we all know that there's been a number of proposals to build similar lines northward, so things like the Rainbow transmission line, there's definitely examples out there, proposals to do just that. So I would say that this EIR/EIS is going to have to consider that their real prospect by bumping this much capacity at the north end of that 500 kV line.

You've probably heard this already, but there's been a lot of questions about feasibility of Sterling, or the technology out in Imperial Valley the feasibility of it when it's going to be available, whether this line would be built and what by holding that out as the, you know, source of renewable power, we actually one are starring San Diego County for the media pipe dream; and two, are we redirecting, you know, limited resources of energy and time to that project that really ought to be going to ones that are more feasible and more short-term.

And that leads me to my last point, which — it strikes me that the No Project Alternative is going to have to include all the recent legislation that's been enacted. That calls for the global warming solutions that was just signed, the global emission standards for electricity emission, sellable energy standard, then the California Solar Initiative that was signed last year. We can't — in the past we might have said there's nothing concrete we don't think it's feasible so we're not going to study that as an alternative. Just now it is required by law. It is feasible. There's technology in place to do it. It will meet many of the objectives of the project. So I would argue that this has to be part of the No Project — not a separate alternative?

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm not sure the court reporter got the last Cal what? The Cal --

MS. SULLIVAN: California Solar Initiative.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. The next speakers coming up are Keith Ritchey, John Callahan, Grazyna Krajewska, Robert Reich, and I believe that's Laura Copic.

MR. RITCHEY: I have copy of my notes, if I can provide it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Sure.

MR. RITCHEY: Hi. I'm Keith Ritchey. I'm a Peñasquitos resident, west Chase Homeowners Association. And I'm representing West Chase Homeowners Association here today. When I look at this project, the overall project, I don't know whether it's needed. I have my suspicions about the need for the project. I don't know whether the coastal link is needed in entirety, but I'm very concerned about the way they route the coastal link to Peñasquitos, specifically addressing the link from the Chicarita Substation area over to the end of Park Village Road area. And the look of alternatives that SDG&E even studies to see what could be done there. I have proposed that analyze three different routes through the area.

The first one would continue at Chicarita and run up to Carmel Valley Road where it would go underground under that roadway. SDG&E has franchise right of way to run under the roadway. It would run about 3 miles underground and then transition near the Evergreen Nursery back to the overhead lines and would impact far fewer homes than — SDG&E's proposed route.

Another one that they didn't study is running under or in the median of State Route 56, which runs from the Chicarita Substation over about three miles to where the overhead lines again could be joined and that would impact no homeowners and would also be underlying, less expensive. Both of those alternatives would be less expensive than the proposed route.

The third route that we had looked at was running through a little more of the park or the preserve, as we call it, an area that is an abandoned sewage area and along some lines up to the park where the ball parks are. And then it would turn and run up Mercy Road into the existing area in Scripps Ranch where there are overhead lines. That alternative impacts far fewer homes. Again, it is a much better alternative than SDG&E's proposal. The reason West Chase is so concerned is, we have a park for 1500 feet along this easement. It's a landscaped private park where our children play. And this line either overhead initially as proposed or underground would run right through the middle of that park, 3 feet underground where kids are playing. We're going to have a 230 kilovolt line. It's just not an acceptable alternative. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. And can you — are you going to keep that, or is that in the materials you gave us?

MR. RITCHEY: The final map is on the back as a copy of this and has a copy on it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very very much. Next speaker, John Callahan.

MR. CALLAHAN: My name is John Callahan. Although I do not live in Poway or the directly affected areas, I live in Escondido. I'm an electrical engineer. When I read about this project — which I probably haven't read as much as a lot of you folks — I kind of understand the concerns that have been mentioned up to now about the lines go over personal property. I kind of sympathize with the concerns that having power over one's property can induce. EMI, take that concern to heart.

Even though I'm not directly affected, I thought I would like to make sure that existing rights of way that exist between the east and the west of this link, that whether SDG&E has power rights-of-way as well as natural gas pipelines, rail lines, oil or diesel pipelines, all of these rights-of-way highways that was mentioned earlier that exist that impact, I think, a minimum number of people in terms of their property, their houses, their children. If one could take a look at those rights-of-way and see if any of those links or segments could be incorporated into the powerlink.

I kind of agree that the powerlink is necessary. I agree that we need more power. San Diego has shown that they need more power by their growth. So, in summary, I would like to recommend that this report, this EIR/EIS report, entail and encompass the possibility of using highways, rail lines, natural gas lines, water sewer lines, run these utilities in common as much as possible so we don't affect our residences, our children with the EMF and EMI that is generated by power. Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you it. Grazyna Krajewska.

MS. KRAJEWSKA: I'm Grazyna Krajewska. I see the power lines from my windows although I'm not very close to them. But there are other things that I will — very close to them, and here I found the chart that you have of electromagnetic field that goes up quite a lot with the number of kilowatts? So I think that whatever it was acceptable when the houses were built possibly was fine. Maybe it was already too much. But quite likely, I think, more power lines would increase electromagnetic fields. And I also have the progress, and it's really time to understand ground or power lines period. They should not be hanging there anyway.

Now, another issue is, we saw that energy in general — we like solar energy. I like energy system project. So far the contract is signed for 300 megawatts. That part of the contract would be fulfilled without, I think, an extra power line. Existing power lines are good enough. The project can go to 900 megawatts, the standing energy system. They don't necessarily want one giant project. What they want — they want to be able to have access. Oh, they want to be able to produce big vat of energy collectors. So my concern is okay. When you want these 300 megawatts, don't build any more power lines. Look for a space. Standard energy collectors will use a little bit of efficiency. That is not optimal, but they would work just fine with power anywhere. So there could be some other ideas that are close to existing power lines that are underutilized where these smaller collector lines could be put in, and then no power lines would be needed. What I think you should look at where the probably applies — it applies to us and SDG&E and quite likely for the brand there the collectors closer to San Diego are more expensive. Then you would save on the power lines, so the cost of the project could be less.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you very much. Robert Reich.

MR. REICH: My name is Bob Reich, and I'm in Peñasquitos. I concur with the earlier speaker which suggested that this powerlink is debatable. From an implementation point of view, it hasn't been considered with the whole issue of energy for the city of San Diego considering sources that are nonsolar which will provide for the next 20, 30 years — according to the most educated studies, 90 percent of the power for us in the U.S. — and so the forthcoming Rosarito plant, energy from the north are going to be the principal appliers of energy.

And I've worked a little bit on solar and I've done quite a bit of reading. And the assumption that we're going to have in the near future huge solar farms in Imperial County is ridiculous. And so this should be considered a cost benefit. There may be some politicians who think we've got to get solar energy going in Imperial County now torpedo the cost but we who are going to be affected by immature technology crossing the lines should be in the loop, as I assume we are. Also, the cost benefits are important because most of us want underground power lines which involve cooling at quite an expense which involves liquid nitrogen being pumped through, and the estimated cost versus open is 2 to 500 to 1. Why are we being subjected to this burden? Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Laura Copic.

MS. COPIC: My name is Laura Copic from the Poway-Carmel Valley Community Board and Carmel Valley Concerned Citizens. I think it's clear that nobody wants the power lines in their backyard. Nobody wants transmission lines. That's pretty obvious. So in light of that, I don't want them in my backyard. I don't want them in anybody's backyard. We feel strongly that nonwire alternatives for this transmission line should be consciously pursued. The transmission first strategy proposed by SDG&E appears to be in conflict with the Energy Action Plan and the San Diego Regional Energy Strategy, which maximizes demand reduction distribution rates and others in county generation and renewables before transmission is preferred strategy to attaining our future energy needs.

In addition, this transmission line would be a visible, audible relied upon our state park --

MR. MICHAELSON: You're going to get one more chance. You have to slow down.

MS. COPIC: — and as well as fire and health hazard to nearby residents.

I want to specifically address the area in Carmel Valley. The line travels — the proposed line travels underground in Rancho Peñasquitos and then comes up above ground right before it hits a neighborhood in Carmel Valley or Carmel Country Highlands where there is an existing overhead transmission line. There's actually a large what we call "the lattice structure" with 230 kilovolts, and then

there's 138 kilovolts circuit on a lower profile wooden structure, which is not very visible. SDG&E proposes to add an additional 230 kilovolts on another tall tower. I did want to point out the NOP indirectly identifies the towers that we currently have as — I think they call them monopole or whatever the single pole structure is — when they're actually the lattice structure poles.

We obviously would love to see all of the lines go underground. We feel that our community is being essentially wired off from the Peñasquitos Preserve. It is along the border of the Preserve that these lines are located. And we do feel — and I want to say I agree with Mike Vildibill that we feel like those communities that already have power lines are not being considered by SDG&E at all in spite of the fact that we've approached them several times about this.

We feel only by limiting our underground preferred route in dissection can be impacted and be meaningfully mitigated. If underground is not feasible, we would also like to evaluate the slower stack cables and further consolidation of the line. We feel like newer technology definitely exists, and we certainly agree that prudent avoidance is applicable even in those communities where the lines currently exist.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Tom Kluczynsia.

MR. KLUCZYNSIA: My name is Tom Kluczynsia, and I'm in Rancho Bernardo. But I also have property out in Borrego, and I didn't get to speak out there or make it out there yesterday.

I'm kind of curious. Have you ever had anybody come up and say "Go ahead. Put it in my backyard?" I'm just curious. The alternate route I saw in the paper but by the canyon — that as to an aesthetics value, that would ruin a lot of aesthetics of when you come into Borrego down Montezuma Grade because you peak the mountain top there and it's just the prettiest — at least in my opinion and a lot of other people's opinion — just wide open vast wilderness. And to have a power line run up there would ruin that whole thing.

And I know you guys got a tough job. SDG&E has a tough job too. It doesn't seem like — no matter where you go, you're going to run into problems. But the southern route I've heard that want to keep out of the fire threat areas, and the southern route where they already have one seems like it east fire threat area to do the if you run another line parallel to that. And, like you say, you haven't knocked off any of previous alternatives.

I was looking at Figure 8, Item D, that seemed to be a second one that I thought would be better than taking any of them through Borrego. I have to admit, I've been up by the canyon and if it has to run it comes on to it, then so be it. But not Uptopp Canyon. That would ruin a lot of Borrego's appeal. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. That was all the speaker cards that I have so far, but I do want to ask if there is anybody else who would like to speak. Did we miss you on the way in? So what I see is somebody actually has a card filled out. If we could have somebody on the staff bring these cards, and I'll call you and have you come up.

But, Mr. Payne, do you have one already?

MR. PAYNE: Good evening. I thank you for coming out to Rancho Peñasquitos. My name is Harvey Payne, and I am the chair of Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens. I believe this panel is already aware that Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens is an intervener within the proceeding.

I would like to respectfully note that the rate payers not only here in San Diego county but, frankly, all over the state are counting on the PUC to fully develop an unbiased record of alternatives. Specifically it is extremely important the it energy division and its consultants provide a thorough nonwires alternative or alternatives. While parties such as ERPA have accepted the study of nonwires alternatives, the weight given to a thorough study by nonaliant consultants will probably be given greater weight. RPCC believes that are for a number of nonwire alternatives to this proposed project including additional inbasin generation, distributed generation demand reduction, conservation efficiency measures, and AMI to name a majority of the option and combination of these options. Or perhaps even one specifically inbasin generation would make up for the significant gap that SDG&E claims is going to exist in the future.

We also encourage the PUC to look closely at the projected numbers that SDG&E has put forward. Some say it's almost impossible to build new inbasin generation. That's just not the case here in San Diego. Within the last five years, we've built one power plant and permitted another power plant. In addition, our two old plants are right for repowering. One, as the commission is well aware, has already submitted an application to repower to the ECC. Therefore, the inbasin generation option clearly is a viable option.

In addition, a piece of property on the southwestern edge of MCAS Miramar was specifically set aside by the federal government a few years ago for the sighting of a new power plant to San Diego's future needs. It's just isn't true that transmission is our only option. We can get this done with inbasin generation alone. Yet I would submit that there are a variety of other alternatives that in combination with each other probably provides the best mix. I know that I'm coming to the end of my time, so I will allow a few other people to use their time, and I will come back and finish my comments.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. I have more speaker cards filled out. Michelle Ritchey, Mark Schmidt, Weixing Chen, and Aurele Gilleran.

Again, I apologize if I mispronounced them. So, Helen Dominguez.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Hi. My name is Helen Dominguez. I live in Park Village. My concern is specifically with EMF transmission. Even though I'm of the option that the SDG&E is look at putting the lines underground, I still have concerns with EMFs because from things that, well, that I've read and — there's even a report that I've seen on CPUC web site that states that there's contradictions with increased amounts of brain tumors in children, essentially in young children. And there are a lot of young children in the Park Village community. The lines are also pretty close to Park Village Elementary which, if you look on the map, it's just behind a park also, a public park where a lot of children play. So my concerns are with these issues and it's in the first line of the scope — that is, it's to promote the safety, health, et cetera. So I don't believe that that's being looked at too well if the line is running too close to an elementary school, too close to a park, and too close to houses.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Michelle Ritchey.

MS. RITCHEY: My name is Michelle Ritchey. I'm on the West Chase Homeowners' Association board. And I'd just like to reiterate we live in a very dense community of attached homes and there is a about 150 foot easement. And we all knew at the time that, yes, it was an SDG&E easement. But it's also a planned community with no overhead lines, no visible lines. We have a lot of homes that are adjacent to the park, actually have gates that go into the park. The closest homes sit only 5 feet from the that fence. And it would be devastating for those lines to go through the park.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. RITCHEY: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Mark Schmidt.

MR. SCHMIDT: My name is Mark Schmidt. I'm a resident of Scripps Ranch. Like other speakers, I'm also concerned about the aesthetics, noise, public safety, impact of additional power lines. I'm particularly concerned about the Chicarita Substation including Scripps Ranch and Poway. To mitigate these concerns where we want to reiterate the option of using more underground routing. I'd also like to see an easy way to understand a quantifiable analysis of these impacts.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Weixing Chen.

MR. CHEN: Hi. My name is Weixing Chen. I'm a resident in the West Chase — West Chase Community. I just want to let you know that, based on my reading, that the power line is going to — we have a community park across the whole community greenbelt. It's very beautiful, kids and children, paradise. And the — on both sides of the park it's the house. And the proposed line is going to go through the middle of the park, and distance between the lines to house, it's about — based on my variation, it's about 23 to maybe 40 feet. And although they propose under the ground, it's going to be under the ground.

But I read one article at your published, world famous journal called Nature couple months ago, talked about the potential big earthquake in southern California, and San Diego is one of the areas that can be affected by this big disaster. And I'm wondering if you put the power — if SDG&E put the power line under the ground just like 20 feet from the house, what about the earthquake cause a big fire there? And this going to really devastate to life and the public. I just wondering whether or not it's a standard if SDG&E put this power underground, what's the distance it should be from the house? 20 feet is just too close. So that's all I want to say.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

MS. GILLERAN: My name is Aurele Gilleran, and I'm in the Rolling Hills Estates in Poway.

I have two concerns: EMF and property values. Ours is a community where the power lines will be overhead, basically in the backyards of our neighbors. And as I look through the scoping process and everything that was presented tonight, I don't see any agency that represents our health. We're concerned about fish and game, other speakers talked about the beauty of Borrego desert and all that. But my question is, Who represents the health of the residents in the community through which the power lines pass? Is there anybody that represents our health?

And the second is, there's also no one apparently that is concerned or represents the property values of the homeowners that could tell us what the potential impacts would be on our property values of a second huge power line going through the backyard of our community.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Next speaker is Demian Dorrance.

MR. DORRANCE: Good evening. I'm a resident in the Carmel Valley community.

MR. MICHAELSON: We just need your name. Thank you.

MR. DORRANCE: Demian Dorrance, resident of Carmel Valley.

I wanted to make a couple comments just very briefly about what it's been like as a homeowner and someone in the community trying to learn about the CPUC process and become involved at the same

time working under a community that's rather a major marketing campaign, really is. What I'm thinking of is SDG&E is spending I don't know how much money, but I know a lot of their staff — some of them very nice, some not so nice. We can't listen to Padre games, you know, during the baseball playoffs without hearing all of these commercials that tell us how great Sunrise Powerlink is going to be, solving all the power needs of our community.

Well, there are alternative viewpoints on that and it's tough to cut through that message as individuals. I hope that you'll listen to the comments of the people here who live in this region. We do have a regional energy strategy that spells out what is favored over transmission for power generation, and that's inbasin generation and repowering of our power plants. The alternatives to go around Anza-Borrego, which I personally support, I think Anza-Borrego is deserving of protection and preserving, of maintaining its wilderness designation. The alternatives they have just recently presented are not real alternatives. They look to me much like a poison pill. They're things that SDG&E knows will be completely unacceptable when looked at from a variety of angles. There hasn't been a no-wires alternative presented. And I believe that there should be and that the commission should seek that from SDG&E, whoever the involved parties are.

Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve is a very special preserve. It's about 7 miles long. It's the largest coastal preserve in the city of San Diego. One half of it is in the coastal zone. It certainly took a lot of people many decades of work to make sure that that was there, and I believe that land and open space is deserving of the same protections as Anza-Borrego.

Currently as has been proposed, lines would be undergrounded in Peñasquitos if this project were to proceed. I certainly feel strongly — and I know many members of my community feel strongly — that the lines should be continued underground through the second half of the Preserve that they would traverse if the coastal link was approved. That's all my comments for today.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

MS. DORRANCE: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Next speaker is Glenn Halchadorian.

MR. HALCHADORIAN: Hi. My name is Glenn Halchadorian, a Peñasquitos resident. And my primary concern is the stated goals of the power line to increase reliability, lower cost, et cetera. I cannot find anywhere on the CPUC web site or anywhere in the documentation to what degree those goals will be met. And so I believe that the public at large is at a disadvantage to evaluate the proposal because there's no hard numbers as to what is going to be met in terms of goals. And so I would strongly encourage the CPUC to request SDG&E provide those numbers. To what degree will reliability be enhanced? To what degree will renewable energy resources be used? And to what degree will energy costs be reduced as to rate payers for what benefit it is to us. Because we all know there's a cost. There's a cost to the public at large. And so what will be saved going forward?

And then my second point is specifically on the coastal link. I reiterate and encourage the previous speaker's point that that most — Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve is a special canyon, is a special asset to the San Diego city and county. And I would encourage that the entire coastal link were buried if it would be approved. Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Do you have any other cards turned in? Anyone else who would like to speak who has not already before we go back for seconds? Yes, sir. Come forward.

MR. BRAUN: My name is Tad Braun. I'm a resident in the West Chase Homeowners over there in Peñasquitos. I just have a couple quick questions. Couple niggling thoughts actually.

I'm concerned that this new Sterling solar farm is this new technology that's — it's in infancy. And it's supposed to go to full blown major proportions that provide all of the alternative energy over this 500 kilovolt line. What happens if it doesn't fill out? What will fill the line? Where will that power come from? I'm very afraid they will take it from Mexicali plant. And then there's this whole Imperial Valley pollution plant with the Mexicali plant. I'm very concerned where the power is going to come from if Sterling doesn't pan out.

One thought I had. There exists — I believe it's a 230 kilovolt power line already along the border all the way over to south San Diego. What would stop SDG&E from perhaps swapping the line, put the 500 kilovolt along the border and run the 230 along the existing route that they're proposing for Powerlink? The benefit I see there is it might take away SDG&E's — what I consider their sneaky proposal to sell power to L.A. which is the only reason I think they're going forward with this line, is to someday connect to sell to L.A. once the ISO contracts sell out. I'm proposing they swap the lines, run the 500 south, run the 230 north and they go ahead and underground in Peñasquitos, and all those other places as well, and come cross I believe in Anza-Borrego Park, there's already shorter poles. They could just put the 230 on that pole, I believe. They would haven't to raise it as high. So, then, there goes the visual across the end of Borrego Park. Just a couple thoughts.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Those are good scoping comments that what we're looking for. Thank you.

Anyone else who wants to speak before we give those who couldn't finish in their first allowed amount of time?

At this point anybody who's ready to come up and take a second helping, please feel to do so. All we need is for you to give us your name again.

MR. PAYNE: Harvey Payne. I'd like to turn to the issue of one of SDG&E's stated goals for the project, which is to get access to renewables. A new transmission line is not needed to get access to the foreseeable economical, realistic renewable resources that exist out in the Imperial Valley. We have a 1900 megawatt 500 kilovolt line called the Southwest Powerlink. If the State of California desires to have our future energy resources come from renewables and to the extent that those are located out in the desert, why don't we load up that Southwest Powerlink with every single renewable megawatt we can possibly put on it? We have a line that goes to the exact same place where this new line is scheduled to begin.

In addition, there are existing paths coming north out of the Imperial Valley in the SE, territory that could be used to transport renewables as well both existing proposed future upgrades and more specifically, the proposed LADWP green path — traditional real green path project.

I'm sure the PUC and the BLM and its consultants are painfully aware of the difficulty of selling a new transmission line from the Imperial Valley here to San Diego. It's significant.

In summary, there are no good options. The cost of putting in this line is simply too high from an economic standpoint, from an environmental standpoint, not to mention the human impact of this line all the way from the Imperial Valley through our state park, through our beautiful back country, through our preserves — as close as the Los Peñasquitos Preserve here in San Diego, ending up just a mile from the coast. Ranch Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens looks forward to providing detailed written

comment to the PUC concerning alternatives to being developed by RPPC within the coastal link which will include both nonwires and alternative route analysis. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. COPIC: Hi. Laura Copic again. I want to reiterate everything Harvey said. And our desire to see nonwired alternatives fully vetted.

I also wanted to get very specific as I see that's what kind of input you're looking for with regard to the coastal link in Carmel Valley. There is a substantial adverse effect of the Scenic Vistas neighborhood enjoyed with the Los Peñasquitos Preserve, and more prevalent towers and wires would increase the wiring-off effect of the public from the preserve and further reduce the public access. These wires and towers along the Preserve's edge is also notable for those in the Preserve on both sides of the Preserve. And it is visible from the school and public places, from everywhere in our community. There they are biological effects there already its orientation caused by new home and road construction near the Preserve's edge and wildlife corridor, and it's already causing the deer population to wander up onto the road. And there's been several deer mortalities. And I suspect that the significant construction impact of adding more towers in this area will cause more disorientation and the displacement of other wildlife population as well.

There's a concern as to hazardous materials. The existing towers appear to be one quarter mile of Sage Canyon Elementary School. They are certainly visible from the school and close to children's homes. The school and homes could easily be impacted by any hazardous materials released during the construction operation of the circuits. There is a hydrology concern. Existing habitat trails have already been adversely impacted by shifting drainage patterns caused by new home construction, which we expect the construction of these additional towers to do the same. And we feel that that definitely needs to be avoided.

In terms of land use planning, there is the site of the Torrey Hills Peñasquitos — well, the Peñasquitos Substation. But that actually has a fuel pipeline beneath it as well, and it is the site of community park in Torrey Hills. There's many cumulative effects in the area, the increased wildfire risk in community and we do have density of vegetation because of the preserve, and we also have an inadequate response time because of the lack of a fire station in our area. And more wires would increase that risk. There's some concerns.

There's also the interstatewide and other construction projects that continue to impact our community. So, cumulatively, this is really much — a lot for our community to bear.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. KRAJEWSKA: Grazyna Krajewska. One further is the need for the power line. Like according to SDG&E, this 1.2 million electric meters in San Diego and thousand in the county. That's what SDG&E said. Now Sunrise Powerlink is going to be for 600,000 homes. San Diego route predicted by 2010 is hundred thousand homes. So definitely by 2010 we don't need the power for 650,000 homes. And the number of homes cannot be definitively. So there's some number of homes by 2030 but quite likely it's not 650,000. That's one thing.

Other thing. I look at the report and under "system," all things considered and implemented by SDG&E what they had — they had energy efficiency, they did not think it was enough. I agree. They have looked up solar but they consider, but they did not think it would be good enough. I think they might be wrong in that idea because there would be more locked up solar power. Okay. Maybe it won't be now, but there will be definitely much more. But then for distribution, generation what they considered it said

"small fossil fuel systems" is the only thing they considered for distribution generation. So I don't think they did their homework.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

We did say that we would have the opportunity also for Q & A. So if we've taken care of the people who want to add to their comments, we could move into this. If you wouldn't mind again coming to the microphone to state your comments.

MR. DORRANCE: Demian Dorrance again, Carmel Valley.

The proposed computer simulations that SDG&E has prepared to the impact to the Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley communities completely ignores all the homes and residences. They jump a 3-mile range and they picked the mall and the construction site to demonstrate no. The impact to the community would be — the impact is going to be far greater than is shown in these documents. And what they show is they show some low wooden structures being relayed by tall monopoles and moving existing circuits actually closer to homes than they are today. So not only would residents in the area naturally, as I do, prefer underground routing altogether. But I think it's reasonable to expect that any rerouting of existing circuits not be placed closer to people's residences than they already are today.

Those of us who bought in the area had to think long and hard about existing power lines and went through MSRF study before purchasing. And we certainly did not expect to see additional towers in that area, and we certainly didn't expect to see EMF ratings that are higher than we have accepted raising our families with. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Thank you.

Yes, sir?

MR. DORRANCE: Demian Dorrance. My final comment for the evening is I don't have a good understanding of how the various alternatives are evaluated and rejected. As I read through the NOP, I see that SDG&E has looked at things and rejected certain alternatives because they passed through high density housing. Well, the proposal as it exists today passes through high density housing. So I would encourage the PUC to have SDG&E and possibly an objective third party evaluate the alternatives so that we understand — and document the results — so that we understand how these various alternatives were rejected. One speaker spoke about burying one of the lines down the 56. That seems like an obvious solution to a problem. And yet it wasn't considered and it wasn't evaluated. So I'm at a loss as to understand how these various alternatives are evaluated and rejected and would encourage that document to be written. Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: I don't know whether you were here at the very beginning of the meeting, but CPUC and BLM are the independent third parties that are going to be doing the review of those alternatives, so they do a fresh from the start review.

MR. DORRANCE: Okay. Good. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, ma'am?

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Hi. Helen Dominguez again.

I just think it's important that in the documentation that's going to be brought forward that there's a full disclosure of what can happen — what kind of chemical releases can happen if there is a fire when it's underground or overhead towers that are involved because it is in such close proximity to the public

and the health is very important, especially with the children around. So I think it's important for somebody to do a study which will kind of — what toxicity would be in the air and what effects it is going to have on the people around it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. VILDIBILL: Hello. Mike Vildibill. I just wanted to make a very small point. It's actually an exclamation point on something that was stated earlier, but I felt that it needed to be brought out. We've all expressed concern and about whether SDG&E is doing something sneaky in trying to get power from Mexico into the United States. And that a topic that's reoccurring, and we don't ever seem to get a clear answer on how much of that is true or what degree that is true. But what you're collecting here also is community values and perspective on this. And I just want to say that I'm not alone in saying that many in the community have very deep and serious concerns about the prospect of increasing our reliance on foreign energy sources. And the idea of whether this really is a ruse to bring in power from Mexico — it does have environmental impact and potential for pollution impact. But I think also outside of the chart of your group but something that is of concern to the citizens is furthering increasing our reliance on foreign energy and looking at the trouble that continues to get our country and our region in something that we really don't want to be a part of. I do ask that you take serious consideration to the implication of Mexican energy as being part of this equation.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. All right. If you have a question that you would like to ask of the panel, they will do their very best to answer it. And because of where we are, early in the process, you may have some very good questions for which there are not answers.

And I just need you to come up to the microphone and state your name and ask your question.

MR. VANDYKE: Marijo Vandyke. I have concern about first responders and neighborhood fire fighting capacity when it comes to dealing with overhead towers and these high voltage lines. I'm wondering if the City San Diego, City of Poway have the kind of equipment and training to deal with these mega lines. If there were to be a fire, how would they approach it? You're looking at a tower in the picture there's that's 160 feet tall, something like that. It is the size and height of a high-rise building. And yet this is in a suburban area where these types of buildings don't normally occur. And I'm wondering if there's capacity in the firefighter community to be able to handle that.

MR. MICHAELSON: I'll take that as a scoping comment for us to look at in the document as opposed to something that they can answer tonight. Is that okay?

MR. VANDYKE: Yes. I think it's clear that you're the independent assessor, let's say, of the alternatives. I wanted to ask if that is just going to be an evaluation of the alternatives already proposed by SDG&E and other sources or all alternatives on the table, and you'll be pursuing that.

MR. MICHAELSON: A little louder.

MR. VANDYKE: Okay. I have some written comments.

MR. MICHAELSON: Please, if you have anything that you were reading from that you would have in writing, we'd love have to it. Thank you very much.

Anyone else have a question? If not, we sincerely appreciate all the time and energy you put into doing your homework and taking time out of your busy lives to come and visit with us tonight. This has been a nice capstone on a series of some very useful and fruitful meeting that we've had.

And with that you're adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 8:29 p.m.)