

**REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING
RE: SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT
CPUC/BLM SECOND ROUND OF SCOPING MEETINGS
FOR PREPARATION OF DRAFT EIR/EIS**

Held 7:00 p.m. February 6, 2007
At Ramona, California

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

STAFF PRESENTATION

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

Presentation: pages 3 to 9
Public Comments begin on page 9

PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER

Mr. Wise	10
Mr. Younger	11
Mr. Kiefer	11-12
Mr. Trafecanty	12
Ms. Gansert	13
Mr. Zelmer	13,18
Mr. Coon.....	14
Mr. Scott	14
Mr. Jones	15
Ms. Conklin.....	15,18
Mr. Hardcastle-Taylor	15
Ms. Ayer	16
Ms. Gaczy.....	17
Mr. Johnson	18
Mr. Yepiz.....	18

STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. My name is Lewis Michaelson and I've been hired by the California Public Utilities Commission and the Bureau of Land Management to serve as a moderator tonight and, actually, all the scoping meetings being held here this week throughout San Diego and Imperial County. And as many of you already know, we already had three meetings, one in Rancho Penasquitos, one in Imperial County, and one in Wynola. And so far I would have to say they've been going extremely well in terms of providing a lot of good information and input to the panel that you see before you today, which is the purpose of doing the scoping.

As I'm sure almost all of you know, this is the second round of scoping meetings. The first one focused on the proposed project itself, the one that was proposed by San Diego Gas & Electric. And out of that came a lot of feedback about potential environmental impact concern as well as potential alternatives that people wanted to see considered. And the reason we came back for a second round, which is not usually done in the process, is because there was so much work done in terms of flushing out and adding to and modifying and eliminating various alternatives that in many ways it's like a whole new project in some ways. And so out of fairness to all of you, it was felt that it was a good idea by the two agencies to come back out and do a second round specifically on the alternatives since there's so much new to look at.

The agenda for today is to have Billie Blanchard with the California Public Utilities Commission, she's going to talk about the actual process and give you an update on the schedule, which has changed somewhat since the first one, since the first round of scoping meetings. Then Lynda Kastoll with Bureau of Land Management will talk about their role in this review process. Susan Lee with the Aspen Environmental Group will then talk about the potential impacts that have been considered and will be analyzed in the EIS/EIR. Billie Blanchard will then talk about how the screening process took place in terms of adding and subtracting various alternatives. And, finally, we'll finish up in terms of presentations with Susan Lee talking about those alternatives that were retained or eliminated with the particular focus on the region directly around here. Then we'll get to the most important part of the evening which will be your opportunity to comment orally.

I already have quite a few speaker slips that have been filled out. If you missed that somehow on your way in, please feel free to go back to the registration table, grab one, fill it out. I will be calling people in the order in which they signed up to speak tonight.

So what are we doing here to night? Part two, scoping. The purpose is to inform the public and responsible agencies about the alternatives proposed for full analysis in the EIR/EIS. That's the Environmental Impact Report, Environmental Impact Statement, which is yet to be prepared. Is to inform you about the review process and final schedule, is to influence input about the proposed project, that's where you come in. And, finally, after the completion of this scoping there will be a second alternative scoping report for distribution to the repository and placed on the web site.

One thing that's sometimes lost in this process is exactly who are the actors and who's with you today and who's not with you today. I want to make it really clear that San Diego Gas & Electric is the Applicant, but they are not part of this proceeding. But who you see before you today is California Public Utilities Commission and the Bureau of Land Management, which have regulation authority over the land and the decision-making in regards to the environmental review process, as well as Susan Lee

and many others that I know you got a chance to meet here during the poster session from Aspen Environmental who was hired by these two agencies to help them in the preparation of the document.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Billie Blanchard for our next presentation.

MS. BLANCHARD: Good evening. Just for a quick overview, the CPUC has two parallel review processes going on with SDG&E's application for the CPCN, the general proceeding portion and the environmental review portion which we are doing at this table. The CPCN general proceeding is being led by the assigned Commissioner Dian Grueneich and Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman.

The scope of the proceeding is defined by the Public Utilities Code 1002, which is determining need for the project, considering community values, historic aesthetic values, park, recreation and environmental impact. A few highlights on the schedule for the general proceeding where we are now, there was several prehearing conferences that have already been held. A scoping memo came out which outlines the issues and the schedule for the proceeding and that came out in November of 2006. There was some slight revisions to the schedule in January of 2007 through an administrative judge ruling. Testimony will start being exchanged beginning in January of 2007. Evidentiary hearings beginning in July of 2007. The ALJ's proposed decision is expected to come out in December of 2007. And a commission decision by January of 2008.

The last time we were out on our scoping meetings we didn't have a defined schedule for the environmental review process. We do now at this point. Right now — we've already done a first round of scoping and we are now doing a second round of scoping on alternatives. And then we have a scoping period that's January 24th to February 24th. And we will have a second scoping report coming out that will be available to everyone in March of 2007. We are anticipating the release of the Draft EIR/EIS by July of 2007. And there will be a 90-day comment period on this document from July 13th to approximately October 12th, 2007. And then a final document will be coming out in November of 2007. And then expect certification in January 2008.

Now, I'll turn it over to Lynda Kastoll from BLM.

MS. KASTOLL: Good evening. I'm Lynda Kastoll from BLM out of the El Centro field office. With me tonight is Daniel Stewart. He's sitting over there in the audience.

BLM became involved in this project in November of 2005 when SDG&E submitted an application to us to cross BLM lands for the construction of Sunrise Powerlink. There is approximately 31 miles of BLM land in Imperial County and about 1.3 miles in San Diego County, actually in this general area, I believe. We will also be considering a plan amendment to our California Desert Conservation Area Plan, because the proposed action will deviate from the designated utility corridors in that plan. In addition, the proposed project follows an existing right-of-way across Anza-Borrego Desert State Park that is administered by BLM. This is a right-of-way that was issued in 1955 as a continuance for a power project, federal power project. That right-of-way is 100-feet wide and contains a 69 kV line right now.

BLM is also responsible for coordinating with other federal agencies such as BIA, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service. Who else did I miss? DOD, or any other federal agencies that we need their expertise or have an interest in the project. We will use this EIS/EIR to make our decisions

as to whether or not to amend our Desert Plan and whether or not to issue that right-of-way to San Diego Gas & Electric to cross BLM land. Record of decision is expected in January of 2008.

Back to Susan.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Lynda. I'm Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group and I am part of the consultant team that's working on preparing the EIR/EIS for the CPUC and BLM. I'm going to talk a little bit from these maps, and just so you know, I know you can't see these very well up here, but you have them all in your handouts. They're attached to the notice. At the end of the notice there are a set of 10 maps. Just as an overview, the proposed project which is Figure 1 in that map set, we just want to remind you what the entire project is because the proposed project route itself is what rides the way we look at alternatives. We look at what the project is, look at different ways to avoid and eliminate the impacts of the proposed project. So it's a 150-mile long transmission project that is broken into two major components. The blue line on this map is a 500 kV high voltage transmission line starting down near El Centro at the Imperial Valley Substation, mostly in Imperial County but with about 25 miles in San Diego County and within Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. The 500 kV portion ends at a substation that would convert the power to 230 kV. This part of the route would come out through Santa Ysabel, down through where we are now, San Diego Country Estates, down along crossing Mussey Grade, Highway 67 into Sycamore Canyon Substation, and then continuing overhead with an underground piece also in Rancho Penasquitos down to the Penasquitos Substation.

The other components of this project besides the transmission line include, as I mentioned, a major substation that would be new up in the San Felipe area. It would be ultimately a 40-acre substation but require about 100 acres of grading. Also the reconductoring, which is putting new wires on an existing transmission line, south of the Sycamore Canyon Substation down to the Elliot Substation, about half of that is through Miramar. Two substations that are within the San Diego area would require internal upgrades. The one last component that we have incorporated into the proposed project is what we're calling future phases of the project. This is something that we have become aware of in the last month or so as SDG&E has been answering our data requests, understanding what would be the future build out of the Central East Substation. The answers that we've got to these questions state that in the future there could be as many as four additional 230 kV circuits coming out of the substation. They don't know where they would be. It would be speculative where they could go, but the most likely places would be to serve the growing areas in the areas of Escondido and then the whole northern part of San Diego City. So we're looking at and we will in our EIS/EIR analyze potential impacts of this expansion because it is reasonably foreseeable that a major substation like that would have future lines. So that's an additional component of the project that we haven't talked about before.

I'm going to quickly talk about some of the major impacts of the proposed project and I'll skip the Imperial Valley portion because we've been down there and I think most of you are really interested in the part that's further west. Briefly in Anza-Borrego, because I know everybody has got concerns about the Anza-Borrego issues, the major impact in Anza-Borrego is effects on designated wilderness. The project itself would actually be located within wilderness in one area and would require an extension of the right-of-way into wilderness on quite a bit of this six or eight-mile segment of the project. It would be highly visible, would have recreational impacts, impacts on endangered species. And, I think, I said recreational already.

The next slide talks about the Central Link. The Central Link really begins just west of Anza-Borrego and includes the San Felipe Valley, the Santa Ysabel Valley, we were up in that area today, a

very highly scenic area, and a lot of agricultural land, and these really are the major issues in this area. The next link is what we're in the middle of right now in San Diego Country Estates is the Inland Valley Link. This is an area where the region begins to get much more developed, so there are impacts here on residential areas. You know there's a major underground segment which you would drive on if you're driving back towards Ramona, so we're looking at potential for construction impacts. Also parks, San Diego — the Mt. Gower preserve is up on this one end. Both in the Inland Valley Link and the Central Link we know that there are major concerns about fire. We're looking at concerns about whether the line itself could increase the number of fires and also whether it would inhibit firefighting, so those are issues that we are going to include in the EIR/EIS. And then further west in the Coastal Link, this is, again, a very highly developed link, so the concerns are mainly associated with residential development.

I will turn it back to Billie to talk about alternatives.

MS. BLANCHARD: Thank you. Just quickly where we are in our process now is we are doing the second round of scoping. We've already done one scoping. We're doing this scoping on alternatives and we're basically in the process of screening the alternatives. We utilize the CEQA/NEPA criteria for screening alternatives and there's a great deal of discussion in the notice on Pages 6 through 9 that talks about the methodology that is generally utilized in screening alternatives for a CEQA/NEPA document. The reasonable range of alternatives is determined by three major things, the consistency with most or all project objectives. In this case we use the three main objectives of the liability, access to renewables, and economical benefit of cost of energy. We also looked at the ability to avoid or to reduce significant impacts of the proposed project that have been identified through the team, environmental team analysis, agency consultations, the applicant's PEA, numerous data requests, and scoping comments. And then the third criteria is feasibility. Technical feasibility, whether or not it can be built, if there's some problem that you couldn't build it. Reliability feasibility, can it be permitted. And legal feasibility in terms of could it be built under the law.

The source of alternatives that we included included alternatives suggested in the scoping comments, reconsideration of SDG&E's PEA alternatives, also a reconsideration of alternatives that were eliminated by SDG&E, and we also looked at alternatives from the CPUC proceeding filings and from the ISO alternative process.

The types of alternatives that we are considering is link and route segment alternatives, substation alternatives, Southwest Powerlink alternatives, full project route and system alternatives, as well as in-basin generation and other non-wires alternatives.

So now I'll turn it back over to Susan Lee and she'll talk more about the alternatives in specifics.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Billie. I'm going to skip this next slide because, again, the Imperial Valley Link is not something that we'll focus on today. Quickly in Anza-Borrego we have — in Anza-Borrego we were looking for the possibility of an alternative that would be entirely underground. And the only way to do that technologically at that point is to convert the project to a 230 kV transmission line further east. So the recommendation that we're carrying forward here is basically moving the substation from the Central East Substation, which is over here, all the way out here to San Felipe, which is an area just east of the park boundary, and expanding this to be the 40-acre substation rather than the one at the other end allowing this route to be installed underground all the way through the park, following

Highway 78 and not going up Grapevine Canyon, to the last mile of Highway 78 where there's a crossing of the Earthquake Valley Fault. And this is a major fault that's identified as an Alquist-Priolo Zone, which is a state-designated active fault. The route would have to become overhead for this last mile because of the risk to an underground system, then could go underground again for three more miles and then the same fault follows the road all the way up Highway S-2. But we did end up with almost the entire length of the park being underground.

The other alternative that we carried forward at this point for the EIR/EIS instead of having 150-foot right-of-way which SDG&E has proposed, the right-of-way through the park would be reduced to 100 feet eliminating any direct impact to wilderness, so rather than moving into wilderness in a couple of places where they have proposed, the towers be retained in the existing right-of-way that BLM has granted. The advantage is you have no direct impacts on wilderness. The disadvantage is you still have indirect impacts on wilderness, some greater impacts to some cultural resources, so that's Anza-Borrego.

Briefly the Central Link detail map here. If you look at Figure 4 in your package, I don't have that one up here, but we spent this afternoon on the Central Link. We have a couple of alternatives in Santa Ysabel, one that would following the existing right-of-way for the most part on the southern half of Highway 79 is east of the road instead of the west of the road. And we also have an alternative that would entirely — that would be overhead west of the road where the existing right-of-way is and then underground within Highway 79 where it's not coincident with the Elsinore Fault. We have another major fault in this area. So those are two alternatives that we're carrying forward in the Santa Ysabel area.

I know that most of you are from the Ramona area and San Diego Country Estates. This is an area that because SDG&E has proposed the original route having quite of bit of underground segments there were very few alternatives suggested to us when we were out here for scoping the last time. One of them was an extension of the underground less than a mile further east. It now would have ended the way SDG&E proposed it at the top of Mt. Gower preserve and then would have been overhead along the existing transmission line to the east. And the community in here along Oak Hollow Road suggested that we consider extending the underground another half mile or so further to the east. So we looked at that. That seems like a feasible alternative that at this point we plan to carry forward. We also looked at the possibility of extending the underground to the west. This was an area we found much more problematic. A western extension of the underground for a couple of more miles would have gone through Barnett Ranch Open Space Preserve. The double circuit underground in here would have been a wide swath of disturbance through this preserve that's being preserved for its biological habitat and has a very steep slope going down into the canyon on the west end. So this seemed like an alternative that would create more impacts than it would avoid and have some feasibility in terms of constructing as you drop down into that canyon. So that's one we recommended for elimination.

The other ones that I know that if you were participating in SDG&E's hearings over the last year and a half, they have spoken a lot about an alternative that would run along Creelman and through the Creelman Substation. That's one we do not propose to carry forward. It clearly would have greater impacts than the route they proposed. So these are all the alternatives that have been on the table in this segment.

I think I'll skip the Coastal Link if that's okay. There are many, many alternatives in the Coastal Link including a variety of underground alternatives because it's a much more urban link.

We do have substation alternatives. I mentioned earlier the proposed Central East Substation which would be located at basically the very northern end of this project. This substation requires an extensive amount of grading. It's a very irregular parcel topographically. We were looking for a possible location that would require much less grading, much less potential for erosion and it also is in line with the Earthquake Valley Fault. So we've got a substation possibility called the Mataguay Substation that's on Vista Irrigation District land just to the north, a little bit north and west of this proposed site.

Southwest Powerlink Alternatives. This is Figure 8 in the package that you have. When we started this project we were directed by the public utilities commissioner to look for alternatives that did not affect Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. And if you know the geography of Anza-Borrego, this green area is Anza-Borrego, it goes all the way down from about a mile and a half from the border. So in order to avoid Anza-Borrego, you need to go into this mile just south of Interstate 8, which is where the Southwest Powerlink and existing 500 kV transmission line is located. So we looked for alternatives that could co-locate with different links of the Southwest Powerlink. We have four that at this point we're proposing to retain, but are looking for comments on. One would follow Interstate 8. We got a lot of comments and suggestions during scoping that this existing I-8 corridor is one that should be considered, so we have an alternative that follows Interstate 8. One goes up through BLM land and through the national forest. This is called the BCD Alternative. A long history to these names. We have an alternative that primarily follows an SDG&E right-of-way. It has quite a bit of national forest land called the Route D Alternative. And then one that is entirely west of the forest, which creatively is called the West of Forest Alternative. This one is almost entirely on private land. And, again, this resulted from a concern that a lot of people have that the proposed route seemed to be developed by putting it primarily on protected lands. So we have a very wide range of alternatives down here.

We also have Transmission System Alternatives. This is Figure 9 in your package. These are alternatives that would use a different piece of the regional transmission system not connecting the Imperial Valley Substation to the Penasquitos Substation, but that would allow meeting of the project objectives in different ways entirely. The first one is the LEAPS project or the Lake Elsinore Advanced Pump Storage Project. This is a proposal in the Lake Elsinore/Cleveland National Forest area that would include about a 30-mile 500 kV transmission line connecting the Southern California Edison system, it's just off in this area, connecting Southern California Edison system with the San Diego Gas & Electric system, so it would allow San Diego Gas & Electric customers to benefit from a better transmission system between the two areas.

We also have two other smaller transmission upgrades. One, it actually would be in Mexico but would allow an increase in electrical reliability, the Mexico Light. That could be used in combination with other alternatives. And one called the Path 44 Upgrade, which is really a Southern California Edison transmission system upgrade in Orange County. That would benefit San Diego Gas & Electric by improving reliability and the ability to import power. And those two are being evaluated by the California Independent System Operator to see how they would work in terms of working with the transmission system.

The last big category of alternatives that we plan to retain, and this is in Figure 10 in your map package there, is what we call Non-Wires Alternatives. And these are alternatives that do not include a major transmission line component. What we started out with here and, again, in response to a lot of comments that we got during scoping was looking at the potential for in-basin renewables, which is not renewables from Imperial County necessarily but wind down from the Campo area, solar photovoltaics,

also solar thermal and biomass, biogas and combined together to allow renewable power and an increase in generation within San Diego.

The second one is all of those renewables plus this is what we call Resource Bundle One. Those renewables I just mentioned plus the addition of the South Bay Power Plant, which as you probably know is under review within San Diego to be looked to be rebuilt as a newer, cleaner power plant.

The next one called Resource Bundle Two is all of those, renewables, plus South Bay, plus the use of renewable energy certificates, which is a way that you could trade renewable energy credits without actually building a transmission line to bring them to you.

And the final one is in-area generation plus transmission, which is one that we want to retain as a sort of a flexible option where you might want to retain South Bay Power Plant and also have some transmission upgrades perhaps in Imperial County allowing better imported power into San Diego.

So that's our long list of alternatives.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for sitting through this presentation. As you can see there is a lot that has happened since the first round of scoping. And unlike the first round of scoping, as we said, which focused on the proposed action, if you want to take advantage of your speaking opportunity tonight and make the most of it, if you look here, these are the types of comments that are going to have the most impact tonight. And, that is, do you agree or disagree with the alternatives that have been proposed either for addition or for elimination, and if so, why do you support that. And, also, do you have any suggestions for any further modifications to the ones being considered or perhaps there are even some other new alternatives that have occurred that you didn't see and are under consideration. Those would be all very helpful during the second round that is focusing on alternatives.

There are a series of cards that have been turned into us by people indicating they would like to speak tonight. I'm going to call on you in the order in which you have been signed up. The speaking time is three minutes tonight. And I have a very sophisticated way of indicating time. When you have one minute left, I put my index finger up like this so you can find a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. And when your three minutes are finished, I put my closed hand up like this indicating it's time for the next speaker. So particularly if you're reading from prepared remarks, it's useful to look up occasionally so that you can see my high sign.

What we do know is that the vast majority of Americans are deathly afraid of public speaking and we don't want anyone to feel left out of this process because they didn't do this tonight, and so I want you to know that written comments are given the same weight and consideration and obviously they allow for much more extensive comments than oral comments would. And the deadline for those comments is February 24th. You have time to compose those if you want, or you probably also saw our written comment sheets that are available. If you want to save yourself the postage, you can fill those out and hand those in tonight. You can take them home and give them to your friends, too.

There is a lot of information besides what was handed out to you tonight and if your friends and neighbors want to learn more, I recommend that you make them aware of the web site, the one that is conducted by the California Public Utilities Commission that provides up-to-date information on this

process. For those of you who don't have access, there are also a list of 29 information repository where you can go and see things in hard copy. If after this meeting you have some questions or need clarification, there's also a project information line and e-mail address that you can call for information.

So with that, it's time for your comments. So I'm going to call — I know it's difficult sometimes to make your way to the microphone up there, so what I do is I read the first several names and keep doing that so you have an idea of when you're coming up in the rotation so you can be ready to go.

And you may or may not have noticed seated to my right we have a court reporter here. Her job is to make a verbatim transcript of everything that's said and that's why it's important for you to come to the microphone, that way she and everyone else can hear you. And the only thing, we don't require an address, serial number, or anything like that. All we ask is that you provide us with your name at the beginning of your comments.

So in order the first four or five speakers I have are Daniel Wise, Glenn Younger, Mark Kiefer, Denis Trafecanty and Joe Gansert.

So, Mr. Wise.

MR. WISE: Hi, good evening and thank you for this opportunity to speak as a citizen.

I worked for San Diego Gas & Electric for nine and a half years as a strategic analyst. I was a part of the gas transmission project team to convert the oil fire power plant in Baja to gas so that SDG&E could buy cleaner electricity. I also worked on a lot of economic analysis projects with SDG&E over the years. However, over the last couple of weeks there have been several disturbing sort of flip-flops in SDG&E's economic analysis and feasibility in the millions of dollars in this terms of savings that they proposed and then recounted and then repropoed. I'm concerned about this in terms of long-term planning feasibility overall.

I am in support of the bundling process of upgrading existing power plants and developing the alternatives, solar energy resources that San Diego possesses and has been ignored by SDG&E for too many years. You can go on the National Renewable Energy Web Site and you'll see solar radiation maps all over the country and you'll see the highest single radiation potential in the country is right here. We're talking kilowatts per square foot. We're talking the need for local investment in our technology, jobs and communities. If you don't have a rooftop, you can put it on a lot. If you don't live in a building or if you don't have a single-family home, you could pool your money and create a co-op energy firm.

I'm looking to the CPUC out of this process to merely wake up and update the independent energy producers rules so that it's not such a lock-out on the intensive capital investment for alternative energy producers to become viable again in this state and produce more jobs as well as kilowatts, clean renewable kilowatts. Thank you.

I don't know why SDG&E feels it's necessary to go all the way to Imperial Valley for solar energy when they're sitting right here in the middle of the sunbelt.

Okay. If you can't put it on a roof, you can put it on a lot. If you can't put it on a lot, you can invest with some people and create a solar fund and find a useless piece of real estate or a piece of real

estate somebody will lease and put a little solar power plant there and resell that energy to SDG&E or your own customer base.

It's time to decentralize. These large projects, they're great, but we're not on the emergency road right now. We need to invest in a million solar roofs projects that our own governor is proposing. I say put that 1.3 million dollars on our roofs and every square meter of solar energy that's available. Look on the internet. Look on the maps that you'll see, people. The energy is here. It's collectable. The biggest customers of solar energy are government, are military establishments, telecommunication all depend on solar energy. It's reliable, it's economical, it pays for itself in six to seven years. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: And you didn't say your name.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Daniel Wise, former SDG&E analyst.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Glenn Younger and I don't know if you can talk as fast as he can, but that's a good thing because the court reporter just barely got all that.

MR. YOUNGER: That's a hard one to follow. Thank you for the opportunity. I'm here to disagree with the elimination of the Creelman alternative, so I'll get right to our backyard here. Seems like we may not have focused on the fact that with the Creelman alternative it's shorter based on the map. If we're going to the Creelman Substation, either way, I'm assuming that's a typo. It says it's longer in length. Based on my crude measurements it would be just the same length or probably shorter to get the Creelman Substation. There may be some other things. It's an open field that SDG&E has a current easement. They already have the easement. It's shorter and passes through a former cattle pasture that has been open space for the last 20 years. The alternative using San Vicente Road increases the commute time for about 20,000 cars a day, increases the road hazard, lowers property values, and is opening up anybody who's involved to a possibility of a lawsuit taking its claim, federal taking its claim. It's costlier doing dig up of pavement versus digging through raw land. And it would increase air pollution because it's increasing commute times.

For all those reasons, I think that's one that we may want to reconsider.

MR. MICHAELSON: Are you speaking of during construction —

MR. YOUNGER: Yes.

MR. MICHAELSON: — that it would interfere?

MR. YOUNGER: Yes, absolutely.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Thanks very much. Mark Kiefer.

MR. KIEFER: Hello, I'm Mark Kiefer. I don't have a lot of prepared things. My first notice of this was a letter of condemnation and a letter of eminent domain procedures. That's the first I got, so naturally I hate the whole thing. But learning more about it, I see there's necessity for it, but there's things we need to know. We need to know a lot of things, like how will the property be obtained? As a property owner I'm on both ends. I'm on Ramona and I'm in Borrego Springs and I'm on both maps, so I'm working through that. But there's a lot of things like the electromagnetic field. If you're 100 feet away from that, there's still — when you start adding that much electricity there's still electromagnetic

energy that I've never been able to find any studies on or anything like that. Who is producing the power? Where does it actually come from? It's kind of — it's coming from here, it's coming there there, but nobody has said it's going to be produced in this time. It's not clear on anything I've been able to find, which is another thing I would like to know. And then who is the end user? How is it going to be distributed? Is it going to go through us to North County? Is it going to go through to Orange County? That's another vague issue on what we've been able to learn. And I have more concerns about those things than I do about how it's going to be run at this point. I just wanted to make that known.

MR. MICHAELSON: I appreciate that. Those will be looked at in the documentation to come, so most of those things, so stay tuned.

MR. KIEFER: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Denis Trafecanty.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Hello. My name is Denis Trafecanty. I wanted to read an e-mail I got from a retired Naval pilot, a resident of Wynola which is right between Julian and Santa Ysabel. "On a Thursday night in December I observed the Julian ambulance going down the Inaja Grade, lights flashing. I waited to see if it would continue on to Ramona, but apparently stopped in Santa Ysabel by Dudley's. Approximately three minutes later an aircraft later determined to a Life Flight helicopter orbiting and then landing at Dudley's. Five minutes later it took off and headed to San Diego presumably to help save somebody's life. Food for thought, if the powerlink is installed in the proposed route, then we would lose the nighttime emergency helicopter as it would be too dangerous to attempt a nighttime landing in the area of the power line. Since when is a power line more necessary than emergency health care to human beings." This is Norman Billed, retired naval pilot.

He also sent me an e-mail later on, and I have a picture of an airplane. I don't know if you all know it, but in the middle of December on a day when we were having wind gusts of 50 to 60 miles per hour at our house, which is right in Santa Ysabel Valley, he observed a picture of an — I was awakened by my wife — no, I was in the shower and she told me that there's a fire behind our house and the winds were blowing, the fire was flowing up this hill. The fire trucks were coming and one of them came to the back of our house and the wind was blowing so hard I had to scream into his ear to tell him you're in the wrong driveway, go to the next one. Anyway, this gentleman, this pilot took a picture of an airplane that was going to drop retardant on the fire. If that power line was there, that retardant wouldn't have been dropped in 60-mile-an-hour winds. You would have a situation where that fire might have destroyed many, many homes in Ramona.

I'm the person that was passing out this Protect Our Communities Fund flier. We're developing this fund with the San Diego Foundation to try to defeat the line altogether. The mission statement's right here. I would like each of you to have one of these and communicate with me. My name is on here and I would like to keep in touch with you as this is the landowner group and an environmental group to help fight the line. I also have some of these that you're welcome to have if you'll put them on your car. We're grouping together, the environmentalists and the landowners for one reason to defeat this line. You know, that doesn't mean that we have to — we can go to the dance together, but that doesn't mean that we have to go home together if you're opposed to certain environmental groups. We're all in favor of defeating this line.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm going to read ahead again. Joan Gansert, Richard Zelmer followed by Warren Coon, Travis Scott and Perry Jones.

MS. GANSERT: Hello, my name is Joan Gansert. I am opposed to building the South power line mostly for visual and environmental reasons. It is my — to go back a little bit in history, it's my understanding that there was a conference several years ago, a joint conference with San Diego Gas & Electric, San Diego County and city officials and others. And an agreement was drafted where all parties agreed that sufficient power could be generated without building additional major power lines. My question is, what has changed?

I am very much in favor of exploring most of the non-wire alternatives, the building of the South Bay Power Plant, and for careful building of local — for local in-area generation. Basically I'm interested in sufficient power for San Diego County, but I am not interested in building a power line or power plants in order to generate power for Orange County. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. ZELMER: Hello, my name is Richard Zelmer. I'm a real estate broker in Ramona and I spend a lot of time traveling around the back country looking at this place. It's all beautiful. Some of you have come here because you don't want that power line near your property and we all understand that, but I'll you'll do is shift it to the neighbor's property. There's no place this thing is good.

Now, when you come up with a project like this and before deciding to do it, you're going to study a lot of alternatives, that has a tendency to make it look like this is a thing already accomplished. It's not if we're going to do it, it's which alternative we're going to choose.

Suppose I were to propose we keep a pig in your living room, you probably wouldn't like the idea. And then instead of saying, no, we won't put it in your living room, I say, well, we've got nine alternatives of how we're going to put the pig in your living room, we're going to have a little pen over in the right corner, a little pen in the left corner, we're going to have a leash on the pig, do you still want it in your living room? Especially you in the BLM. You got a responsibility to the public and you know that and all the other environmental areas this impacts. The whole of San Diego County is beautiful. You can't put this anyplace and have it not beautiful.

Next thing, if you notice Eastman Kodak isn't doing real well. I was listening to the economic forecast and they had a hell of a time because they didn't catch up with the digital age, they think we all still want to use film in cameras. SDG&E has to get with it. The time has come for solar, alternative generation, in-bases use. We can do without SDG&E entirely. They phase out much like we don't really need tobacco farms. We don't need SDG&E. They're serving us. We're grateful for what they do for us, but we need alternative generation to take over. There's no way you're having this system of huge towers and wires doing anything to really enhance the community. It may destroy other people's property instead of yours, but it will destroy somebody's. And if it is used for some degree, then the only place for it is underground along the roads if it helps enhance the character of things. If it's expensive, so what. It's expensive to other people when you destroy their economic base.

And I did get the finger there just now telling me it's time to cut off. The last time I sat through two hours and then the administrative law judge cut us down to 30 seconds each to talk and they looked bored to death. They weren't at all interested in anything we had to say. They just wanted to get out of that meeting, but thank you for listening.

MR. MICHAELSON: Mr. Zelmer, I assure you we are interested. We are. Warren Coon.

MR. COON: Hello, my name is Warren Coon. I live down in Poway and I get up here into what we would consider the back country because it's so beautiful and I think that it's all beautiful, the private property, the public lands, it's all great. I agree with this gentleman that if it's possible not to do this project, that's the best choice. And if you have to do it, let's do it along the road and underground the whole way from start to end. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Travis Scott.

MR. SCOTT: Hi, my name is Travis Scott. I was at the Julian/Wynola meeting today. After reviewing a lot of your paperwork, I came up with some questions I had. And first off, I'm really interested in why a lot of San Diego isn't informed on this? I feel that maybe the homeowners are the ones that are and the ones that they let know, the ones that are coming.

On the Elsinore Fault Line, what proof that underground is bad do you have except for what SDG&E is telling you? They can make this feasible. There's a lot of technology out there. And what if that line breaks up in the air due to a fault that you're so concerned about, is it going to fall and de-energize? Is it going to cut off the rest of county with their power? What answer is there to that? All new construction should use solar, that would eliminate any need for any new power from here on out. You can make that enforced today.

The environmental report for the Central East Substation is going to destroy 100 acres. What construction permits were there? Were they approved by the County? They just bought this last year.

The historic and aesthetic values are irreplaceable and will forever be destroyed. We value our serenity, our ability to lose time, and our vast open space without obstruction today. What proof do you have for the necessity for the project? What future use is proposed for this project? The Central Substation SDG&E states that one or two circuits may be required by 2020. That means that all the substations will probably be able to hold the same capacity. How can you determine future necessity or the even impact that you are going to have? If additional circuits do come out of the Central East, where are your impact reports for that? San Felipe Valley has a very large history and I hope that you look into that.

Instead of allowing to ruin the national park or state park or the forest, why don't you instantly finance to make the Southwest Powerlink work if this can prove need at all. How do we make the Southwest Powerlink possible?

When I walk over the underground, how can you prove that I won't be affected? I'm the gentleman with 16 inches of steel. I'm bothered by cold and high power magnets. This is known because of proof. Why don't you kill two birds with one stone and keep out the immigrants, help the feds with the fence, you could even energize it.

Some alternative routes have been eliminated due to high visibility, but the aboveground on Highway 79 is still on the table. On Craig's List there's free solar for homes. You can just find it. The end receiver of this powerlink, who are they? And behind Dudley's on Highway 78 and Highway 79 this is the only place for aircraft to land during emergencies. Please remember that. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. I'm going to read ahead. The next speakers are Perry Jones, Diane Conklin, Michael Hardcastle-Taylor and Jacqueline Ayer.

MR. JONES: I'll pass.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay, sir. Diane Conklin, you would be next.

MS. CONKLIN: My name is Diane Conklin. I live in Ramona off of Mussey Grade Road. I am the spokesperson for the Mussey Grade Road Alliance. I'm an intervenor with the CPUC in this process regarding the Sunrise Powerlink. I want to start my comments by thanking the CPUC Environmental Division for the completeness of the last written report from the last round of scoping meetings, the inclusion of the transcriptions, the consideration you have shown the public, and for the work you've done in preparation for this meeting. That's a really heartfelt thank you. And I think people here should understand that these are hard working people and they have done some good work and I would like to give you an applause.

I want to talk quickly about the three-legged stool, economics, reliability and renewables. I will be augmenting my comments with written comments. With regard to economics just so that the people here can understand, SDG&E has recently said that the economic savings are going to be far less than they anticipated. Now they've upped them again, but that will be looked at. The reliability, well, some of us think that this line is going to Mexico and it will include power plants that are built across the border and that will mean more pollution for Imperial County. And it will also mean that we have an extension cord that essentially goes from here to Mexicali to the LNG Sempra Shell Baja facility to Indonesia and other parts of the world, so we don't think this is a really good idea for reliability. There's a long, long cord.

For renewables, Sterling, well, people wonder whether Sterling will ever get up. These are the engines that supposedly the patent has been around for 100 years and obviously it hasn't been very successful because where are they. The point is if we think it's a pea shell game and that SDG&E has talked about renewables when, in fact, renewable are not the name of the game regardless of the name of this thing being called Sunrise Powerlink.

Now, with regard quickly to global warning, the UN report recently came out, said that there is a problem, now the Bush administration is admitting there's a problem. So we think you ought to factor global warming somewhere into your materials.

With your non-wires, I would ask you do not, do not eliminate the stand-alone use of renewable technology. Let's look at that because we cannot air condition ourselves out of global warming. We cannot air condition ourselves out of global warming with SDG&E's Sunrise Powerlink. Please do not eliminate the stand-alone and let's look at innovative ways to get the energy into San Diego County in addition to in-county generation and in-basin generation. Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Michael Hardcastle-Taylor is next.

MR. HARDCASTLE-TAYLOR: Well, I came in late so I may have missed some important descriptions of the local route through the community. I want to make sure I understand it. I do probably because I'm a homeowner over on Del Amo Road which connects to Gunn Stage Road. Got a very good presentation mailed to me.

I think I'm clear on reading what was sent to me that the proposed route that's still in consideration would go underground or either prior to, east of, or somewhere near the Gower Mountain State Preserve, county preserve, come down through that, go into Gunn Stage Road underground,

presumably go all the way down Gunn Stage Road and turn right on San Vicente Road and come down the middle of that. I'm presuming it would be in the middle of both of those roads. As the gentleman said before earlier, it appears to me from a casual observer of the overhead projection that the Creelman alternative would impact far fewer residences and owners in terms of the construction and the maintenance and the necessary maintenance activities that will have to go on for the lines coming into the estates as I described them and understand them. That's a concern to me.

Also the fact that much voltage coming through a major development that's been around for 30 years or so seems to be a little bit of a cart before the horse. But, anyway, assuming those impacts are all as I stated them, then — and I'm personally not convinced that I read enough to conclude that this Sunrise Link is necessary at all given the global technology and many other in-county capabilities that have yet to be fully explored. But assuming it is necessary, and I'm not convinced of that personally, I guess I wonder why the still-in-play routes have to march and come through one of the most beautiful state parks in the nation if not the most beautiful, a county preserve, the San Diego Country Estates, which is largely built out now, and then go aboveground just west of the estates with presumably the same type of towers that are on site to the east with the same large towers. It just seems inherently obvious that more serious consideration should be given to the overall need. And it needs to be clearly established to gain widespread support. And then, if so, why not investigate some of those — more fully those alternatives involving Orange County and Southern California Edison and specifically for our county the Interstate 8 corridor where it seems to me undergrounding, grading and geological determinations have been made far before by the Eisenhower administration subsequent to making that beautiful highway.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Jacqueline.

MS. AYER: Yes. My name is Jacqueline Ayer. And I have substantial concerns with the PUC considering LEAPS to be a viable alternative for a number of reasons. First of all, aside from all the environmental problems associated with LEAPS, there's substantial evidence that should actually include the 500 kV transmission line in the LEAPS project is primary and essential to the project, it will be challenged in court. And the schedule for LEAPS will not achieve the objective, the time objectives that seem to be San Diego Gas & Electric's time frame for this project.

Also, the LEAPS FEIS was issued just last week and a review of that document reveals that any analysis of environmental impacts from the biological impacts to even traffic is completely nonexistent; therefore, you're going to have to basically perform an entire analysis that cannot consider anything in the EIS because there isn't anything in the EIS. And before you make any determination as to which one has more environmental impacts, I want to make sure that everybody understands that the LEAPS includes a 32-mile right-of-way, brand new right-of-way through the pristine Cleveland National Forest.

Also, Figure 10 shows a 500 kV full loop alternative which have has been eliminated, probably will be eliminated; however, this figure shows a 500 kV line just to the east of the LEAPS project that is a component of the full loop alternative. Since this blue line could be made to terminate exactly the same way that LEAPS terminates and this blue line is virtually identical to the LEAPS alternative, it should be considered a viable alternative, just the blue line itself, which is part of, like I said, the 500

kV. Certainly if LEAPS is considered an alternative, then that line should be considered an alternative also.

And I also request that you redraft the system analysis Figure 10 to both — to include both the Talega Station and the Escondido Station and the line that connects the two of them. And that's it. Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. So far that exhaust all of the cards that we've had turned in to speak; however, we don't want to exclude anyone who has become inspired since then. So if you would care to comment tonight, if you would just come up to the microphone and give us your name, we'll have you fill out a card afterwards. Is there anyone who hasn't spoken tonight who would like to? Yes, ma'am, if you would come to the podium, please.

MS. GACZY: My name is Nancy Gaczy. I live in the San Diego Country Estates. This is going to be very short. I want to know if you're listening? It seems like this has been going on and on with your proposed propositions for getting this powerlink in and there is a lot of opposition. On some regard I feel like we can sit here and say we oppose it for a number of reasons, but as a large corporation you're going to do what you want. Do you really hear?

MR. MICHAELSON: Go ahead and finish.

MS. GACZY: I mean, are you really listening to what people are saying? Because there are a lot of concerns here.

MR. MICHAELSON: Maybe we should go ahead and clarify. I don't know if you came in late.

MS. GACZY: I did.

MR. MICHAELSON: San Diego Gas & Electric is not here. That's not who you're addressing right now. When you said them and are they listening, the corporation, this is the California Public Utilities Commission and the Bureau of Land Management.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They have a billion dollars to get your ear, sir, and we don't.

MR. MICHAELSON: I just wanted to be clear.

MS. GACZY: It's all the organizations who are dealing with the situation. And the homeowners, the people, you know, we're representative but we're not as large as the governing agents that are overlooking them. And I just hope that they hear the voice, because it's really, really important.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. We would like to report out again that this second round of scoping meeting is not required, but, in fact, this was something that California Public Utilities and BLM felt that was something that would be good to do and they wanted to do, so I think in terms of showing their commitment to wanting to listen to the public. If they didn't want to listen, there was no reason for them to come out here in the first place.

Sir, you're next.

MR. JOHNSON: Norman Johnson. I'm a resident here in the estates. And as our young neighbor here mentioned about the pig, if I was a starving man and there were no other pigs, we would certainly enjoy a dialogue as to where to put the pig in the living room. But I'm just not really

convinced that we're in that desperate situation. On conflicting reports I read in the San Diego Union has shown that San Diego Gas & Electric has not done a very accurate estimation of any savings. Secondly, they even commented that they didn't need the South Bay Power Plant, that they had enough power, so that really brought up my interest because it seemed a lot cheaper to take an existing facility or buy that facility and upgrade it than the billions of dollars they would spend on creating a lot of conflict and bad feelings and not really saving much money.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Thank you.

MR. YEPIZ: My name is Salvador Yepiz. There was a question brought up about the source of power, where the power is coming from. I understand there's a power plant being built about 30 miles east of Yuma with 500,000 gas turbine engines being fed by the natural gas coming through Mexico and the pipeline. Is that the source of power that we're talking about transmitting here in this area? Could you answer that question?

MR. MICHAELSON: Susan just said they don't even know about that one, so I guess the answer would be no for the time being.

MR. YEPIZ: Do you know where the power is coming from right now?

MR. MICHAELSON: Well, the project proposal is what it is, which is to bring renewables in to Imperial County and — but it's part of a grid, so electrons move, so I don't think there's any way to answer that question definitely.

MR. YEPIZ: Okay. There is a power plant going up about 30 miles east of Yuma.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. That's useful information.

MR. YEPIZ: Okay.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. ZELMER: My name is Usha Zelmer. I live on Mussey Grade in Ramona. What page is that? Figure 9, non-wire alternatives. There's only 14 numbers. How come we don't have hundreds and hundreds of alternatives, because we're not interested, we're so committed on having this power line. I grew up in four different continents and you'd like to think there's no bribery but money buys things. You know, money buys things, everybody knows this. And the billions that are spent on this power line, it's amazing. And billions are not spent on alternatives.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Is there anyone else? If not, we really appreciate you coming here tonight. We have four more meetings to go around Riverside and San Diego County. And did you have something that you wanted to add real quickly?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. CONKLIN: I did. Diane Conklin. And I would just like to let people know, if you don't mind, that there is a meeting on Thursday the 8th of February at 7:00 p.m. at the Borrego Springs Resort where the California Parks and Recreation Commission will be coming. And I thank you very

much for letting me tell people this. This is the only time Bobby Shriver, who is related to Maria Shriver, and is the chair of the California Parks Commission will be at the meeting at 7:00 in Borrego. It's going to be the only time the Parks Commission will be talking about what may happen to Borrego if this line goes through and I wanted people to know.

MR. MICHAELSON: You can send in written comments by February 24th. Thank you very much. We're adjourned.

[Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.]