

**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 7:30 p.m. February 5, 2007  
At San Diego–Rancho Peñasquitos, California

Reported by:  
Anne M. Zarkos, CSR No. 13095

**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 13  
Public Comments begin on page 13

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

MR. Hoffman .....	13
Mr. Ritchey .....	14
Mr. Pappas .....	14
Mr. Wescott .....	15
Ms. Krajewska .....	15
Ms. Copic .....	16
Mr. Trafecanty .....	16
Mr. Hurst .....	17
Mr. Lawhead .....	18-19
Ms. Dominguez .....	19
Ms. Joosten .....	20
Mr. Smith .....	20
Mr. Vildibill .....	21
Mr. Bourd .....	22
Mr. Hildebrand .....	22-25
Mr. Chapman .....	26

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

## STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. Thank you very much for being here tonight.

My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work for Katz and Associates. We were asked to support these meetings and for me to serve as moderator. I recognize quite a few familiar faces from the last time we were here having a meeting on this subject.

Back in October, as you may recall, there was a first round of scoping. We held seven meetings in five locations on the same subject, the Sunrise Powerlink.

Go ahead and fill in. There are plenty of seats, especially on this side of the room.

As you may recall, the focus of the first set of scoping meetings was on the proposed project. And there was a lot of information available on that. It was fresh on people's minds. And we received a lot of really helpful and constructive comments. They were focused on the proposed project, and they really helped the team so far look at that and also a lot of comments on potential environmental impacts. And those have been very useful to the team so far in trying to identify alternatives.

That was the reason for the second round of meetings. Although they are not required, there was so much work done since the first set in terms of adding additional alternatives, revising alternatives and eliminating different alternatives that out of deference to the public and the agencies, the feeling was that it would only be right to have a second round of scoping meetings.

However, the focus of these scoping meetings are different. As you can see, it says “Second Round of Scoping Meetings on Alternatives for the Draft EIR/EIS.”

For those of you familiar with EIRs, Environmental Impact Reports and Environmental Impact Statements, EIS, you know that the alternatives are really the heart of the document and the analysis. That's actually what gets analyzed.

And the more alternatives there are, the more complex the document is, and also the more analysis can be done and ways to modify or accommodate various needs and constraints of the project.

We're going to go over the agenda here real quickly. I'll be done here in just a minute. Then we're going to have Billie Blanchard with California Public Utilities Commission to talk about the CPUC process and the schedule update. And that schedule has been undated since we were here last year.

Lynda Kastoll with the Bureau of Land Management will talk about their role in this process.

Then Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group will speak to the proposed project, but in particular to the different alternatives and the impacts that have been looked at as potential environmental impacts by various links, focusing on the link around this area of Rancho Peñasquitos.

We were in El Centro earlier today and did the same thing, focusing on the impacts, potential impacts in Imperial County.

And then Billie Blanchard will come back up again and talk a little bit more about how the alternatives were selected and screened.

And then we'll go into more detail, Susan Lee will, on the actual alternatives in and around this area.

And then we'll get to the most important part, which is your opportunity to comment to them, to the panel in front of you.

You may notice to my left is the court reporter. She is here to make sure that we get a verbatim transcript of everything that's said. So it will be important to have you come up to the mic when it's your turn, to make sure that everything can be heard.

So why are we here? First of all, it's to inform the public and responsible agencies about the alternatives proposed for full analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS. It's important to realize that even though we're out here for a second time, the document has not been prepared yet. That is yet to come. This is still scoping.

Also to inform the public about the environmental impact process and final schedule, to solicit input regarding alternatives to the proposed project and to prepare a second alternative scoping report for distribution to repositories.

One last word before I turn it over to Billie Blanchard. And that is to recognize that there are different actors in this process. We have Billie Blanchard representing the California Public Utilities Commission. They are responsible under CEQA for the Environmental Impact Report.

The Bureau of Land Management, because their lands are involved throughout Imperial County. And they are required to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement under a different law, the national Environmental Policy Act.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company is the applicant. They are not a part of this meeting tonight. They are not seated in front of you here. These are the third parties and regulators that are asked to look at and examine and analyze that application.

And Aspen Environmental Group, being the group that was hired by BLM and CPC to serve as a third-party environmental reviewer and help with the preparation of those documents.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to her.

MS. BLANCHARD: Thank you, Lewis.

As many of you may already be aware, the CPUC has to review processes for SDG&E's application for the CDCN. One is the general proceeding portion which has an application number of 06-08-010. The old number was recently closed out on that. And the environmental review process, of which I'm the project manager of the CPUC.

The CPCN is led by Assigned Commissioner Dian Grueneich and Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman.

The scope of the proceeding is determined by the — defined by the Public Utilities Code Section 1002 in terms of determining the need for the project, considering community values, aesthetics at parks, historic, et cetera, and the environmental impacts of the project.

A few highlights on the proceeding schedule. Where we are at this point is that a scoping memo was issued on general proceeding outlining the issues and schedule, what would be covered in the proceeding. That was in November of 2006.

The schedule was slightly modified by an ALJ commission ruling in this January 26, 2007. Testimony started this January. Evidentiary hearings will start July 2007. There's ALJ's proposed decision for December 2007 and a commission addition in January of 2008.

The Environment Review Schedule — the last time we were out here for the first round of scoping meetings, we indicated that we hadn't actually defined the schedule for the EIR/EIS yet, as we had a number of issues to deal with. And we indicated that we would come back out with that schedule.

So we have a schedule now. And we are doing a second round of scoping meetings during this time. There will be a second scoping report coming out, like the first one, in March of 2007. We will be releasing the Draft EIR/EIS in mid-July 2007. The review period for that will be 90 days, going from approximately July to October 2007. A final EIR/EIS in November 2007, and certification January 2008.

So I will turn it over to Lynda Kastoll.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can I just make a quick announcement?

I see you're bringing in more chairs. There are actually 15 or 20 empty seats around here. Don't be shy. If it means walking in front of the room to come find an empty seat, there are still plenty of seats all around. Come on over. Go ahead.

MS. KASTOLL: I'm Lynda Kastoll. And here in the audience is Daniel Stuart.

Our involvement in this project began when SDG&E submitted an application for us to build the Sunrise Powerlink. The proposed project will cross approximately 31 miles of Imperial County and 1.3 miles in San Diego County.

The proposed project also proposes the following through Anza-Borrego State Park. BLM issued that in 1955 as a continuation of the Federal Power Project. BLM's continued role in that is under review, and a decision is expected in a couple of weeks.

Also, part of this project will be considered to an amendment to our Desert Conservation Area Plan. Because the proposed action deviates from designated utility corridors. BLM is also responsible for consulting and coordinating with other federal agencies, such as the Forest Service.

ROD, our record of decision, is expected to be issued in January 2008. We will use this EIS/EIR to make our decisions, whether or not to modify our plan, whether or not to issue a right-of-way passage.

Now Susan will give you a little brief description of the project.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Lynda.

I'm going to talk from this map up here. And if you can't hear me, yell out. You all have this map in your packet as Figure 1. And this is the overview of the proposed project. So I'll just do a brief overview.

The project starts as a 500 kV portion, about 90 miles starting near El Centro at the Imperial Valley Substation. The 500 kV portion crosses a lot of BLM land, enters San Diego County just east of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, which is this big green area (indicating).

The 500 kV portion would follow through Anza-Borrego. And this is primarily within the right-of-way that Lynda was describing that is under BLM's jurisdiction — or may or may not be, depending on their determination — and continues to a substation, a proposed new substation on the north end of the project called the Central East Substation that would ultimately be a 40-acre substation requiring quite a bit more grading, because it's not on level land.

The project at that point would convert to a 230 kV project. And a double circuit. The 230 kV line would come out of the substation down throughout the Santa Ysabel Valley, through the Ramona area, down through across the north side of Miramar, and then into the coastal link, which is where we are here.

There are a couple other components of the project besides just the transmission component. One of the major ones I mentioned is the Central East Substation. This is — there would be about a hundred acres that would have to be graded up there in order to create the 40-acre pad.

Another component is this piece running south through Miramar. It's an existing transmission line that would be reconductors. So new wires would be put on — primarily on existing towers in this segment. And then there are a couple substations where there will be internal upgrades within the substations themselves.

One of the other things that isn't on this map, and information that we received from SDG&E within the last month or so, is what we're calling the future phases of the project. This substation — it's a major 500/230 kV substation that SDG&E has proposed. Ultimately, SDG&E says it would have four to five additional or total 230 kV lines leaving this substation.

So we will, in our EIR/EIS, look at this long-range future. This could be ten years or so out in the future when this additional lines would be needed. But we'll look at additional routes into Escondido and the possibility of having a second line along on this proposed route, which is a possibility, we understand, from SDG&E. So that's the future phases, again, not on the map.

I very briefly will talk about the impacts of the proposed project. I'll skip over the Imperial Valley. We were out in El Centro today.

Let's go back one to Anza-Borrego, just because Anza-Borrego is such a regional issue of concern. The project goes through 25 miles or so of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. The major impacts here — and one of the concerns you've heard about recently is the effects on wilderness.

The project itself, because it would require a wider right-of-way than what is existing, would be on state wilderness land, requiring that that land be redesignated or de-designated as nonwilderness land. That's a major concern.

Visual resources, recreational impacts of having a 500 kV through this. It is a existing right-of-way. The existing poles in there are wood poles. It's a 69 kV line from this point on.

There also is a concern about certain species, the big-horn sheep being one of the most important.

The central land — we have two meetings tomorrow that are actually in the Central Valley area. So I won't spend too much time on that. But there is a major concern about visual resources, agricultural resources, and a creation of a new corridor in an area that has no existing corridor.

The Central East Substation, we are looking at alternatives to that. Again, we have an alternative that's up to the north. Because the substation has the potential for fault impacts, and it also has quite a bit of grading. So we do have an alternative to talk about.

The Inland Valley Link is the portion that goes through Ramona. We'll focus on that primarily tomorrow. That has an underground segment like this one.

We know that most of you are here because of the coastal link. So we'll focus a little bit on that today, starting with Sycamore Canyon Substation, right at the very north side of Miramar and continuing down past the Chicarita Substation and down with the underground segment through Peñasquitos and ending at the Peñasquitos Substation.

The issues of concern that we heard from you when we were here the last time is the visual impacts of having an additional line in the corridor, the corona noise from the additional line in the corridor, the effects on recreational values through the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and as well as right there in the corridor.

So those are the issues that are driving our alternative selection. We haven't yet made determinations that these impacts are significant. What we're in the process of doing now is writing an EIR/EIS. What we've attempted to do is identify the major impacts that really will drive our alternatives.

Now we go back to Billie.

MALE SPEAKER: May I ask a question?

MR. MICHAELSON: I saw your hand up earlier. We're really not in a Q/A format. So I'd appreciate if you could wait to make your comments.

MALE SPEAKER: I don't have a comment. I have a question.

MR. MICHAELSON: We need to go through our presentation. And then you can ask your question during the comment period.

Thanks.

MS. BLANCHARD: Just briefly on this slide, where we are on the EIR/EIS process is that we're doing the — we're still into the scoping. This is the second round of scoping and screening of alternatives.

Our criteria for screening of the alternatives is outlined in detail in the notice that hopefully you all have, pages 6 through 9.

So I'll just briefly go over the highlights that — the alternatives that we're looking at permitted by the CEQA/NEPA criteria of, one, of consistency with most or all of the project objectives. And then we use the three main objectives of reliability, access to renewables and economic benefit, i.e., the cost of the delivery.

The second is basically the ability to reduce or to avoid significant impacts of the proposed project that's been identified through our environmental team analysis, agency consultation, Applicant's PEA, data requests, and scoping comments.

And then the third is feasibility. Technical feasibility, if we're able to do it from a technical standpoint. Regulatory, if it can be permitted, and can it be permitted under the law.

The sources of our alternatives have been from a number of different areas of alternatives suggested certainly in scoping comments. We received many alternatives in the first round of scoping from a number of people, including this group here; reconsideration of SDG&E's PEA alternatives; reconsideration of alternative eliminated by SDG&E; alternatives from CPUC proceeding filings and ISO alternatives process.

Alternatives we are considering are link and route segment alternatives, substation alternatives, Southwest Powerlink alternatives, full project route and system alternatives, as well as generation and other non-wires alternatives.

And now I'm going to turn it over to Susan again to go into the alternatives in more detail.

Thank you.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Billie. I'm going to go back to this map. Again, I'm going to skip over the Imperial Valley. We talked about that in quite a bit of detail earlier today.

Let me describe quickly, because I know again Anza-Borrego has a big constituency. The alternatives that we plan to retain for the Anza-Borrego area, the first one is a partial underground alternative that would follow primarily along Highway 78.

It would require actually moving this large substation from the proposed Central East Substation location to the San Felipe area just about at the county line. And a 230 kV line then would be built along the highway following — not following Grapevine Canyon, which is not paved, but following Highway 78.

Our goal in this was to see if we could come up with an alternative. Unfortunately, there's a major fault crossing of the Earthquake Valley Fault right here. There has to be an overhead segment at the south end of here and, again, an overhead segment along Highway S-2 because of the coincidence of the fault with the highway.

But that is what we're kind of fine-tuning, a location of this and an attempt to keep this section out of wilderness to the extent possible as it comes right down to the edge of the road.

The other alternative that's being retained within the Park is an alternative where, rather than as we described earlier, the route would be within a 150-foot-wide corridor. It would actually be contained within a 100-foot-wide existing easement. So that means that towers would be possibly a little taller. There would be slightly more towers in there. Because every time the smaller corridor moves, you have to add another tower.

So we just got some engineering on that from SDG&E. That removes the direct impacts to wilderness, because towers would not be located within the wilderness. There are still going to be

indirect impacts. Obviously you have wilderness on both sides of the corridor in here. So it would be highly visible. That's an alternative that we're proposing.

The ones that we've proposed to eliminate are listed on here (indicating). I won't go over those. We'll go over those in more detail when we're in Borrego Springs.

I'm just going to jump to the Coastal Link at this point. Because I know that's where most of your concerns are.

Let's first talk about the ones that we've proposed to retain. And I know a lot of you have looked at this map and have comments on it. And we would love to hear any comments you have on things that are either retained or eliminated or if you have suggestions about how these could be modified. Those are the things we really would love to hear today.

MR. MICHAELSON: Which figure number is that?

MS. LEE: Okay. This one is Figure 6. Figure 6 is a key one for the Coastal Link. This looks at the alternatives that at this point we're looking to retain.

Let me point out one of them first, which is this long route that goes through Miramar. We are expecting to hear from the Marine Corps that this route is not going to be feasible for the Marine Corps, based on the disruption of their use of this land. So we haven't yet got that in writing.

So everywhere we've mentioned this alternative, we've put asterisks next to that saying that there are concerns about the feasibility of this alternative. But we have been seriously been pursuing it.

The other alternative that — let me just go through one-by-one. The Rancho Peñasquitos Bike Path is a small alternative, which isn't even — it's not much visible on here. It's the little dotted blue lines. Where there is a bike path between the Chicarita Substation basically moves the route further north closer to the freeway. We've looked into that one, and that seems to be a feasible alternative.

The Carmel Valley road alternative, which would be overhead in the existing right-of-way — and we understand the concerns about this. We'd love to hear more from you about that. And then underground along Carmel Valley Road and back overhead again in another existing right-of-way, back to rejoin the proposed route.

Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and Mercy Road, we have a very long — over here (indicating) — through the preserve, crossing it, and then joining up with Park Village Road, again to continue through the proposed route.

There's a small alternative you almost can't see, because it's kind of a light kind of green olive color, which is Black Mountain Road to Park Village. The intent of this short alternative here is to avoid the use of the open space that's been landscaped through the community in here by underground.

Several of these alternatives — and let me just put that on the table — we've been researching with the City of San Diego the existing underground utilities in these roads. Because you can only put a transmission line underground if the road isn't filled with a lot other things. And in an urban area like this, there are obviously gas lines, sewer lines, water lines. So we've been meeting with the City and County to find out what is in these roads.

Black Mountain Road has a very large water line in it. And we're now still researching whether or not there is space in that segment of the road that would allow the installation of the transmission line.

The long one that we have on here, the long green route, is one that we definitely are pursuing also, looking at feasibility of undergrounding based on the availability of space in the road. And I know that some of you here — who are here may have other information about that. We'd like to have that. We're continuing to deal with the City in terms of fine-tuning the availability of this.

One other alternative we're retaining that is not on the map, because it's hard to define on the map, is the — on that is the last one listed on the slide, which is the Coastal Link System Upgrade. This is a transmission system upgrade that would happen essentially around Sycamore Canyon, basically rewiring the transmission system.

And if it works — and this is being evaluated by the California Independent System Operator — if it works the way it's proposed by the Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens Group, it could eliminate the need for the entire western portion of this project. So that's one we're definitely retaining. We're looking forward to getting information from the Independent System Operator on how that works in the transmission system.

Now, I'm not going to talk through all of these. But this Figure 7, which is in your packet, shows all the alternatives that we've looked at. We looked at everything that everyone suggested to us. We tried to give you, at least in the handout there, a summary of the information that we got as to why these were not pursued in detail.

A lot of them — well, just one easy one, Highway 56, which does seem like an obvious possibility because it goes from A to B in the rights-of-way. Caltrans refuses to allow linear projects within their rights-of-way. We did meet with them to confirm that that was the case, and they said no.

There are a lot of other ones that involve the transfer of impacts. And I know that's also the concern on some of the ones we've retained. So we'd love to hear that. By moving a route from one place to another, you take it out of one neighborhood and put it into another. And that's one of the really challenging things about putting a transmission line in a developed area.

I'm pretty much done with the Coastal Link. I think I will go on quickly to the Southwest Powerlink alternatives. Let's skip substations. The Southwest Powerlink alternatives, if you'll look at Figure 8 in your packet. I'll have this one out here. Let me go back to the microphone so you can hear better, and it might help the court reporter a little bit.

The Southwest Powerlink alternatives are also alternatives that would eliminate the need for the portion of the project that goes through the area where we are now. I'm sorry. I take that back. I'm going backwards from El Centro, where we were earlier today.

Sunrise Powerlink alternatives would not change the end point of where we are now. They would avoid Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, which is the reason that they were originally suggested to us. And, in fact, we've been specifically requested to consider alternatives that would avoid Anza-Borrego.

So if you look at Figure 8, you'll see there are four alternatives we're looking at that would avoid Anza-Borrego. They reconnect with the proposed project in two different places. Three of the

routes, the Interstate 8, the — what's called the BCD alternative — and the Route D Alternative reconnect at a point near Santa Ysabel on the south end of Santa Ysabel and would follow the proposed project westward from there. The fourth one would reconnect just at the eastern end of Miramar Marine Corps Air Station and continue down the proposed route west from there.

Let's look at the next slide, which is transmission system alternatives. And these are — I was jumping ahead of myself — alternatives that have the potential to replace the entire project, with the exception of the second one. And I'll talk about that.

What we looked at in the transmission system alternatives is different transmission upgrades within the region that have the potential to do the same thing that the Sunrise Powerlink Project would do region-wide. And they would provide the benefits, in terms of the objectives Billie talked about earlier, to the region and to San Diego customers that the Sunrise Powerlink would.

We looked at about 25 alternatives in this category and haven't listed all the ones eliminated. The ones that seemed to best meet the project objectives, the first one is the LEAPS project. That stands for Lake Elsinore Advanced Pumped Storage project. You may have heard of that one. It's in the Lake Elsinore area, but also the adjacent Cleveland National Forest.

This will involve a 500 kV transmission line that essentially would create a link between the Southern California Edison transmission system and the San Diego Gas & Electric system. So that project could stand on its own by providing a benefit to SDG&E.

The second one that's listed in here, Mexico Light, is a smaller system upgrade that actually would occur in Mexico but has the potential to improve the reliability of the regional electric system. That one we're looking at really in combination with other alternatives as a way to improve the regional reliability.

The third one listed here, Path 44 upgrades, really is an upgrade to the Southern California Edison system in a way that would enhance the reliability to San Diego Gas & Electric. So that's also one that's being evaluated, in terms of its transmission benefits by the California Independent System Operator.

Then the last category of alternatives is called Non-Wires Alternatives. And we heard from many, many of you when we were here the last time that it was important to you that we consider renewable power, that we considered in-basin generation. And we looked at several combinations of this.

What these alternatives that we are retaining do is, they basically build on each other. The first one we will look at as an alternative that is entirely based on in-area renewables as opposed to going to San Diego — or into Imperial County — to look for renewable power and import them via a 150-mile transmission line. So we're looking here at wind, at solar, photovoltaic, solar thermal, and biomass, biogas.

The second one called Resource Bundle 1 builds on the first alternatives. It's those renewable options plus conventional generation, which is — in this case, we're assuming the South Bay Power Plant, which is under application right now to be repowered by LS Power.

And then the third option, which is Resource Bundle 2, is the first two added together, which is local renewable, plus South Bay, plus what's called renewable energy certificates, which is a way that

SDG&E could get credit for renewable energy that is generated in other places but traded like the Stock Exchange, just by virtue of buying and selling credits, rather than having to build the transmission line that actually leads to the renewable source itself.

The last one that we're considering is called In-area Generation Plus Transmission Upgrades, is a possibility that just in-area generation plus some smaller transmission upgrades within the system, or even possibly in Imperial Valley, could also result in a system benefit equivalent to the Sunrise Powerlink.

So that is the large range of alternatives we've been looking at.

Back to Lewis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Okay.

Thank you very much for sitting through that. I know it's a lot of information.

If you didn't get one of these handouts on your way in, it would be very helpful to make sure you get one before we leave. Because if we were to go through everything in this document, we would have been here for probably another couple of hours. So we didn't expect you to sit through that much. But hopefully Susan has been able to touch on the ones of most concern to people in this particular area.

I mentioned before that this is the second round of scoping. The first round focused on the proposed project. And the reason I mentioned that is because at this stage what would be most useful, most constructive, and most relevant is to reach what you have comments on that relate to whether you agree or disagree with the alternatives to the proposed project that have been proposed for retention or elimination, why you may or may not agree with those.

You may have further suggestions or further modifications to alternatives that haven't been mentioned yet. And you may still yet have other alternatives that haven't been considered or mentioned so far. So again, this is a second round, really focusing on alternatives to the proposed project.

I want to make it very clear that while I have a dozen speaker slips here, and we're very happy — we also know that most Americans are painfully afraid of public speaking. And it's really a minority of you that feel even semi-comfortable doing that. That's why written comments are also important.

You can save yourself postage and hand-deliver them tonight or mail them in to this address which is on there by the postmarked date of February 24th. And I just want to you know that written comments are given the same consideration, the same weight as oral comments. So if you don't speak tonight, you can still be heard.

For more information, we've tried to make information as available as we possibly can, given the various channels that are available, including a website. That address is available on the handouts. For those of you that may not have that access, there are actually 29 area libraries and offices where the project information has been placed. You can also e-mail at [sunrise@aspenerg.com](mailto:sunrise@aspenerg.com). And there's also a project information line. So hopefully if you need any more information, you'll avail yourself to that.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

So I'm ready to start calling the names of people who filled out speaker registration cards. If you didn't fill one out and you do want to speak tonight, raise your hand. Danny will bring you around a card. There's a gentleman over there. Thank you.

Each person is going to have three minutes to speak. And I have a very sophisticated way of indicating times. When you have one minute left, I'll put up an index finger. That's why you need to occasionally look my way. And when your minutes are up, I'll close my hand like this (indicating), and that means it's time to move on to the next person.

Also, the way you're seated here, it can take a lot of time to jostle back and forth and get in and out. So I read ahead the next four, five, six names. That way you'll know when your turn is coming up, and you'll be prepared to come up to the microphone.

Again, we have a court reporter here. So it's important that you use the microphone. And we don't need your address, but if you would state your name, we'd greatly appreciate it.

Bill Hoffman, Keith Ritchey, Constantine Pappas, Jim Kennedy, and Doug — I believe it's Wescott.

So, Mr. Hoffman, you're first.

MR. HOFFMAN: I'm right here.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can you come over to the microphone, please.

MR. HOFFMAN: Good evening. Bill Hoffman, of course.

I have three things I'd like to talk about real briefly. One is Borrego. The other is, assuming that the power line is indeed in the Route 8, the alternate route, and then the last is a non-wire, I think you called it, alternative.

On the Borrego, I think there's a significant opposition to that. In any event, I'm glad that the commission is looking at ways of mitigating that by putting things underground. I think either the wires should be put not underground, but in some sort of flex line situation around Ocotillo Wells, where I think the area is that you were talking about the earthquake.

But I think that it would be better just to say no on Borrego, because there are so many alternatives otherwise. And I have been advocating — and I think a lot of other people have been advocating — the Highway 8 route. So it's easy to maintain. It's easy for vehicles to get there to maintain it. So I think Highway 8 is a good alternative route, again, if we do need the alternative source of energy coming from the Imperial Valley.

But I think the better solution is the non-wire approach that you were discussing. And I think that has a number of benefits, one which wasn't even mentioned. And the first is, I didn't see on the slide a cost-benefit analysis. And solar is an example, because of the recent so-called tax credits, how that's going to play out. I think everybody is a little bit confused. But this is going to cost a lot of money. Maybe that money can be used to give the citizens of San Diego a rebate in putting in solar systems.

Now, there's another advantage to that. And that's from a national security viewpoint. And maybe that seems a little far-fetched. But look at how the Internet works with a lot of different nodes. So one of them is down, and then the routing can go elsewhere. Well, if San Diego had a lot of people with solar, or there's a lot of local alternative generations, then we knock down a major line going through Imperial Valley. So that's pretty much what I had to say.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Keith Ritchey.

MR. RITCHEY: Good evening. I'm Keith Ritchey, a representative of West Chase Homeowner's Association. We were here the last time when you presented several alternatives to the route.

I'm encouraged that you are continuing to consider several of the alternatives; but I'm discouraged that you're not going to go forward with the State Route 56 option. I know you've said that you've met with Caltrans, and they said no. But that's not the law.

I looked up the law on State and Highway Code 709. And it says that the Caltrans has to act reasonably in approving permits for longitudinal encroachments on freeways. And it does say "freeways," not "highways." 56 is a place that Caltrans needs to act reasonably in there.

Now, their regulations, their own guidelines say that they don't like those encroachments. But even they provide an alternative procedure for exceptions. And it doesn't appear that we're exploring those alternatives.

If this group had gone forward or does go forward and fully explores the Route 56 alternative and determines that it's the best alternative for the community, then they have a very good case to request an exception from Caltrans.

But if they don't undertake that analysis because Caltrans doesn't want you to, then we'll never know. And we won't be able to force that issue. We'll just be giving up at this point.

So I'd request that the group relooks at going forward and fully studying the Route 56 alternative. And depending on what that study suggests, then you can deal with Caltrans appropriately.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Constantine Pappas.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you.

My name is Constantine Pappas. And I'm referencing Figure 5, the Inland Valley Link.

I am a property owner at the southwest corner parcel at the intersection of San Ysidro and Wildcat Canyon Road, Ramona. I object to the transmission of the 230 kV line from underground to overhead located in San Vicente Road and continuing overhead to the north side.

This portion of the line should be underground. The basis given for eliminating the underground is erroneous and misrepresents the facts. This segment is not in an open space reserve, as stated on page 15. There are no biological resources along this route. The 230 kV power would

virtually affect the development of the property, which is presently zoned residential, one unit per two acres.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

MALE SPEAKER: I pass.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, sir.

Let me read ahead again. Laura Copic and Jim Kennedy.

Is Jim here?

MALE SPEAKER: I passed.

MR. MICHAELSON: Sorry.

Craig Wescott.

MR. WESCOTT: I'll submit in written form.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Grazyna Krajewska.

MS. KRAJEWSKA: I made copies of what I will say.

Okay. So my name is Grazyna Krajewska.

I'm glad that you started to include the no-wire project alternative that I support. Also, there has been additional research on the particular alternatives. It was done by San Diego Region Renewable Energy and a few other people. It is a part called "Promise of Renewable Energy in the San Diego Region Renewable Energy."

It was to SANDAG and consisted of the information. You can find it on San Diego — the society website. And it's PDF file. It talks about how much would it cost for energy from the desert. And, okay, what is the price of energy from the desert if we could use that?

And next what is the price of energy from the desert if you get from the San Diego area. And, also, they look at what is the price of energy generated in San Diego area. And they look at renewable energy.

And the conclusion is that price is very similar, although the energy — generating energy in the desert is cheap. If you include price of the power lines, the price goes up.

And in that case, what they got in fact, they delivered solar plate energy. That's, you know — that is not such a high price. But if you look at all the different solar energy that in fact generated from the desert, it would be generated in San Diego. And in your general comments, generated in San Diego power lines, long power lines, so definitely to get in a increased this way.

And also does the fact that you have several locations from to get the power also gives you increased liability.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. COPIC: Laura Copic. I wanted to comment that one of the basic project objectives outlined was facilitated specifically from Imperial County or the Imperial Valley. And I have two questions or observations with regard to that objective.

No. 1 is, we can already access renewables from the Imperial Valley with Sunrise Powerlink and Green Path North Project. And I was not clear if the Green Path North Project was an alternative that was evaluated. I'm not sure if that's the same as Path 44 or not. I wasn't clear on that at all. But that seems to be a project discussed in the past that could also access renewables in the Imperial valley. And I don't see it in the stuff anywhere.

If improved transmission capacity is required to access viable renewables in the Imperial Valley, it's far preferable for all of us involved to improve transmission capability and transmission upgrades using best available technology rather than a massive energy superhighway that will in the end transport much more fossil fuel power than renewables.

The San Diego Regional Energy Strategy calls for 50 percent of our renewables mandated to be achieved with in-county generation sources. So while facilitation of renewables should certainly be an objective, shouldn't we be emphasizing in-county renewables over those from the Imperial Valley? That is if San Diego is the true beneficiary of this line.

It cannot be ignored that this transmission line will facilitate access to other gas, fire, energy resources outside the San Diego region and will make San Diego an even greater net importer of energy than it already is, which again is contrary to the goals of the San Diego Regional Energy Strategy.

For these reasons, I would like to reemphasize my support for the local non-wires alternatives in the scoping memo because they increase reliability and energy security. The San Diego Regional Energy Strategy emphasizes in-county generation because it is most efficient and secure to generate energy closest to where it's used.

No. 2, it puts more emphasis on local renewable resources, which helps promote the California Solar Initiative.

And No. 3, it will reduce the congestion on the existing lines, because local generation frees those lines from the need to import energy over long distances. Reliability, renewables, and reducing congestion were the three primary benefits SDG&E has promoted for this line. And I contend that in-county non-wires resource bundles outside — or outlined in your scoping memo can better achieve those goals.

MR. MICHAELSON: The next will be Denis Trafecanty, Tad Hurst, David Lawhead, Helen Dominguez, and Lorene Joosten.

MR. TRAFECANTY: I'm Denis Trafecanty. I'm opposed to the proposed Sunrise Powerlink. Not the Sunrise Powerlink, the "proposed" Sunrise Powerlink.

I think it's kind of comical when we talk about Caltrans, the military, Indian reservations, and things like that. But what about the landowners? Who are they? That's all of us in this room. Why don't we think a little bit more about what the landowners want?

Laura just stated — and she was very articulate — that there was a 2030 energy working group here in San Diego that proposed transmission lines as being only about the fifth alternative. The first one was in-county generation.

I wish we could have seen some maps like that of how you were going to go about, in your EIR/EIS proposals to the CPUC, how in-county generation would move around this city. Let's think about it for just a minute.

We need power in San Diego because it's projected, I think, there's going to be another million residents in San Diego. Why would we want to bring power all the way from Imperial Valley? They don't need the power. Boulevard doesn't need the power. South County Inland doesn't need the power. North County Inland doesn't need the power. None of it is going to stay there. It's going to come right on in here.

Let's think a little bit more seriously about where we get the power right here in the basin. It's certainly available.

And what are you going to do? What about my children and my grandchildren and their children? They're going to get to see this huge tower going through a state park. Never in the history of the United States has there been a “D” designation in a state or national park. And we're talking about it. This is a landmark case.

Okay, I've got my one minute. Let me tell you why I'm here.

I'm here because I've decided, with the help of some people in Santa Ysabel, where I live — and I work near Poway, so I'm not a foreigner to the city. We've set up a fund called the Protect Our Communities Fund. And we've already generated a very dramatic amount of money. And it's being banked and stored at the San Diego Foundation, which is a very reputable not-for-profit organization.

We are trying to defeat this line, not only with our words here in this room, but with our technical experts, our environmental experts, and our attorneys. And we're going to go to all these meetings and attend all the events. And we're going to defeat the line.

We have assembled some money just recently — a lot of money we already have. But we're trying to accumulate \$100,000 of money from large donors who will be very happy to match any contribution that you all make.

I'll be standing at the door over here with this flyer. And you can e-mail me at any time.

Thank you very much.

MR. HURST: My name is Tad Hurst. And on a little bit different note, I'm here representing two groups, United States Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association, the San Diego Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association. I'm a director for both of those organizations.

And, in particular, only one of the alternate routes has particular impact on that activity directly. That has to do with the set of routes to the south. The I-8 alternative and the Routes BCD and

the west of forest WF-25 routes manage to go right throughout the middle of one of our landing zones and would either eliminate flying at that site, one of three major sites we have in the county, and goes between the launch.

And the landing zone in another side near Lakeside, also incidentally goes very near to a place we just recently found out is going to be protected because of some eagle nesting, which I hope you folks all know exactly where that is. It's a little hard to tell from your maps.

But it's clear that it would either eliminate two of our three major sites in the county or cause a couple of deaths a year. We're not in favor of deaths. I'll go on record for that.

I suspect that you hadn't even realized that those sites might impact very dramatically those folks in San Diego who are hang gliders and paraglider pilots right along Highway 8 and cutting along past the reservoir near Lakeside.

So I wanted to make you at least aware that have and preemptively, at least, state an objection to those southern routes.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: David Lawhead.

MR. LAWHEAD: I'm with the California State —

MR. MICHAELSON: Can you move closer?

MR. LAWHEAD: My name is Dave Lawhead. I'm with California State Parks, Colorado Desert District in particular, which includes Anza-Borrego. So I'm going to focus on that segment, because I'm not going to be available for your Borrego meeting, because the Park and Rec Commission is meeting that same evening.

So first of all, I'd like to thank the agencies and the consultants for coming up with a broad range of alternatives. That was sort of refreshing compared to the earlier versions that we saw.

We've still — I'll be brief — we still have strong opposition to the passing of the alignment through Anza-Borrego. So I want to make that clear up front. But I did want to comment on a couple of the alternative issues related to Anza-Borrego.

The first one was the undergrounding component of — my understanding is from the junction of Old King Springs Road and Highway 78, all the way to the west. And our view is that if you're going to underground the entire route through the park, not just that segment, and sort of in concert with that, we think — or I think, anyway, that you should also reinstitute the alignment that you were going to eliminate, SR-78 that's north of Old King Springs Road. Not if it's above them.

I think the main reason that it was eliminated was because of bigger impacts originally, and that's if it's undergrounded, it would be better to consolidate any impacts. I think that was the main concern at that point. Again, just reiterating that our preference, of course, is to avoid the Park altogether.

And I did have one question. And you mentioned that the right-of-way through Anza-Borrego was being reevaluated. I guess I'm not sure of the appropriate designation.

But I'm curious as to why State Parks has never been solicited for any discussion about that.

MS. BLANCHARD: Renewal as it is right now?

MR. LAWHEAD: Yes.

MS. BLANCHARD: It is strictly administrative. It's whether or not BLM still has authority to renew that. And if so, it would be just the existing right-of-way as it is. It would not have the — it would be — that part would be addressed in the EIR, just of the renewable as it is.

MR. LAWHEAD: Do we have to wait for documentation on whether the Irrigation District has any legal rights to it? Is that coming?

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes. That's under review as well. They're looking into that.

MR. LAWHEAD: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Helen Dominguez.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: My name is Helen Dominguez. I'm a mother of two young healthy children, ages three and eight. I'm a Park Village resident.

I'd like to recommend that you do not retain the proposed project route by SDG&E, which goes underground through Park Village Road. It goes directly behind Peñasquitos Creek Neighborhood Park, affecting community values, and cuts in front of the corner of Park Village Elementary School. That affects children ages from grades K through five. So my concerns are the dangers of EMFs, which can cause cancer.

It also cuts directly through the Park Village neighborhood homes on Nos. 144 through 145 on Figure 6. And that affects children and concerns with the elderly as well, with the EMFs and the dangers that those proposed.

My question is the environmental feasibility and social feasibility with the environmental damage to the canyon areas and the damage of the socioeconomic structure of the community. And it is inconsistent with important community values and needs.

I have serious concerns with the summary of potential impacts, which can have lasting health effects. The hazards and hazardous materials and wild fires — I want to point out that there was a fire that occurred behind — directly behind park — Peñasquitos Creek Neighborhood Park in July of 2006, which burned 22 acres.

And then the improper storage or handling of hazardous materials, leakage and spilling of fluids, and the toxic releases to the environment which — all of which are serious concerns to anybody who lives in the neighborhood close to this should have.

If alternative routes have to be looked at, my first choice would be the MCAS Miramar alternative. Second choice would be the Pomerado Miramar.

I seriously question retaining the Park Village Road option, when so many options and alternatives are listed that would eliminate direct effects on children, family homes, and community values.

That's it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Our next speakers are Lorene Joosten, Geoffrey Smith, Alex Bourd.

MS. JOOSTEN: I'm a resident of the area. And although my home is not —

MR. MICHAELSON: Could you state your name, please?

MS. JOOSTEN: Lorene Joosten.

My home is not directly impacted by any of the proposed routes. But I'm troubled at the thought of, first of all, power lines marching through the Anza-Borrego Desert, Santa Ysabel, and through our own pristine Los Peñasquitos Canyon.

And I was surprised to find out when I was looking at the CPUC website that children in residential neighborhoods in their homes and parks aren't entitled to the same protection against EMF transmissions as children (inaudible).

And since there are a lot of kids living in our neighborhoods, that's especially troubling to me as a parent of two young children. And I am relieved — or not really relieved. I guess I'm hopeful that you're seriously considering the prospect of in-basin generation, since that would limit most of that.

And if you do find the necessity to have the lines coming in from the Imperial Valley, I would hope that you would consider the more commercial routes to keep them as far away from residential neighborhoods as possible.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: My name is Geoffrey Smith. I live in Mira Mesa here. I'm going to speak for several constituencies.

First of all, I serve as chairperson of the Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve. I've held that position for 17 years. And that organization oversees 4,000 acres of open space in the heart of the San Diego urbanized area.

I'm Vice President of the Desert Protective Council, which has been serving the southwest desert region as an advocacy organization.

I'm a coordinator for the California Wild Heritage Campaign, which is seeking to establish 45,000 acres of wilderness in San Diego County.

And I'm a resident for 37 of my 51 years.

So the constituencies that I also speak for, which can't speak for itself, is the diversity of plants and animals and the sanctity of the pristine open spaces and our back country that are irreplaceable resources and that are essential for their own sake. And yet they also provide relief for the human condition, which is ever more stressed, even in our technological age.

I try not to talk about the tree-hugging sort of things in these forums. But it is really true. We have to put a measure on open space. It's important to our lives and our survival as human beings, just as much as turning on a light switch is.

So the constituencies I represent question the need for the power line project at all. It's clear from the origin of the line, close to the border where the Mexican power plants are operating, the northerly extent of the line at Warner Springs, which is suspiciously close to Riverside County, the limited financial benefit to San Diego rate payers as was recently revealed in the press, and a lack of a comprehensive strategy from the region, even the United States for that matter, points to the fact that the no-wires alternative is the ethical choice. So I do support the non-wire project alternative.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. VILDIBILL: Hello. Mike Vildibill.

I'm a resident of Poway. You might know me as Mile Marker 138.5. So, as mentioned earlier this evening, several weeks ago SDG&E reported intent to possibly increase the number of 230 kV lines coming out of the Central East Substation. And that information was news to me. I had not seen that or heard of that previously.

I find that distributing. And I certainly would like to know more about the intent to increase the number of lines coming out of Central East Substation and how far west-southwest they go. I don't know if that's something you can address this evening or if that's something we can look in the mail for.

MR. MICHAELSON: Maybe after all the comments.

MR. VILDIBILL: So make the assumption that that's going to actually go west out of Central East. I live in the Rolling Hills area, Mile Marker 138 and a half. And I'm disappointed that our proposed alternative — the Pomerado Scripps-Poway Parkway to underground a small section of the route — was rejected.

The proposed plan as it now stands would bring a total of 667 kV to within a distance of 70 feet in our neighborhood homes. Of the actual — not the property line, but the house. 70 feet.

Future addition of additional lines — and we need to know if that's going to also impact our neighborhood — would increase that an incomprehensible 897 kV coming within 70 feet of the homes in the Rolling Hills area. And in fact, this is, as measured by the City of Poway, that it would be, as we understand, the new towers that would be up would go between the existing towers and the homes. So it's much less than 70 feet. It's a disturbing proximity.

And many people here in the Peñasquitos area are concerned about a 230 kV line going through their neighborhoods. And I once again ask that the considerations — that you consider undergrounding of incremental lines. And what I'm seeing in the outcome of this process and the behavior of those involved in the process is such that once a line goes in, there's nothing to slow down putting in more lines.

And I'm looking at right now — the potential of the math was 897 kV coming within 50 feet of homes. And there's nothing in the process that's looking out for those homeowners that are currently shouldering some of the burden of existing lines. And nowhere in your report do I see consideration for undergrounding of incremental lines simply for that purpose.

As a result, there is no end. And we're looking at megavolts in the future and no consideration to preventing that going onward. So I would appreciate if you can take that into consideration.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. BOURD: My name is Alex Bourd. I also live in Park Village, and I'm the father of children aged four and one.

And I want to oppose the segment that goes through Park Village Road on the reason that it can affect children and expose them 24 hours a day.

I live 150 feet from Park Village Road. And the lines will be underground of the play field where my kids play. So they're exposed 24 hours a day. And I know firsthand what it means. So I just cannot understand how a State agency could allow that to happen.

I come from Soviet Union. And there, the people always hear last. And I emigrated here. I feel that this state puts people first. And this, it's people last. The military wants to oppose it. We have military in our neighborhood. Ask them if they want their children exposed.

So I'd also like to encourage reconsideration of the proposal going through Miramar. Because that doesn't affect anybody except minor convenience of military between construction time.

That's all. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: John Hildebrand.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Hi. I really had a question that couldn't get answered earlier. The lady on your right —

MR. MICHAELSON: Susan Lee.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Susan, you mentioned that there were going to be an additional four or five 150 kV lines?

MR. MICHAELSON: I think she corrected herself. Four total. She's going to address that afterwards.

MR. HILDEBRAND: As long as I'm here, how many actual lines are there?

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. She's going to — we're not going to try and do a Q and A.

MR. HILDEBRAND: You said earlier I could ask my question.

MR. MICHAELSON: Do you want to go through that right now?

Is that your only question?

MR. HILDEBRAND: I have a follow-up also, if that's all right.

MS. LEE: I know this is a question that several people have. If you look at page 5 of this notice, there's a paragraph and a half that discusses future phases of the Sunrise Powerlink — I'm sorry, page 4.

The future phases were described to us, when we asked questions of SDG&E, about the required width of the right-of-way for some of the alternatives. The response explained that this substation was being built for — it says in here up to six — six 230 circuits.

Now, the one that's being built is two circuits on one set of towers. That leaves four more for the future. These are not guaranteed. They're not, at this point, planned.

The way it's been described to us by SDG&E is, they are expected at some point in the future to utilize the substation that's being proposed in response to growth that would happen in the future.

So the agencies want to disclose the fact that the substation is being built for more than just this double circuit line that's on these maps here. The substation is being built for additional future projects that may or may not come to pass.

I think we're in an effort to disclose to everybody what seems likely to come to pass. We want to include in this document a description of the most likely routes. From the Central East Substation to the Escondido area appears to be most likely, and another one appears to be a duplication to the Sycamore Canyon Substation.

It's very difficult to guess where these lines would go. But we want to include in this document some estimate — and of the environmental impacts — and to let people know that this is a possibility. And it's on the table for possible future growth.

MR. HILDEBRAND: So if I understand you correctly, there are going to be probably a total of six 250 kV lines?

MS. LEE: Circuits. That means three sets of towers, right.

MR. MICHAELSON: Leaving that substation?

MR. HILDEBRAND: Right. That means there's going to be 1500 kV coming from the Imperial Valley, coming into that substation?

MS. LEE: You can't really add kVs that way. Usually, the power is looked at in megawatts. A 1500 kV line has the ability to carry 2,000 megawatts and the equipment you have on it. So it is a 500 kV line can be expanded. So there definitely will be the capacity to have six 230 kV lines coming out of that.

And it's nothing that SDG&E has proposed to build. It's a disclosure issue that we think is important for the EIR/EIS to explain pail mail.

MR. HILDEBRAND: So if I understand this correctly, you're going to build a 1500 kV tower, and you can add additional lines onto that tower to increase the capacity?

MS. LEE: You don't have to build additional lines. The 500 kV, as it's built, to meet the capacity of the power that it carries, could be increased just by adjusting the transmission system to allow more power to flow. You don't need to put additional lines on it.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Okay.

Now, the part through Peñasquitos, how many of those six — additional six lines would the circuits — would be going through Peñasquitos?

MS. LEE: We don't know. What we're in the process of defining now, it's what we think is the most likely scenario that will be looked at in the EIR/EIS. Pretty much all we know is in this paragraph (indicating). This is pretty new information to us.

I think SDG&E described it as likely substations, including Sycamore Canyon and Escondido. So it's possible it could come to Peñasquitos. We don't want to take that off the table. But it's totally speculation.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Just one more question.

What effect would additional capacity have, assuming you send down to Escondido and one somewhere else? So we could have four 250 kV lines coming from Peñasquitos.

Is that going to affect the undergrounding? Are we going to be able to underground that many lines?

MS. LEE: That's a good question. One of the things this issue has made clear to us is that we need to know that there may be a possibility that each alternative isn't just ending with a double circuit 230 kV line.

But at the point that the substation is, it needs to have the probability to have additional lines. So if you're looking at an underground alternative, we would want to have more than one alternative.

And as you can see, there are several undergrounds that could be considered in the urban area. We are also looking at this kind of speculative future phase and where that possibly could be located.

MR. HILDEBRAND: How much of this future phase is being addressed by the current environmental report now?

MS. LEE: We're just writing the report right now. So we're now defining what — how the report will define those future phases.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Are we just dealing with the 500 kV and the 250 kV lines? Or are we dealing with the 1500 kV and the six —

MS. LEE: The proposed project is still a 500 kV line to the Central East Substation and a double circuit 230 kV. That's the project that's proposed. And that's the project that SDG&E has said it plans to build.

So the future phases is analyzed because NEPA and CEQA, the federal agencies that govern the analysis, require that we look at reasonable foreseeable other elements. So if this project is driving the likelihood that other things will happen as a result of it, the disclosure of those other things, we feel, is important.

MR. HILDEBRAND: And how will this disclosure of additional capacity affect the special alternatives, especially the no-line, no additional transmission capacity?

MS. LEE: I don't think it will directly affect that alternative at all. Because the non-wires alternatives, the generation alternatives, are alternatives that in themselves are objectives of the proposed project. So there isn't a future growth scenario.

You would — you know, what the future phases does is basically take the needs analysis another 10 or 20 years into the future. So certainly if San Diego continues to grow, other things will be required in the next 10, 20, 30, 40 years. We're not trying to do that.

The reason that we're getting, basically, involved in this is that this is a reasonably foreseeable consequence of that project by virtue of this being this very large substation that is intended to allow the development of additional circuits.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Okay.

So the proposed additional circuits aren't really going to be addressed in this report?

MR. MICHAELSON: Can I jump in here for a second?

We're using a lot of NEPA/CEQA-type language. And something is getting lost in the translation here. She keeps saying “disclosure” of something that's reasonably foreseeable, and you're saying “proposed project.”

These are things that could happen. But they're not proposed at this point. And so you're asking her to speculate on things that aren't really proposed, that are just possibilities. And I just don't know how much further you can speculate. I've already gone a couple steps beyond.

MR. HILDEBRAND: At this point as it's been disclosed, that being considered to add additional capacity.

MR. MICHAELSON: Right.

MR. HILDEBRAND: Wouldn't it be proper to address that?

MS. LEE: We are.

MR. MICHAELSON: In terms of the potential environmental impacts, yes. But that's different than saying these additional lines have been proposed. That's all. They haven't been. In fact, they're even speculating on where they might go.

I think there were about 12 questions, actually. And it's been interesting, because I think a lot of people are interested in this. But I think we have exhausted what knowledge is there. We're getting really into the very speculative realm at this point.

Do you have any other comment to make?

MR. HILDEBRAND: No.

MR. MICHAELSON: They were good questions. Thank you.

That exhausts all the cards. Is there anyone who hasn't spoken yet tonight who would like to?

Go ahead and come forward.

MR. CHAPMAN: I just have a question.

MR. MICHAELSON: Could you give us your name?

MR. CHAPMAN: Phillip Chapman.

I have a question between what a single circuit is and a double circuit, and what this 230 means compared to what I have going across my back yard right now, which is — I live right off of Bassmore Drive, just below the Mount Carmel High School field.

MR. MICHAELSON: I actually have a suggestion to make, which is that we break to the small group sessions, again, because we're getting into the kind of questions that are really difficult. So I'm going to adjourn the meeting and have somebody come talk about that. Thank you.

All right. There's no one else?

Then I would like to thank you, everybody, very much for coming out tonight. You're obviously very involved, and we appreciate your very constructive comments.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.)