

**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 1:00 p.m. February 9, 2007
At Temecula, California

Reported by:
Michelle Mc Laughlin, CSR No. 13025

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 10
Public Comments begin on page 11

PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER

Mr. O'Neal	12
Mr. Stinnett	13,25
Ms. Dye	13
Ms. Nelson	14
Mr. Weiler	15
Mr. Hunter	16
Ms. Hunter	17
Mr. Kwon	18-19
Mr. Nelson	19
Ms. Pierce	19
Ms. Stinnett	19
Mr. Sterra	20
Mr. Guzman	21
Ms. Johnson	22
Mr. Trafecanty	22
Ms. Porter	23-24
Mr. Douley	24
Mr. Guthrie	24

STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good afternoon and welcome. We're so glad you could be here today.

Thank you to the City of Temecula for hosting this meeting and allowing us to use their facilities.

Ordinarily, we don't like to kind of sit up here on a stage above you. We like to be on the same level, but in this facility, this is the easiest way for us to do this. I notice that most of you had the opportunity to take advantage of the time we built in ahead of time for you to talk more specifically about the proposed project and its alternatives at the stations over there, and we hope that was informative for you.

My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work for Katz & Associates, and we are part of the EIR/EIS team. In particular, we're involved in helping with the public participation aspects, specifically helping support and conduct these meetings.

I was the moderator for the first round of scoping meetings. We had seven meetings in five locations, and this time we've added a few because of the addition of —

Can I ask for the conversation at the boards to stop? It's very distracting. Thank you.

The original proposal, as many of you may or may not know, had a fairly defined corridor, but as it went forward from there, there was consideration and suggestions about — and additions of a number of different alternatives to the proposed project, which took us further south, which is why we held additional meetings this time around in Alpine, Boulevard down near the border in San Diego County, because of some of the system alternatives that are being considered, again, as alternatives to the proposed project, including such things as the LEAPS Project, that brings us up north into Riverside for this meeting here today. So we're very happy you could be here.

As I said, this is a second round of scoping meetings. The first one really focused on the proposed project, and we got a lot of really good input from the meetings that we had and the written comments that were sent in about environmental impacts that people are concerned about and, again, also alternatives.

In fact, there was so much that was received about alternatives, and they evolved so much since the first round of scoping that a request was made from the stakeholders, and California Public Utilities Commission and Bureau of Land Management both agreed that it made sense — although it's unusual — to go out and do a second round of scoping.

So while these meetings are not required, we're very happy to be here and really want to listen to what you have to say.

So the agenda — after I explain a little bit more about the purpose of today, Billie Blanchard with the California Public Utilities Commission will talk about their process for review of the proposed power line from SDG&E and get a schedule update because it's changed since the first round of scoping we did in October.

Lynda Kastoll with the Bureau of Land Management, which is also involved because of some of the land that they manage, will talk about their part of the review of the process.

Then Susan Lee is with Aspen Environmental Group, and she, among several others that were staffing the posting stations — were from the firm that was hired by these two agencies to help in the preparation of the joint document, the Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement.

Billie is going to talk in more detail about the process for screening and adding and eliminating alternatives so you kind of know how we got to where we are today with a list of proposed alternatives.

Then Susan will talk more specifically about the actual ones recommended for addition or elimination with a particular focus on this part of the region, the ones we think you would be most interested in knowing about.

Then we get to the part which is really the most important, which is your opportunity to comment on the record. We have a court reporter seated below me to my left, who is here to take a verbatim transcript of everything that is said, and that's why when it is time for public comment, we will have you come up and use the microphone so everyone can hear, and she can hear you really well.

So we're here to inform the public and responsible agencies about the alternatives proposed for full analysis in the draft EIR/EIS.

And that's an important point. The document has not been prepared yet. The analysis has not been conducted because until they decide on what the final array of alternatives are, they wouldn't know precisely what it is that they are analyzing.

So don't be fooled that we're out for a second round. This is not the public hearings on the draft document. This is the second round of scoping before preparing that document. Also we're here to update you on the review process and schedule and then to solicit input regarding alternatives to the proposed project to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS and those proposed to be eliminated.

There was a scoping report developed after the first round, but because we're doing a second round of scoping, there will be a second alternatives report.

So on to the next slide. One thing that I would like to make abundantly clear, because it always seems to get lost somewhere during the meeting, is that SDG&E is the applicant, but they are not a part of today's meeting.

The people seated before you today represent the two public agencies, again, the California Public Utilities Commission and the Bureau of Land Management, who are responsible for doing an analysis and review of that application. So if you could just keep that in mind, bear that in mind when you're making your comments, we would appreciate it.

So with that, I would like to go ahead and turn it over to Billie Blanchard to talk about the CPUC process.

MS. BLANCHARD: Good afternoon.

I'll give a little bit of an overview of the process and the timelines for the CPUC and BLM.

The CPUC has two power review processes for SDG&E's application for the CPCN on Sunrise, the general proceeding portion and the environmental review, CEQA/NEPA process.

The general proceeding is being led by Commissioner Dian Grueneich and the administrative law judge Steve Weissman. The scope of a CPCN proceeding is defined by the Public Utilities Code Section 1002.

In terms of determining the need for the project, looking at the community values, recreational park areas, historic/esthetic values, and environmental impacts.

I wanted to give a few highlights on the general proceeding process and timelines. We've had a couple of prehearing conferences down here in Ramona already. The scoping memo has been prepared by the administrative law judge in November of 2006. That outlines the scope of issues and the schedule for the proceeding.

There was some slight modification to that schedule in January of 2007. Testimony has begun to be exchanged, beginning in January of 2007. We have evidentiary hearings coming up on the Phase 1 and 2 portions beginning in July of 2007. ALJ proposed decision is scheduled to be out in December of 2007, the CPUC decision in January of 2008.

As far as the environmental review process, we didn't have a defined schedule the last time we were out here in our first round of scoping, and now we do. Where we are now — we did do a first round of scoping meetings in the fall, and we did a scoping report that came out in November of 2006. We are now in a second round of scoping meetings specifically on alternatives. We have a 30-day scoping period going on from January 24th to February 23rd, 2007.

We will, again, put out a second scoping report on the results of all of those meetings and input in March. The draft EIR/EIS is scheduled to be released in July, specifically July 13th, 2007.

There will be a 90-day comment period on the EIR/EIS going from July to October 2007. We are expecting to have a final EIR/EIS out in November of 2007.

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

MS. KASTOLL: Hi. Good afternoon.

BLM is involved in the project because SDG&E applied to us to cross federal lands from the Imperial Valley Substation into central San Diego.

If you look at Figure 1 in your handout there, you can see that you can't get out of the Imperial Valley Substation without crossing BLM lands in any direction.

The proposed project crosses approximately 31 miles in Imperial County and about 1.3 miles over near Ramona. In addition, part of the right-of-way through Anza-Borrego that currently contains a 69-kV line is a federal reserve for which BLM issued a right-of-way in 1955. It's 100-foot wide. That right-of-way has recently expired, and BLM's continued role is under review by our legal people now.

BLM will also be considering a plan amendment to our California Desert Conservation Area Plan which affects only the BLM lands in Imperial County because the proposed alignment deviates from any of our designated utility quarters.

BLM is also responsible for coordinating and consulting with other federal agencies such as the Fish & Wildlife Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Defense, Cleveland National Forest, and any interested federal agency as well as Native American tribes.

So this EIS/EIR will be used by BLM to decide whether or not to amend our Desert Plan and whether or not to issue SDG&E a right-of-way for the powerlink. Our record of decision is anticipated to be issued in January of 2008.

MS. LEE: Good afternoon.

I'm Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group, and I'm one of the consultants working for the CPUC and BLM to prepare the Environmental Report on the Sunrise Powerlink Project.

I'm going to describe briefly the project that SDG&E has proposed because in order for you to understand what we're looking at in terms of alternatives, which is why we're out here today — it will help you to understand the project itself.

If you can turn to Figure 1, which is in the notice — it's the first of the ten maps in the back of that package — you'll see on there a long blue line and a red line that connect about in the middle of the map.

The project that SDG&E has proposed is a 500-kV transmission line starting in El Centro, as Lynda mentioned. It would continue for about 55 miles through Imperial County and then enter San Diego County almost right at the eastern border of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

The 500-kV line — and this is the major, high-voltage transmission line — would travel through the center of Anza-Borrego right along Highway 78 in the same corridor and, in fact, co-located with an existing 69-kV line, which is the small wood pole line that follows through the middle of the park.

It would then, at the — just a few miles west on the Anza-Borrego State Park border would be a major substation called the Central East Substation — and you'll see a note for that on the top center of this Figure 1 — where the power would be converted from 500 kilovolts, 500 kV, to 230 kV, and then the red line that continues all the way over to the coast is a 230-kV line that brings power into the developed urban areas on the west side of San Diego and then the northern part of San Diego County.

There are other components to this project besides just the transmission the line. One of them is, as I mentioned, a major new substation in the northern part of San Diego County. There also are other system upgrades, one of which is also shown on this map south of the Sycamore Canyon Substation, a section of existing transmission line that would be reconductored, which means the existing wires on there would be replaced with newer, higher-capacity wires, and then there would be modifications to a couple of substations within SDG&E's system.

The third part of the project that's being proposed is something that we've been developing a description of over the past few weeks. We know now that SDG&E's major substation would have not only a single double-circuit, 230-kV line leaving it, but it's being built for a capacity of two additional lines, two additional double-circuit lines, so we're looking at a reasonably foreseeable event of an expansion out of that facility over the next 10 or 20 years, and we are going to evaluate in the EIR/EIS what we think is the best, most likely case for that.

Any additional lines out of that substation would have to be evaluated by a separate EIR/EIS and would have a separate evaluation/application process through the CPUC, but we want to include it in this document as a reasonably foreseeable event.

The next few slides — and you have all of these slides in your handouts — I'll go over very quickly. What these slides show is what the major impacts are that we've identified at this point. And as Lewis said, we haven't prepared the EIR/EIS yet, but we've identified in each segment what the major impacts are because it's these impacts that help us decide what alternatives we should look at.

As you can tell from just flipping through this package, the alternatives are very broad and regional, so we'll just go quickly through these slides.

The Imperial Valley has about 20 miles of segment that is along the edge of agricultural lands, so there are impacts to agricultural land uses and also impacts to dairy farms and some endangered species including the flat-tailed horned lizard.

The Anza-Borrego link is the one that has gotten really the most attention because it is a segment — the park itself has a very strong constituency, and these impacts to the park would be, in fact, fairly dramatic. A new high-voltage line through the park would include direct impacts to state-designated wilderness.

The line itself, of course, would be highly visible. There are impacts to biological resources and cultural resources, big horned sheep. We're looking at those impacts in a lot of detail, and the park itself is the reason for many of the alternatives that I'll describe a little later.

As we get west of the park, the impacts are primarily to residential areas. The Central Link also includes quite a few very scenic agricultural areas, ranching areas that are historic ranching areas that, at this point, do not have major transmission lines through them. So we're looking at, in the Central Link, visual and agricultural resources.

Then as we go further west into what's called the Inland Valley Link — this is the area around Ramona — and the Coastal Link, which is the more developed area, Scripps Ranch, Rancho Peñasquitos, the impacts are primarily related to effects on residences, and the impacts there, because SDG&E has proposed both overhead and underground line segments, include construction noise, corona noise from the operation of the line itself, the visibility of the line itself. So those are the kinds of issues we're looking at along the route, and we'll talk about it a little bit in terms of why we evaluated certain alternatives.

We'll skip over this substation. Go ahead past these. I pretty much talked through these already.

Okay. Back to Billie.

MS. BLANCHARD: First of all, just, again, to go over where we are in the process now, we are into a second scoping, and we are in the screening of alternatives stage of this project, of the EIR/EIS.

The methodology for screening alternatives is utilizing the NEPA/CEQA criteria, and the reasonable range of alternatives is determined by basically three main things, the consistency with most

or all of the project objectives, and then we use the three main objectives of reliability, access to renewables, and economic benefits.

Second, the ability to reduce or avoid significant impacts of the proposed project that's been identified through our environmental team analysis, agency consultations, information from the PEA, data requests, and scoping comments.

And then, third, feasibility, technical concerns: Can it actually be built? Regulatory feasibility: Can it be permitted? And legal issues, which is: Could it be allowed under the law?

Sources of alternatives that we've included are alternatives suggested in scoping comments — and we received many suggestions about alternatives through our scoping process — reconsideration of SDG&E's PEA alternatives and also the reconsideration of alternatives that were eliminated by SDG&E also alternatives from the CPUC proceeding filings and from the ISO alternative process.

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

Now I'm going to turn it back to Susan Lee, and she is going to go into more specifics regarding the alternatives.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Billie.

The first five slides here that talk about alternatives — in fact, six — talk about, as Billie described, the route segment alternatives. What these are are portions of the route that was proposed between El Centro and the coast in which we've recommended small route changes that either vary for, you know, a half-mile or two miles in order to reduce or avoid impacts to the proposed route itself, and because we're now in a meeting that's kind of at a more reasonable scale, we'll skip through these local improvements until we get to the one talking about Southwest Powerlink alternatives.

If you have specific questions about any of these small route segment alternatives, feel free to talk to us afterwards, and we'll stay around and make sure we've answered all of your questions.

If you will turn to Figure 8 now in the same package that has all of the maps, Figure 8 shows the Southwest Powerlink alternatives, and you can tell from looking at the map of where the proposed project goes, between El Centro and San Diego, that it would be a more direct line to get between those two points to go basically due west out of the Imperial Valley Substation into the southern part of San Diego.

We were directed, when we started this process, to look for alternatives that avoided impacts to Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

If you look at the map on Figure 8, you'll see that the very large, light green area along the right-hand side of that map is Anza-Borrego, and it, in fact, continues all the way to the south until a point where it's only a mile or two north of the Mexican border.

So looking for routes that actually avoid Anza-Borrego, the only way to do that is to look at routes that are very down — very far south looking near the Mexican border, following, to some

extent, the Southwest Powerlink, and that's an existing 500-kV transmission line that SDG&E operates between the Imperial Valley Substation and the Miguel Substation.

So we looked at several alternatives that would be much further south than the proposed route. We were trying to minimize the amount of distance that the line would parallel the Southwest Powerlink.

For reliability reasons, you don't want to have 500-kV lines next to each other any longer than you need to, and also the further west you go in San Diego County, the fire risk increases dramatically, and you don't want to get to the point where one fire would cause both of these lines to be out at the same time.

So we have four alternatives on this map. One thing to note on this map and on all of our alternatives maps, except for the system map, which we'll talk about in a minute, is the yellow lines on here are alternatives we considered but are recommending not be carried forward, and the colored lines are the ones we are recommending be considered in the EIR/EIS.

So there are four colored lines on here, the pink and brown ones, which are the Interstate 8 Alternatives and the BCD Alternatives — start in the area just southeast of Boulevard, if you know that area down by Interstate 8.

They both follow quite a bit of national forest land, some BLM land, and then they join with the blue line called Route D continuing up north through the Cleveland National Forest and connecting to a new substation site southwest of Santa Ysabel.

The other two Southwest Powerlink routes we're looking at — one is called Route D, and one is called West of Forest. They're light blue and purple on this map, and both connect to the proposed project, one in the area of Sycamore Canyon and the other one at the same point southwest of Santa Ysabel.

If we can go to the next slide — Transmission System Alternatives, this is the reason why we're here in this area today. When we started this screening process, we looked at about — almost 100 alternatives, and these included alternatives that were evaluated in the Valley to Rainbow process, which I know a lot of you will remember.

They were very large regional alternatives, and you can tell from the scale of this map that we looked at alternatives all over Imperial County, San Diego County, and Riverside County and looking for ways that each alternative would have the ability to meet the project objectives that Billie identified earlier, bringing renewables into San Diego County, providing increased reliability for SDG&E's customers, and also reducing electricity cost.

So of all of the lines on this map here, we looked at whether or not they had the ability to meet those objectives and also to reduce the impacts of the project that was proposed, the proposed Sunrise Powerlink that I described earlier, and the three projects that had been identified that had the potential to do all of those things are the three bullets that are listed here.

The first one is the LEAPS Project, and I know many of you are very familiar with this project, Lake Elsinore Advanced Pump Storage Project. The main component of this project that has the potential to meet the project objectives that Sunrise is proposed for is the 500-kV transmission line that essentially would connect the Southern California Edison transmission system with the San Diego Gas

& Electric transmission system. That would improve the reliability in San Diego County and also allow the import of renewable power from the north.

The ability of this project, the LEAPS Project, to meet the reliability objectives is now being evaluated by the California Independent System Operator. They're performing modeling for this very project that's being fed both through the Independent System Operator into the CPUC's process.

So depending on their findings, in terms of how this transmission line would serve SDG&E's system, that may change the way we're looking at this right now, but we're looking at it in anticipation of finding results from the Independent System Operator.

The other two system alternatives that we're looking at are smaller. One of them is called Mexico Light. This is a very small transmission upgrade that actually would take place in Mexico but would improve the reliability of the transmission system serving SDG&E, and that would be used really in combination with other alternatives to improve the reliability of the electric system.

The third one is called Path 44 Upgrades, which is upgrades to the Southern California Edison system. In fact, a little bit north of here, it would also allow better imported power into San Diego Gas & Electric's system. This is another one that is also being evaluated by the Independent System Operator in order to let us know whether it would meet those reliability objectives or not.

Another thing that's very important for you to know and has been really important in every one of the meetings we've held this week, in alternatives that were created based on feedback that we got in the scoping meetings we held last October, are what are called the non-wires alternatives, and these alternatives are based on generation instead of long transmission lines.

The first one is a renewable power option that would entirely be based on — not importing renewables from Imperial County but developing renewable energy sources within San Diego County, wind, solar energy, both, photovoltaic and solar thermal, and biomass/biogas, and we're developing detailed descriptions of what exactly that alternative would involve so we can evaluate the environmental impacts of that compared with the Sunrise Powerlink.

The next two alternatives start with a base of the renewable power options but then add other components to that. The Renewable Bundle 1 — or the resource bundle, would add to the renewal option also a component for conventional generation within San Diego County, which would be the South Bay Power Plant, which, as you know, is undergoing review now by the California Energy Commission, and the next renewable bundle would be renewable energy plus the South Bay Power Plant plus the ability for SDG&E to get credit for renewable power by trading renewable energy certificates, which is like a stock market for renewable energy, and this is a system that's currently being set up by state regulators.

The final option for non-wires alternatives is one where in-basin generation, such as South Bay Power Plant, may require some upgrades to transmission outside of the system but at a much smaller scale than the Sunrise Powerlink.

So as you'll see, this is a very large range of alternatives. One of the other ones that is not on the slide but is also included — as you know, it's required by law — is the No-Project/No-Action Alternative. So the regulators in this case will have the choice of saying “We've decided the project is not needed or the impacts of all of these alternatives are greater than the benefit that they provide.”

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks very much.

I appreciate everyone listening so attentively to that. As you can see, there's a lot more information that's available that can be gone over, particularly in some of the areas we went over somewhat lightly because they're not particularly in this region.

This is the time when we get to hear from you. We have a process for doing that. In particular, though, since this is the second round of scoping and it's focused on the alternatives, the type of input that you can provide today that would be particularly useful and effective would be if you agree or disagree with any of the alternatives proposed, either for retention or elimination and your reasons why you would agree or disagree with that.

In addition, you may have suggestions for further modifications to the alternatives than what's been discussed today, or you may have yet other new alternatives which have not been mentioned. So this is the time to hear that.

Now, we do know that the vast majority of Americans in survey after survey say that they are deathly afraid of public speaking, so we want to make it very clear that written comments are also extremely valued. In fact, you can oftentimes make more extensive comments that way, obviously.

Written comments are given the same weight and consideration as oral comments, so if you're not inclined to public speaking, please know that if you want to hand in written comments, we have sheets for those, or if you want to, you can mail them in, and the postmark date for mailing in for the second round of scoping is February 24th.

All of the information you see up here in terms of names and addresses, in fact, are in the handout, so you don't have to copy all of this down. There's a website, again, that's in your handout. This is the official website, if you will, for this project, in terms of the CPUC and BLM review of this process.

So if you're looking for the EIR/EIS information that's being generated by this team, you want to go to this website. If you don't have access to that, there are also 29 libraries and other offices that have all of this project information, and you can go look at hard copies.

If after this meeting you have further questions or clarifications, there's both an e-mail address and an 800 number that you can call or contact for more information.

So with that in mind, I have a series of speaker cards that have been handed in to me. I'm going to call your names in the order in which you have signed up. We've been using a three-minute time limit at all of the meetings that we've held. This is the eighth one this week.

If you've been to any of the previous meetings, you'll be very tired of this joke. I like to indicate that I have a very sophisticated way of indicating times. That is, when you've spoken for two minutes, I'll put up my index finger like this indicating you have one minute to wrap up your comments comfortably.

Then when three minutes is up, I'll hold up my closed hand indicating that it's time to move on to the next speaker. Both these mikes are live, I understand, so it doesn't really matter which one you

come up to, and we're ready to go if you are. I'll read ahead the first few names. That way you'll have some idea of where you are coming up in the rotation.

I have Paul O'Neal, Ray Stinnett, Barbara Dye, Pam Nelson, followed by Gregory Weiler. I don't need an address or serial number or anything. If you can, just give us your name and if you care to, your affiliation.

MR. O'NEAL: Certainly. My name is Paul O'Neal, Mr. Chairman, and I am here today representing NRG Energy, Incorporated. As you're going to see, my comments will elaborate and agree with the addition of the in-basin generation alternatives. The statement is on behalf of NRG. They are a client of mine.

NRG Energy owns and operates 2,000 megawatts of electric generation in the state of California. This total includes nearly 1200 megawatts in San Diego County.

During the most recent energy crunch in the state, the combined resources of NRG, other independent power producers, LS perhaps, and San Diego Gas & Electric managed to supply all of the region's energy needs.

The question you are considering today is: What initial resources are required to meet this region's current and future energy needs?

NRG would like to make you aware that we are proceeding in partnership with Impex Corporation to permit and construct a 750-megawatt power plant on the eastern reaches of the Miramar Air Station. That's very close to the Sycamore Canyon Substation.

We are also getting the design of repowering the existing Encina Generating Station in Carlsbad. These new facilities will replace our existing power generators by the year 2011. The new generators will be state of the art and will be designed to meet the profile of the county's existing regional energy strategy.

New in-basin generation is essential to maintaining grid reliability in San Diego. We believe that our projects are cost effective and will provide a greatly reduced environmental signature compared to existing facilities.

Hopefully the Sunrise line that SDG&E proposes can deliver on the promises of bringing in renewable energy resources. That's a laudable goal. We suggest also that an analysis of in-basin resources be carefully considered as an economic and reliable option for supplying this region's robust energy requirements.

As we are aggressively proceeding with these plans, we will continue to seek an agreement with SDG&E to provide them with a reliable and economical source of energy.

In this regard, NRG plans to respond to SDG&E's pending RFO projects that will meet the region's needs in partnership with SDG&E and other energy providers in the area.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

MR. O'NEAL: And I did provide comments.

MR. MICHAELSON: Written comments? Thank you very much.

Ray Stinnett.

MR. STINNETT: Good afternoon. My name is Ray Stinnett, resident of Lake Elsinore and definitely within the scoping area of this that we're talking about today.

I'd like to share some alternatives with you, some comments about the existing alternatives plus some other alternatives. I'm somewhat of an independent researcher, been interested in alternative energy since the 1960s. I think we're living in a new body of politics today. We're going to see some of these things finally begin to come to the fore.

We already have many existing alternatives such as CGIT Bus Underground, very high-efficiency method of transporting energy that's not lost heat because of — the biggest problem with transportation of energy, of course, is Ohm's Law. It either goes out as heat, magnetic radiation, or other undesirable problems.

When you put it — this underground system utilizes a dialectic fluid which retains energy within the core of the unit itself, and it's housed in concrete, and there really is no fire danger, and of course the real danger is the cost of this.

But, then, this has been a danger all along. I'm sure this project — for instance, this right here that you sent out — this packet must have cost 10 or \$15 to produce. If all of the money that we spent at these meetings went into some alternative energy projects, we probably wouldn't be here today because you wouldn't have these problems.

The lines that you've drawn all over the county — several counties — I can't sort all that out. That's too much for me, but I do believe we're coming into a new age of energy. Here's an article entitled “Democratic Energy.” The LA Department of Power and Light, they've come across a few alternatives. They've installed a fuel cell — several fuel cell options, in fact. These fuel cells run off natural gas, readily available here in California.

This is the Elsinore Municipal Water District. It seems that they put solar on their project; yet they're trying to get the LEAPS Project in here to build a dam up above where I live so it could possibly fail like Taum Sauk Dam failed, so you guys can have some energy somewhere that we're not even going to use in this area.

So I think we need to seriously consider the alternatives. We're actually living in 2007 here, and we're looking at alternatives for running power lines that have been in existence since bare wire on steel towers, nothing new about that.

It's time to move on, get some new alternatives, and I would seriously consider the use of alternatives as the front line rather than use of wires, grid, and the Public Utilities Commission, you should probably reorganize the way they think about these things.

Those are my comments. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Barbara Dye.

MS. DYE: Hi. Barbara Dye from Lakeland Village Community in the county of Lake Elsinore.

One thing that I have a problem with — Lakeland is at the base of the Ortega Mountains, which is in the LEAPS Project, and from — and I'm the president of the association there. Only six people that I know of received this notice, and I got one only because somebody else gave that to me.

Only one person on our whole board even received notice. I know that you've said you got your mailing list, but a lot of people have not had the opportunity. I don't know if La Cresta did.

La Cresta, too, is up there on the mountain and will be impacted by either the LEAPS Project and your blue line there, which goes — I think it's the Number 9. It's the dark blue line that goes.

There is a lot of opposition to that project, and I'm sure if the communities involved in that project got the information, you would have a lot more people here today and also have opposition from them. We are against the Rainbow Valley Line, and we are against any line that is going through a community.

The freeways have corridors. Put them along the freeway. It doesn't have impact on the forest. It doesn't have impact on residents. I think that is a great alternative. Use that corridor. It's there, and it won't impact the communities or the forest.

I have a campground up there by Julian, and that community, two-and-a-half years ago, was very much impacted by a downed power line, which also affected Anza-Borrego.

The central line that you have there, I think, is not good. I mean, a helicopter took down these lines. Many people lost their homes, forest habitats. Everything was lost from that fire from a downed power line, so I am suggesting that you do not put it through the forest, that you need to find an alternative like the freeway.

The communities that are impacted are Lakeland Village, Horsethief Canyon, Tenaja, La Cresta, Murrieta, Wildomar. There is very much impact on that. We do not want to have any impact on our forest, the habitats, or the communities surrounding those lines.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Pam Nelson.

MS. NELSON: Hi. I'm Pam Nelson from Warner Springs, California.

I'm happy we're discussing alternative energy today, but I think the generation site is in the wrong place. In the desert, it's a little bit too far from our population centers — well, very far from our population centers and creating quite a problem here. I agree with a non-wire alternative, and that's pretty much the only direction I think we should go at this time, particularly because this has not been a route that's been really research — focused on.

We don't see solar or PV panels in the neighborhoods. We don't see small centralized little neighborhood sites for generation. There's a lot to do right here where the users are using the power, and the users need to feel the responsibility.

I've called many times to SDG&E just saying "Hey, I have some great ideas about residential package solar panel-type of situations," where they would lease this kind of a package. It's a scary thing for a resident to do on their own. It's expensive.

There are ways to involve the consumer, and then they feel the need to conserve, all of the things that — they feel the pocketbook — all of the things they need to do when they're using energy.

We need to stay right here and look at the user, look at — forget transmission lines. They're too dangerous, inefficient, and have much too much impact on everything around us. Let's get back here to the home.

So thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Next speak is Gregory Weiler followed by Joshua Hunter, Laura Hunter, Benjamin Kwon, and Greg Nelson.

MR. WEILER: Mr. Lewis, Ms. Blanchard, and Ms. Kastoll, Ms. Lee: Greg Weiler. I'm with the law firm of Palmieri, Tyler in Irvine, California.

I'm here on behalf of Castle Euroasia Corporation, Nevada, Zen Media, and their partners, including Mr. Kwon who spoke to you, I believe, on Monday, and his partners the Hunters.

I would like to present to you — I sent it also by mail, but, for the record, I would like to give you a copy of our correspondence dated February 9th, so if you could, reference that in the record. I think I provided it to staff already.

We are outside the local area here. I know Mr. Kwon spoke to you. Our concerns pertain to the project alignment and the alternatives with respect to the Imperial Substation and that vicinity. Our clients' property is approximately 1200 acres, right where the project alignment intersects with Interstate 8.

We think that there are some facts that were not provided to the staff, for whatever reason, at the outset, when the project was proposed.

I would like to correct our letter. We came into the process late. In my letter, I refer to the proposed alignment. Really the proposed alignment, the way I now understand it, because the staff was gracious enough to explain it to me earlier today, is the project.

The project alignment, as proposed by SDG&E, runs, we think inadvertently, right through our project. The 1200 acres looks today, if you were to look at it physically, as unimproved desert land on the edge of active agricultural land, but apparently unbeknownst to staff and SDG&E, we've been scoping for four or five years with the County of Imperial and have a master-planned community, including almost 4,000 residences, commercial, recreational, open space, planned right for the intersection.

So, simply put, we object to the project — current project alignment because of all of those adverse impacts on a major residential community which could be avoided with a new alternative which we would urge on the staff, moving the alignment slightly to the west, alternatively, slightly to the east,

which would impact some agricultural land but would have less impact, we would submit, than the impact on a residential community.

So with that said, we've given more detail to the staff in the correspondence, and I know my clients would like to address you also, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

The next speaker is Joshua Hunter.

MR. HUNTER: Thank you. I don't necessarily have a fear of public speaking but simply wanted to add my comments to those by Mr. Weiler, who represents us.

I think it's important to know — as well as my comments will accompany those that were made especially by Mr. Kwon this last Monday in the El Centro area — the property — obviously when the alignment was taken into consideration by SDG&E —

MR. MICHAELSON: You need to slow down a bit for our court reporter.

MR. HUNTER: All right.

The alignment did not take into consideration our overall development. As Mr. Weiler had mentioned, if you were to drive out there today, it looks nothing like — a raw piece of land, as any community or development would start out that way.

Had it been brought to the attention of SDG&E and had the BLM communicated the proposed project and our progress that we had made up to this point, I think that the alignment would have been majorly reconsidered.

As anyone knows, the project alignment goes right through the middle, bisecting two of the major parcels, which will go through the heart of the residential area consisting of at least 4,000 homes at this time, a golf course, compact lakes, and other things that are also planned into the community.

It also will become the gateway for the El Centro area, revitalizing an economy that has consistently needed some revitalization and, therefore, has received the support of a local county government, specifically Mr. Herberger as well as Congressman Robert Filner.

In understanding the project in and of itself, Mr. Kwon acquired the property some years ago with the ambition of fulfilling a life-long dream to build and develop a residential community and all of its components, which would be churches, schools, the retail and the commercial that go along with it.

Once that information had become public, we were approached by several large public builders, specifically Lennar, and in negotiations with Lennar and in contract with Lennar. Therefore, the value of the property is clearly established by negotiations with these companies.

I understand the process that we're going through. I understand the need for upgrading existing facilities as well as adding additional electrical facilities in these areas; however, in future — planning for the future growth is key, but it needs to take into consideration all the economic growth. Not only does it bisect our project, but it also runs along easterly — along that easterly portion of the 8 freeway, and, therefore, it causes severe damage to the economic growth of the project or the area, specifically

our freeways — Interstate 8 alone will become a major artery and a gateway for the community and impact commercial and other values of the project.

So we would propose that — although it's needed, that an alternative route would be to push the lines — or the transmission lines to the northwestern portion above Dunaway Road and then offset the alignment from Interstate 8 and away from those areas and, therefore, be able to accommodate both the needs of the general public in obtaining electricity as well as allowing that future economic growth.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Laura Hunter.

MS. HUNTER: Good afternoon. My name is Laura Hunter. I'm representing the Environmental Health Coalition, and I'm not associated with the project that was discussed earlier, just to be clear.

I want to thank you for coming down. I know you've been going through a lot of meetings and taking a lot of input, and I appreciate your hard work and the responsiveness that I think that the consultants and the agencies have had on this.

Environmental Health Coalition strongly supports the no-wires/in-basin generation option. However, we, as equally, oppose the reliance on the LS Power South Bay Replacement Generation Project. That project — and you may not know because I don't think all of you are from here — has run into a lot of trouble recently.

The majority of the city council of Chula Vista has come out against it, and the court has said “If the city doesn't want it, we're not going to give them a lease,” so that leaves them with no site. If they don't have a lease for the land on the bay front from the Port District, they cannot do the project. So we think that that should be removed as — that particular project description should be removed from your consideration.

There are lots of opportunities to look at, some portion of — or different — other projects or other sizes of generation within the county that aren't the LS Power proposal, and we're very active in that CEC proceeding.

It also has zero renewable energy component, which gets you absolutely nowhere in terms of the renewables requirement.

We also think the non-wires alternative should be enhanced by what we believe are regulatory barriers. If you could remove some of these regulatory barriers, then you would have a much faster deployment of clean, renewable energy in the region.

We hope you are tracking the renewable energy study group's analysis of what is the technical potential in the county for renewable energy, and just not even trying — breaking a sweat, I can come up with six regulatory barriers that are really frustrating our ability to do renewable energy development in the region.

Removal of the net metering cap, removal of limitations on direct access. Require Architecture 2030 efficiency limits. Remove the barriers on the current rate structure. Restructure the rates to

incentivize the current preferred loading order and give big users the ability to export renewable energy across the street, which went from one building to another, which right now they cannot do.

But we would also ask you to select one as the maximum global climate hazard reduction alternative. Given the news on February 2nd that it's a matter of how hot we're going to heat up the planet, we should really be pushing the envelope on — we need to know what is the best alternative if we really want to reduce the climate hazards that are coming our way. As a coastal area, that's very, very important to us because sea rise is a very significant part of that.

We will be submitting written comments, but we do think that there are many good in-basin alternatives to an unnecessary multi-billion dollar power line.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Benjamin Kwon followed by Greg Nelson, Kathy Pierce, and Sandra Stinnett.

MR. KWON: Good afternoon BLM, Lynda Kastoll, and California Public Utilities Commission person and moderator. My name is Benjamin. I was in El Centro last Monday, and I already expressed my concern about my project.

As you know, my partner already described the exact area of proposal, and his position was opposing based upon so much invasive critical upheaval for my 4,000 homes including a community golf course as well as a lake, which shall — actually, a new rising of Imperial County along the freeway system, and I really want to develop this project with a major corporate — major home builders — that is Lennar, Centex, as well as DR Horton, and KB Homes already expressed an interest, and I already phoned my partners, and we are moving ahead.

Within a couple of months, we will file an application as well as the go-ahead, of course, of in-depth development, so I do not — against or anything.

As you know, I already mentioned about that San Diego Gas & Electric Company need this crucial transmitter line. I understand. It's a necessary evil, and we have to make a deal on the basis of reasoning minds.

I propose the previously — and, for example, my case is mostly renewable energy and solar energy as well as — [unintelligible] energy company will eventually end up leasing BLM land, messing with BLM land, and actually they are going to pay BLM substantial ground.

I believe simply, one thing. The beneficiary is supposed to — [unintelligible]. BLM has substantial land holdings depressed by the company — you are bidding on natural resources, so they have plenty of land they can consider — [unintelligible].

So the alternative plans they can develop, and then that's going to be very, very helpful to promote this area, a new starting, as well as they really need and are entitled to have a good project. Second to none, a project compared with Los Angeles, compared with Orange County or San Diego. I really want to demonstrate that this project is kind of my life project, and since 1992, I have been working with BLM as well as USDA and the county government.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

MR. KWON: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Greg Nelson.

MR. NELSON: Thank you for your time.

I would encourage you to put the in-basin generation ideas at the top of the list.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can you just state your name first, please?

MR. NELSON: Greg Nelson, Warner Springs.

Since most of the infrastructure is already in place, the use of renewables, in-basin only makes sense. Source point generation works. We've had a solar/wind hybrid system supplying all of our power at our home for over seven years. We know it works.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, sir.

Kathy Pierce.

MS. PIERCE: Good afternoon.

My name is Kathy Pierce, and I'm here representing my mother's property at Assessor's Parcel Number 101-060-09. It's off Tenaja Road, and this is the first meeting that I've been to, so — but I do want to come here and document the fact that our property is being very adversely affected because of the LEAPS power line adjoining one of the corners of the property, and that we obviously adverse — it has a major adverse effect on the property, and I wanted to express my opposition to the property — I'm sorry — to the proposed LEAPS Project.

Also I'm here on behalf of Dr. and Mrs. David Moulton who have Assessor's Parcel Number 101-060-08, and their property would be almost equally adversely affected by the LEAPS Project. Thank you. And they adamantly oppose 111858. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Sandra Stinnett.

MS. STINNETT: Good afternoon. And thank you for listening to our —

I'm not representing any business. I live in Lake Elsinore. My name is Sandra Stinnett, and I'm representing — I guess I could say I'm representing my welfare and the welfare of all others who live in all of these areas, and the only alternative I would be interested in would be the alternative, you know, where we don't have the power lines and all the generation, you know, and we do need to consciously think about the renewables because I know it's been a long time coming and all, but there does have to be some changes made, as everybody here knows. As far as — you know, I don't know how to put this other than saying no one wants to live with these high wires, you know. We don't want them in any of our neighborhoods. They've already been, like, run out of all of the other neighborhoods, and now we're down here in Elsinore again.

I do think they are very dangerous for fire. I lived in Malibu. We were by power lines. They slapped together, burned our neighborhood all the way down to the ocean just because the wind blew, and there's a lot of environmental issues that are very important that I feel have been glossed over, and

the big reports that people don't understand — I took a lot of time to read it and so did my husband, but everyone doesn't understand this, and everyone doesn't know about it.

Even though you let everybody know, there's been no conscious effort to let anybody — all of the people of Lake Elsinore know anything in particular of the negative aspects of, say, the LEAPS Project, so you really need to get more information out there because when everybody in Lake Elsinore and these surrounding areas finds out what would really be involved and they know about all this, it's going to be a bad, scary picture.

I mean, I don't know why anybody wants to try to just approach it from this angle when we are in a new century here, and we do deserve to really pay attention to this.

I have clients. I'm a real estate agent. I'm a Realtor. I have clients whose property will be impacted in Tenaja, and everybody out there doesn't all know about it. Obviously if they did, they'd be here saying no. They don't really understand all of this. They don't understand how it affects them.

In closing, I would just ask you to take a close look at this, and I am — you know, I just have to oppose it because we don't need an earthen dam. Like the LEAPS Project would be an earthen dam right above us, and if it failed like one did in 2005, it scoured all the dirt to the bedrock as it went down the mountain, and only the caretaker's daughter suffered during that, but think how many people live in Lake Elsinore.

I know Anza-Borrego is not very populated, and they don't even want it there. But think how many people live in Elsinore. They would be impacted definitely negatively by this process.

So thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

I'm having a little bit of trouble reading this one. It looks like John Strmina — I'm not sure. You probably will recognize it — followed by John Guzman, Sr., Betty Johnson, and Denis Trafecanty.

MR. STERRA: Yes. I'd like to bring up a couple of points. One is the —

MR. MICHAELSON: If you could, tell us your name, please.

MR. STERRA: Yeah. John Sterra.

Figure 8, as you brought up earlier, has — it shows an — one of the alternative routes which runs south along the border, and that route is — an alternative is being chosen which runs through Jacumba — the town of Jacumba and travels westerly, and then it goes north, and then there's two routes shown there, a magenta and then a brown line, and that magenta and brown line, right at that corner, which would be in the corner of that map, really pass through a neighborhood of quite a few little ranch homes in that area.

We're planning to do a project there, which is really based on solar, and we're quite familiar with wind power and solar, and we just think that that route is a destructive route.

If you did have to choose a route in that area for some reason, I would think going north of the Interstate 8 and connecting again somewhere around Imperial County/San Diego County line and then

going north of Interstate 8 would be an alternative which would have far less impact on that entire neighborhood.

If you travel that area, you'll see a lot of ranches and homes and a potential for building in that area, and it would really knock that all out and create quite a havoc.

I understand that there's also research being done in England, and when I worked at NASA, I know other people were down the hall from me doing studies of sheep under power lines in California. I could refer you to these people. I don't know what the actual data is at the moment for cancer hazards due to these power lines for people living near them.

However, I do know that there were studies in England showing that people on one side of the street closer to the power line had a much higher leukemia rate in children and the adults, and I think that we ought to be paying attention to that.

I lived many years in the Malibu mountains, and I know that I was able to live without power lines quite conveniently, and I have — and at that time, I had a mini computer. Now I have a dual-core processor, which blows away a main frame of the old days by a factor of 100, and it runs on about 20 watts.

And I would like to see your data for implementation of your power plants in the Barstow area where you're using solar, and you're using several varieties. I know you're using an oil based — a Stirling engine. I would like to see the data cost on that and compare it to all this enormous cost of natural gas burning and compare that to wind power, the cost of investment and the cost of maintenance.

I understand it's actually cheaper to run these plants, from newspaper articles, now using your Stirling solar engine approach than it is to build the plant, and it doesn't even require fuel, so I think you're already in the 21st century. Take all that money and please put it into solar and wind and whatever else in that area you can come up with.

I thank you very much for your time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

John Guzman, Senior.

MR. GUZMAN: Good afternoon and thank you very much. My name is John Guzman, Senior.

Actually, my son is a better speaker than I am, but I'd first like to thank you for allowing the public to share their thoughts with you. I think it's very important. My wife and I live in Lakeland Village up in the area that's going to be affected by the LEAPS Project, and I'm also a member of the Project Area Redevelopment Committee where there's redevelopment work being done in the Lakeland/Wildomar area.

To a person there on the board, we feel very, very strongly that we're all against the LEAPS Project. The concern, again — we have power lines that are going to be coming — be placed up on our hills on the Cleveland Ridge.

I don't know if you're very familiar with the area, but there are extremely high winds that come through that area. A couple of months back, we had what was called the Lookout Fire. It started out very small, and before you know it, the whole — the hillside was ablaze.

We were very lucky because that fire was actually stopped before it got into the residences of Lakeland Village, the homes. Had it come into the homes there — if it had happened one night before where the winds were just howling through there, Lakeland Village community would have been destroyed.

My wife and I have lived there in Lakeland Village for about four years now, and we really love the quiet. It's very tranquil up there, especially in the evening, right up there by the hills.

I did want to come just give you the message, though. The Lakeland Village residents, for the most part — the people I talked to didn't even know about this meeting. In fact, I just heard about the meeting through Barbara Dye who is the president of Lakeland Village Neighborhood Association, and one of the members reminded me that this meeting was going to occur.

I think it's very important for other members of the Lakeland Village community to know about this and come out and tell you about their concerns.

Please consider what Ray is saying about putting the power lines underground. For esthetic reasons and for safety reasons, I really think it would be worth the additional cost to do that, especially along the ridge there, the Cleveland Ridge. It would really make a lot more people amenable to the idea.

So thank you very much for your time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Betty Johnson.

MS. JOHNSON: I live in southwest Riverside County, and I'm concerned with the LEAPS Project.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can you give us your name, please?

MS. JOHNSON: Oh, Betty Johnson.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: I hope you will look at the original EIR/EIS done for the Valley Rainbow Project and any other studies done after that project was rejected when you are looking at the LEAPS Project.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Denis Trafecanty.

MR. TRAFECANTY: I don't know if you remember me, but I was at the scoping meetings in El Centro, Ramona, Wynola, Rancho Peñasquitos, Boulevard, Alpine, and Borrego Springs.

I think one thing that we're forgetting here — I wish you would all put the maps away and look at Page 20 of that book and look at the wireless alternatives which they call no-wires.

One thing that we need to remember is that those who use the power should supply the power. The backcountry of San Diego County and Imperial Valley don't need the power. It's all no-growth. San Diego needs the power.

Now, I'm not as eloquent as Paul O'Neal is. I respect him a lot, and I think that you ought to consider Encina and Miramar. As far as what Laura was saying as it relates to South Bay, I'm not knowledgeable enough to know whether or not Chula Vista and that area is creating any power, but they can't just stop consideration of South Bay unless they have some other alternative, which might be renewables. The sun does shine in San Diego. You don't need to go to Imperial Valley.

Let me tell you about Stirling Systems. Ten-year-old — I think it's 20-, 30-year-old technology. It's a bait and switch. There's six units at the Sandia Labs in New Mexico. That technology was rejected by the jet propulsion lab. And they're talking about building 12- to 36,000 of them.

Any smart investor or promoter would realize that you don't get money unless you can prove your technology in high volumes. Someone could build a prototype. By the way, the prototypes aren't working.

The Central Substation — I think you're going to have to get the Rainbow ladies out again, ladies and gentlemen, because the Central Substation has six circuits. Okay? And if you'll look what's in the proposed plan, it looks like a mountain, and at the top of the mountain is the Central Substation, and only two of those circuits are being used on the proposed line.

Where do you think the other four circuits are going? LA, Orange County, Riverside. That's what SDG&E wants to do, same company that stole billions of dollars from us, by the way.

Let me see. Dirty energy from Mexico? Yeah. A lot of health hazards in Imperial Valley. What we are doing about it is we have a fund similar to what the Rainbow ladies put together. It's called Protect Our Communities. I'll be happy to give anyone a copy of it. We're fighting it technically. We're fighting it environmentally, and we're going to have to fight it legally if we can't get the CPUC to vote it down.

Thank you for your time and enjoy your trip back.

MR. MICHAELSON: That exhausts all of the speaker sign-up slips that I received; however, this is usually the point in the meeting where someone who hasn't signed up has gotten inspired.

So is there anyone else who hasn't spoken yet who would like to take advantage of this opportunity?

Come on right up. All I need is your name. I'll have you fill out a card afterwards.

MS. PORTER: My name is Jennifer Porter.

I work with the San Diego Regional Energy Office, and I spoke with a couple of you last year about potential alternatives to the Sunrise Powerlink option, and I just wanted to mention that SDRAO is working on a continuation of the Self-Generation Incentive Program in the form of a bill that could

be introduced this year and hope that you would take that into consideration as one of the no-wires alternative strategies.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Could you tell us what that bill would do or proposes?

MS. PORTER: Sure. The self-generation incentive program is a current program that's administered throughout California, and we are the current administrator here in the San Diego region, and what it does is offers incentives to people who installed distributed generation technologies. They can be renewable or non-renewable, fuel cell, combined heat, and power, wind, PV, et cetera.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Anyone else who hasn't spoken and would like to?

Come on up.

MR. DOULEY: I'm Jim Douley.

My understanding is the cost of the proposed Sunrise Powerlink is something on the order of \$1.4 billion, and I'm sure you know that does not create any power. I just hope you keep in mind what could be accomplished if we built generating power along the coast where it will be used rather than spending all that huge amount of money desecrating our backcountry and generating no power.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Come on up.

MR. GUTHRIE: My name is Dick Guthrie. My wife and I have lived in Tenaja Valley for over 20 years now. It's a very peaceful, restful place. Our property abuts the so-called wilderness area which is, I presume, where the power line would be, and I don't know how the company has worked it out to go across there when there's not supposed to be any kind of activity in there at all except the animals, but I presume that some way or other they are planning to go right there.

Unfortunately for ourselves, we're unable, at this moment, to get electric power from the grid, so we have been making, for all of these years, our own electrical system. It doesn't always work. We're in the dark at times, like the night before last and maybe the night before that and off and on back further as you go.

I wouldn't mind so much their running the lines along here. And on the other hand, would they mind putting a line down so we could get electrical power ourselves off the grid? That was one request I would have.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Anyone else?

One of the important things I need to point out is this is a second round of scoping. One of the questions we got in Borrego Springs yesterday, I think, that was important is: Okay. These are recommendations at this point about which ones will be retained, which ones will be eliminated. We hope you do stay in touch and follow this and the website, and if you gave us your address, you'll be

on it because the actual decisions about which ones will be retained and which ones will be eliminated really won't be apparent until the draft document comes out sometime in July.

Correct?

MS. LEE: [inaudible response].

MR. MICHAELSON: So that's when really there will be an essence of a final decision by this group about what they're going to include, so you'll want to stay in touch and look out for that, and that's when you'll know really what's in and what's out.

With that, anything else?

I would just like to say what a great experience this has been for all of us over the past week. We've been all over three counties, and it's been a tremendous outpouring of good information and participation by the public.

I see a hand, so —

MR. STINNETT: Could I possibly make some additional comments?

MR. MICHAELSON: Did you already speak?

MR. STINNETT: I did.

MR. MICHAELSON: Sure. We'll go ahead and take this as a last comment.

MR. STINNETT: Three minutes is not really enough for me. I appreciate it.

MR. MICHAELSON: I understand. It's what we've used at all of them. But go ahead and take another minute or two if you have something you'd like to add. Just give us your name again.

MR. STINNETT: Ray Stinnett again, Lake Elsinore — actually Lakeland Village.

I commented about the underground possibility of putting it into, I believe you call it a CGIT bus system, and what I didn't comment on is I think this should be placed along the I-15 corridor. I strongly believe that. I see no reason for this backyard — not my backyard problem for you, SDG&E Gas & Power, or for our communities when there are simple solutions to these things, though they just simply cost money.

The money that would be spent on this would probably be well spent for continued transmission power well into the future because this is highly efficient.

When we start looking at — I believe it's Edmund Fitzgerald Emissions Trading, you look at that and the possibilities of how to make economics work in this day and age of pushing around carbon in the atmosphere and money in the banks, I'm sure it could all be worked out if people would really engineer this to the future and stop thinking in the past, and I think that's the bottom-line problem here.

We just really need to look at this as — forget this old stuff. It's in-the-box thinking. We're going to have to have some new out-of-the-box thinking to solve these problems, and it will save all the rate payers a lot of money. It will save all of us a lot of headache. It will save our children their lives in the future and their grandchildren and our grandchildren.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

With that, we're adjourned.

[Proceedings adjourned at 2:36 p.m.]