

**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 2:00 p.m. February 6, 2007
At Wynola, California

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

STAFF PRESENTATION

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER

Mr. Huffman.....	11
Ms. Hartman.....	12
Mr. Feigel.....	12
Mr. Davis.....	13
Ms. Moretti.....	13
Ms. Straube.....	14
Mr. Lewis.....	14
Mr. Trafecanty.....	15-16
Ms. Moretti-Plunkeh.....	16
Ms. Sherrill.....	16-17
Ms. Moretti.....	17
Mr. Kratz.....	17
Mr. Nelson.....	18
Mr. Larkin.....	18
Mr. Van Cleve.....	19
Ms. Bertolini.....	20
Mr. Burke.....	20
Mr. Drown.....	21
Mr. Bowman.....	21
Ms. Costanzo.....	21
Ms. McGrath.....	22
Ms. Lewis.....	22
Mr. Childs.....	22
Mr. Scott.....	23
Ms. Westcott.....	23
Ms. Lee.....	23
Ms. Green.....	23
Mr. Gordon.....	24

STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good afternoon. We're very glad you're all here today. We sat out just as many chairs as we thought we could fit here without creating a hazard for everybody and we're going to see all the chairs filled.

My name is Lewis Michaelson. Some of you who participated in the initial rounds of scoping meetings may recall, actually all of the people sitting up here were the same people that were involved in that first round of scoping meetings. One thing I would like to make very clear from the very beginning is that we're not here for or against the project. I overheard people saying "Are you for or against it? If you're wearing a tie, you must be for it." It means nothing, okay? So we are here as part of a panel who is conducting these meetings to get your input.

Seated at the far end is Susan Lee. She is with Aspen Environmental Group. They're the ones that were hired by the California Public Utilities Commission and the Bureau of Land Management to help in the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report and the Environmental Impact Statement. Seated next to her is Billie Blanchard and she's with the California Public Utilities Commission, which is conducting the environmental review process for the state. Sitting next to her is Lynda Kastoll. She is with the Bureau of Land Management and she is working the project with BLM to oversee the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement. So this is an environmental review process we're going through, and all of these people are here today, all the people that were out there answering your questions, because they want to hear what you have to say in this second round of scoping meetings.

We're going to go back to the agenda. I'm going to finish in just a moment, but just so you know what to expect, after I talk about the second round of scoping just a little bit more, Billie Blanchard with the I'm going to say CPUC will talk about the process and schedule as it's been updated for the EIR/EIS. Lynda Kastoll will talk about their role in this review process, that is, the Bureau of Land Management. Then Susan Lee is going to go through the different links that make up the project. Billie is going to come back for just a moment to talk about how the alternatives were looked at originally, how they were added, how certain ones were screened out or eliminated. And then Susan Lee will come back in order to talk specifically in this area the ones that you're interested that were eliminated or retained for further analysis in the document. And let me be clear, the document has not been prepared. This is a second round of scoping. And then we'll get to the most important part which is an opportunity for you guys to provide your input tonight.

Next one. So if you will recall the first round really focused on the proposed project, the Sunrise Powerlink and it's potential environmental impacts as well as many suggestions people had for alternatives. The second round is not normally actually done as part of this process, but because the alternatives analysis has been so complex and there's been so much work done to it since the first round, both the CPUC and BLM felt it was important to come back again so you know just what had been done with all of those alternatives.

So we're here to inform you and responsible agencies about the alternatives proposed for full analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS, which has not yet been conducted, to inform the public about the process and how the schedule has changed, to solicit input, and this really is the most important part for today's purposes, regarding the alternatives to the proposed project to be analyzed and those to be eliminated. And then we'll also end up preparing a second alternatives scoping report.

I've already done this one so I will hand it over to Billie Blanchard to talk about the process. But just so I'm clear, the types of input that are going to be really helpful today are going to be comments on the alternatives that are being looked at, the alternatives to the proposed project.

Billie.

MS. BLANCHARD: Good afternoon. I just want to give you some overview of certain things with the process and the scheduling at this time. As you know, the CPUC has two review processes going on right now with this application. And one of them is for the general proceeding itself, which has identified numbers that goes with it in case you want to see it on the internet 06-08-010. And we are now undergoing the environmental review process right now. This proceeding is led by the assigned Commissioner Dian Grueneich and the Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman. The scope of our proceeding is defined by the Public Utilities Code. And basically three things determine the need for this project; considering community values, historic park areas, aesthetic values and, of course, the environmental impacts.

There is a schedule out on the general proceeding's part and that has been somewhat recently modified through a ALJ commissioner ruling on the schedule, which was January 26th, 2007, but the testimony exchanges are beginning in January of 2007, evidentiary hearings beginning in July 2007, the ALJ proposed decision December 2007 and a decision by the CPUC in January of 2008.

The last time we were out here for scoping meetings we had not finalized the schedule for the EIR/EIS. So what we're looking at now is we are in the second round of scoping, January 24th to February 24th. There will be another scoping report going out in March of 2007. We're proposing to release the Draft EIR/EIS on July of 2007. There will be a 90-day public review period starting from approximately July 13th to October 12th, 2007. A final published in November 2007. And then proposed certification in January of 2008.

I'll turn it over to Lynda now.

MS. KASTOLL: Hi, I'm Lynda Kastoll with the Bureau of Land Management out of the El Centro field office. BLM is involved in this project because in November of 2005 SDG&E submitted an application to BLM to cross BLM lands for the purpose of constructing the Sunrise Powerlink project. It's approximately 31 miles on BLM land in Imperial County and about 1.3 miles in San Diego County. We will also be considering a Desert Plan Amendment, because the proposed project deviates from designated utility corridors.

We're also involved in a BLM administered right-of-way across Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. It crosses about 26 miles of Anza-Borrego. It was issued in 1955 as a continuation of a federal power project. It is 100-foot wide and contains a 69 kV line at this time.

We're also responsible for coordinating with other interested federal agencies such as BIA, DOD, Fish & Wildlife Service and Forest Service.

We will use this EIS/EIR to make our decision as to whether or not to amend our plan and whether or not to grant the right-of-way to SDG&E for the project. It's anticipated our Record of Decision will be issued in January of 2008.

And, Susan.

MS. LEE: Thank you. I'm Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group and I'm helping manage the team of environmental consultants that's working for the BLM and the CPUC to prepare the EIR/EIS that will look at this proposed project and the alternatives to this project.

MR. MICHAELSON: Susan, if I could just say real quick, we tried as much as possible to get in people's hands both the presentation and the set of maps. And obviously this room is a little bit challenged with some visual obstructions, so if it is difficult for you to see what is on the screen or what is being held up, I would just refer you to those two documents in your hand to follow along.

MS. LEE: I'll tell you as I go through these maps which map I'm looking at, because you'll have it in your handout as well.

I just want to give you a reminder overall of what this proposed project is. If you look at Figure 1 in the notice, the scoping notice — and if you guys don't mind I'm going to put this on the table. The project that SDG&E proposed, and I know you're very familiar with the part that surrounds Santa Ysabel and Ramona, but just as a reminder, because the proposed project is the baseline against which we compare alternatives and the way we create alternatives is by looking at the proposed project and its impact, so it starts in the Imperial Valley down by El Centro with a 500 kilovolt high voltage portion all the way up through Imperial County, crossing the county line and entering Anza-Borrego Desert State Park for about 25 miles. It continues up into the San Felipe Valley where SDG&E has proposed a major 230 kV to 500 kV substation, so the line would at that point convert to 230 kV from across the Vista Irrigation District land down through the Santa Ysabel Valley down the backside of Mesa Grande and then on a diagonal in through the area south of Ramona, San Diego Country Estates. Again, all 230 kV in this segment. And all this is following an existing 69 kV into the more developed area across the top of Miramar and into the Peñasquitos Substation at the far western end of the project. So in addition to the transmission line, the 500 and 230 kV portions that are shown on Figure 1, the other important parts of this project is, and I mentioned substation, is ultimately there will be a 40-acre substation but there's 100 acres of grading required because it's a hilly spot up there. So that's one big component.

There is also, as shown on Figure 1, a reconductoring segment where there's an existing transmission line that needs new wires only primarily. And there are a couple of substations that would need improvement actually within the substation.

One other thing we wanted to point out, because we will be analyzing this in the EIR/EIS, we asked in a data request to SDG&E a little while ago to explain what would be the ultimate build out of this Central East Substation. And they explained to us that there would be an additional possibly four 230 kV lines coming out of that substation. It's important because the NEPA and CEQA regulations require us to disclose reasonably foreseeable impacts of this project. Clearly a major substation like that is being built for additional lines beyond just this one. So we are identifying what we think will be the most likely based on inquiries to SDG&E of where those future lines could go. It seems like Escondido is one likely possibility. And another one may be following the proposed route on down into Sycamore Canyon again. So that's obviously a very important component of the project. It was not addressed in the application, but it's come out of data requests that we've asked of SDG&E.

These next few slides go over the major impacts of the proposed project. And I'm going to skip over the Imperial Valley Link. That's the part furthest to the south and east. We've been down there the last — well, we were down there yesterday, I guess. I will talk a little bit about Anza-Borrego. And I'll

refer, again, back to the maps when we get back to talking about alternatives. I know that Anza-Borrego has more of a regional importance and, in fact, state and national importance in a lot of ways.

What we've done on these slides is identified the major impacts within each link, because those are the impacts that drive consideration of alternatives. In the Anza-Borrego Link the major impact, and I'm sure you've heard a lot about this, especially recently given the meeting on this coming Thursday is the effects on state designated wilderness. The project itself would be located on wilderness in some places and it would require an expansion of right-of-way into wilderness. It also would have recreational, biological, visual impacts throughout the park and major cultural resources impacts as it goes through Grapevine Canyon.

The Central Link, which is essentially where we are now. I know you all know this better than we do. Visual resources are very important. It's a beautiful valley. Agricultural resources throughout the entire valley. Recreation and open space you have basically on both sides of the valley. The potential for fire risk is something that we're going to look at in this document. And the Elsinore Fault, which we talked to some of the people outside, actually runs down the northern part of Highway 79.

Major impacts of the substation I mentioned before really are primarily associated with the huge amount of grading that would have to be done up there. It would be visible from the San Felipe Valley as you're looking to the north. And it also is located at the north end of the trace of the Earthquake Valley Fault.

In all of these areas we're looking not only at the effects of the proposed project, but the effects of these future phases that are, again, speculative completely. We don't know what they are, but we feel that it's important for the decision-makers to know that that is a reasonably, foreseeable consequence of this project.

Inland Valley Link, this is the part on either side of Ramona. As you know, it has an underground section through the middle. The impacts there are recreational on both ends, but residential in terms of construction impacts for the underground segment.

And then the Coastal Link I'll kind of skip over. We've been out there last night. It's the most developed link. It's really primarily residential concerns associated with construction impacts, corona noise, and the additional line in an existing right-of-way.

I will turn this back to Billie to talk about the EIR/EIS process.

MS. BLANCHARD: Real quickly, where we are in the process now is, again, we're doing the second round of scoping and we're still in the screening of alternatives stage. For determining our reasonable range of alternatives that we have talked about in the notice that hopefully you all have, we're looking — we use the CEQA/NEPA criteria for screening alternatives. And mainly the three main things, consistency with most or all of the project objectives. And we use the three main objectives of liability, access to renewables, economical benefit, which is cost of the energy. The ability to reduce or avoid significant impacts of the proposed project that we've identified through our team analysis, agency consultations, the PEA, many data requests that we've done, scoping comments. And then the third criteria is feasibility. Technical concerns in terms of can it be built. In other words, if you have congestion in some roads where you have a lot of utilities already, it may not be possible to underground in a certain area. Regulatory feasibility, can it be permitted. And then legal issues, would it be allowed under the law.

Sources of alternatives have included alternatives suggested in the scoping comments. We've received many, many alternatives in our last round of scoping. We reconsidered SDG&E's PEA alternatives. We reconsidered alternatives that they eliminated in the PEA, alternatives from the CPUC proceeding filings and from the alternatives process, the ISO's alternatives process.

The following types of alternatives that we've considered are link and route segment alternatives, substation alternatives, Southwest Powerlink alternatives, various co-locations with the existing Southwest Powerlink, full project route alternatives and system alternatives as well as generation and in-basin generation and other non-wires alternatives. And those are all discussed in quite a bit of detail in the notice.

MS. LEE: For these first couple of slides, this one, if you look at Figure 3 of the maps in your handout, we have two alternatives that we were — have been able to retain at this point through Anza-Borrego. We were hoping to be able to develop a completely underground alternative in Anza-Borrego. This would require moving a substation that's proposed for the Central East Substation up north of here over to San Felipe. Now, this is not the San Felipe, the San Felipe Valley, it's one that is actually shown on your map on the far right-hand side of Figure 3. So at that location where it says San Felipe Substation would be a 500/230 substation and everything west of that would be 230 kV and at that voltage it can be installed underground. So we looked for an alternative that could be underground in Highway 78. There is a fault, again, another major fault that's identified as the state Alquist-Priolo Zone at the far western end of Highway 78 before S-2, so there would need to be an overhead segment just before the intersection of S-2. And then this alternative would continue up Highway S-2, again a combination of overhead and underground. Overhead in the area of where the fault is exactly coincident with the road, which is something that happens also here in Highway 79.

The other alternative that we've retained in the Anza-Borrego area is one that would be following pretty much the route of the proposed project, but instead of it being an expanded 150-foot right-of-way, it would be retained in 100-foot right-of-way which is the existing right-of-way that BLM has granted to SDG&E. That means that it would not have direct impacts on wilderness, require an expansion into wilderness. It would, however, of course, have indirect impacts on wilderness because the towers would still be highly visible.

The alternatives we have in this area here, and I know a lot of people were looking at this as we were standing outside the door. If you look at Figure 4 in your package, the scoping comments that we got in this area asked in particular for two things and one of them was finding an underground alternative through this area, which really was our hope to find an alternative underground all the way from 76 down at least to the intersection of 78 and 79. We had the same problem here that we had in Anza-Borrego, which is this is the active Elsinore Fault and it's a State designated active fault zone in which when you're parallel to a fault you cannot underground a line because it puts it at risk for rupture. So the best we could do there was to do a combination overhead/underground route.

We talked to some people earlier who have concerns about that. We've also got some other suggestions that sound pretty good about the possibility of using the proposed route up to a point and possibly undergrounding down the southern part of Mesa Grande. So these kind of suggestions are things we would love to get from you and, again, we've already learned that just being here. So anything like that you can think of, we would love to hear it.

We've eliminated — we looked at a possibility of going across Volcan Mountain and that seemed to have impacts that would be greater than anything else we have here given the status of the mountain. We looked at the original SDG&E route, but again, that is through preserve lands also and really didn't seem like that it eliminated, while it's less visible, it still has a lot of impacts in itself. So I'll talk about substation alternatives in just a minute. So that's where we ended up in terms of the Central Link.

The Inland Valley Link, as I mentioned earlier, this is the one with an underground segment in the center of it that runs through the San Diego Country Estates. There were many fewer alternatives suggested in that area. What was suggested in both areas was an extension of the underground segment both to the east and the west. At this point it looks like the extension to the west, which is actually a fairly short extension, not even — to the east, I'm sorry, not even a mile looks like it will be feasible. The one to the west, which is here under the eliminated one, west of San Vicente Road, goes into a preserve area and would require undergrounding through an area that is now being recovered as a habitat area. So that one we're looking to eliminate.

Substations, I know this is an important area here as well. We're looking at the possibility of a substation on Vista Irrigation District land, because of the large amount of earth moving required and the potential fault location of the proposed substation. Let me just say at this point the fact that we're considering an alternative right now doesn't mean that it's going to be preferred over a proposed project. What we're doing now is identifying alternatives that seem to have potential to reduce some impacts. And the analysis that we do will let us know whether ultimately the environmental document will present a conclusion that recommends which ones seem environmentally better once you do the balancing of visual versus biology versus cultural resources and the whole range of impacts we look at. There were a couple of other substation sites SDG&E considered, but they seemed worse than anything else that was already on the table.

Okay. Southwest Powerlink alternatives. These are alternatives that would completely avoid Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and we've been directed since the beginning of this project through the CPUC to consider alternatives that have the potential to avoid the park entirely. These are shown on Figure 8 in your package. We have four alternatives that would basically follow the existing Southwest Powerlink. That the 500 kV line that comes due west almost out of the Imperial Valley Substation. And they turn north in a couple of different places down south, one near Boulevard, another one near Campo. Three of these alternatives would ultimately come up to the Central South Substation, which as I'm sure you know is just south and west of Santa Ysabel. The fourth one, the West of Forest alternative, would actually rejoin the proposed project west of Ramona down here near the Sycamore Canyon Substation, so that one would avoid this area entirely. The other three would eliminate the entire portion north of Highway 78 but not the portion south.

There are two other categories of alternatives we looked at. This one is Transmission System Alternatives, which are big picture transmission alternatives that look at different ways that the regional transmission system could be used to meet the same three major objectives of this project that Billie described earlier. So we looked at a huge range of alternatives here, looking at projects all the way up into Riverside County, Orange County, to see whether there was something that would improve reliability in this area without having to build the project that's been proposed. What we came up with was projects that seemed to meet those objectives. The first one being the LEAPS project, Lake Elsinore Advanced Pump Storage Project, which is a project just outside of Lake Elsinore and up into the Cleveland National Forest. It's controversial in its own right, but it includes a 500 kV transmission

line that would connect the Southern California Edison system with the San Diego Gas & Electric system which provides a reliability benefit.

The second one that we're retaining here is called Mexico Light. It's actually a small transmission upgrade in Mexico near the existing power plants and has the potential to provide reliability benefits to the electric system. It wouldn't be a stand-alone alternative, but in combination with other things that we looked at, it's something that we want to retain as an option.

The last one is Path 44 Upgrades. This is also an alternative outside of the region. It's essentially in Southern California Edison's system in Orange County where some transmission upgrades there would provide a benefit to SDG&E. And then there were lots and lots that we considered and eliminated.

Non-Wire Alternatives. This is another category of alternatives that would eliminate the need for the transmission line entirely, hence the name non-wires. In this category we're looking at several tiered alternatives that start with the basis of looking at in-area renewable generation as opposed to Imperial Valley renewable generation which is what SDG&E's focus was.

The first alternative would include wind, solar thermal, solar photovoltaics power, and also biomass and biogas. And when we get our report all put together, we'll have each of these broken down with how many megawatts you can get from each source.

The second one is an alternative that includes all those renewables plus the South Bay Power Plant, which as you probably know is in a repowering application with the California Energy Commission.

The third one would include the renewables plus South Bay plus the existence of renewable energy certificates, which is a trading program basically for renewable power that allows a utility to get renewable energy without actually building a transmission line to get it.

The last one that's on here is renewable in-area generation plus transmission upgrades. It's the possibility that a plant like South Bay with a combination of smaller transmission upgrades than this project could actually meet the project objectives as well.

Back to Lewis.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you very much for your kind attention during our presentation. Obviously in 25 or 30 minutes you can only cover so much. The document that you received when you came in or was mailed, that has all the alternatives, all the maps, is something you could spend several hours pouring over. We tried to focus on the ones that we felt would be of greatest interest to you here.

I want to just reiterate before we get started that this is a second round of scoping and that the primary purpose of this is to hear your input on alternatives. And that's why so much effort was made to get that information out and to provide in this presentation. So when we take your comments you're going to have three minutes, and I have a very sophisticated way of indicating times, which is when

you have one minute left, I'll put up my index finger like this so that you can find a comfortable place to wrap up your comments. And then I'll put up my closed hand when your three minutes is up.

I have so far 16 speaker cards. Do you have a process question that you're not sure what is happening here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, I have a process question. Are we going to be allowed to ask just questions concerning the alternatives, clarification questions?

MR. MICHAELSON: That's very difficult to do Q and A in this setting. We tried it just a little bit and it immediately broke down, there was no more timing and it was difficult to get through everyone. So what I would suggest is if you've got a question, go ahead and make it a part of your comment if you want. I want to make sure we get through everybody's comments and then what I'll do is anything that can be clarified at the end, I'll have someone up here wrap up any clarifications that they can, but for the most part, yes.

Billie?

MS. BLANCHARD: One other thing, Lewis, they can do also is they could e-mail us or write a letter and ask questions and we can respond back on those questions. We've done that.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, you can send in questions that way, too. I was thinking if it was something you wanted to find out today, that would be the best way. We're trying to wrap up here on time because we're running down to Ramona to do another meeting in just a couple of hours.

So this second round, the types of comments that are going to be most effective and are going to have the greatest impact on the review that's being done by these regulatory agencies are those that tells us if you agree or disagree with the alternatives proposed for retention or elimination, do you have suggestions for modifications to those alternatives, or do you have yet new alternatives that haven't been considered. Those are the ones that are going to have the greatest impact at this point in the process.

Now, I know many people are, in fact, most people are deathly afraid of public speaking. It's a proven fact, so we don't want anyone to feel left out. So if you're one of those people, please know that you can either hand in the written comments or you can mail them in to this address and that address is available on the handouts and on the written comment sheets. And those comments that are written are given just as much weight and just as much consideration as oral comments, so you can have just as much input by doing that. There is a web site that's also available, information material. That's a really good way to stay in touch and stay abreast of what's happening, but there are also 29 repositories throughout the area that are under consideration if you want to go look at hard copies of everything. As Billie just mentioned there is both an information line, an e-mail line which you can call for more information or send for more information.

Now it's time for your comments. What I'm going to do is, I know it's going to be a little bit difficult depending upon where you're sitting to get to this mike here. We do ask that you use the mike to make sure that, A, everyone can hear your comment and, B, over to my right seated at that table is a court reporter. And she's transcribing everything that's being said verbatim to make sure that we get a good and accurate record of all your comments. And she needs you to also use the microphone in order to make sure that she hears and she can report it.

So what I'm going to do is I'll read through several names so you know when you're coming up and that way you can be prepared to get out of here as quickly as you can and that way hopefully we'll have time for everyone's comments.

The first speakers we have are Ed Huffman, Jeanette Hartman. I apologize if I mispronounce anyone's name. It looks like Norman Feigel to me. Jim Davis, Pat or Darrell Straube, followed by David Lewis. So if you would just come up to the mike when I call your name.

Ed Huffman, you're first and all I need is your name. And if you want to tell any organizational affiliation, that would be great, too. Thank you.

MR. HUFFMAN: Can I turn it?

MR. MICHAELSON: I know you want to address the people here, but actually these people came here to listen to you.

MR. HUFFMAN: Dear CPUC, BLM representatives, friends and neighbor's, my name is Ed Huffman, H-u-f-f-m-a-n. I'm a resident of Santa Ysabel, the Wynola area. I have followed along for the past two years the SDG&E proposed Sunrise Powerlink. I strongly object to the proposal. I wrote a letter of protest to the California Public Utilities Commission suggesting that if the project is needed, the route of the 500 kV line with the existing Southwest Powerlink. The independent system operator oversees the electricity reliability for most of California, has stated that the route is unacceptable because it is vulnerable to outages. The terminology vulnerable to outages also exist in any part of the back country of San Diego County. The back country of San Diego County is made up of desert, grasslands, and forests, much of which is scenically the same as when the native people lived here.

My suggestion to preserve the many historical sites, the parks, the open space preserves, the wilderness areas, and the national forest outdoor recreation areas set aside by the people of the United States, the people of California, and the people of San Diego County.

The distance quoted for the Sunrise Powerlink is 150 miles; however, the distance of the Southwest Powerlink following the route that is on the map is roughly 100 miles by my calculations. A shorter route should be less expensive.

I now have additional protests to the Sunrise Powerlink based on newly found information that came out in a pamphlet that I received on the 20th of January. Please listen carefully. SDG&E made a notice of an application for certificate of public convenience and necessity named the Sunrise Powerlink. I partially quote the purpose of the project in that application number A-05-12-014. "The Sunrise Powerlink is needed to ensure continued reliability of service within San Diego area." The same package says, prepared by the Environmental Aspen Environmental Group, "There are several stations that link up Orange County and Riverside County to this powerlink." That's outside of San Diego County.

Another map in the packet, Figure 4, Central Link Alternatives, map indicates proposed Central East Substation near Highway S-2 and/or three miles southwest of Santa Ysabel. I refer you to future phases of Sunrise Powerlink. It appears there's a possibility of six additional lines going to these substations.

That is my protest, all of these encompassed.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Jeanette Hartman.

MS. HARTMAN: Representatives of the California Public Utilities Commission and the United States Bureau of Land Management, thank you for taking the time to listen to the comments of the community concerning this large and very controversial project. My name is Jeanette Hartman and I'm here on behalf of the People's Powerlink, a group of volunteers who live in the vicinity of Julian and Wynola.

There is untapped potential in San Diego County for generating electricity without new transmission lines. This potential includes energy efficiency, demand response, renewable generation, distributed generation and clean fossil-fired generation. All of these energy-producing techniques are included in the non-wires alternative to Sunrise.

The infrastructure to implement the non-wires alternative is also in place in San Diego or can be reasonably developed with the CPUC and California Energy Commission solar programs, the San Diego Regional Sustainability Partnership, the San Diego Regional Energy Office and its companion Resource Center, the San Diego Alternative Energy Institute, the New Science Applications International Global Warming Division and an increasing interest by the general public in energy conservation and renewable generation.

We support the inclusion of the non-wires alternative as an alternative to be evaluated in the EIR and EIS process. We believe that the non-wires alternative is the alternative that is preferable to the Sunrise Powerlink transmission line because it has far fewer impacts and will be less expensive to implement. Selection of the non-wires alternative over the proposed Sunrise project helps to pave the way to a new and better energy future.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. HARTMAN: And I will just get Ms. Blanchard's e-mail.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Norman.

MR. FEIGEL: Norm Feigel, rancher, Mesa Grande. I've got some concerns. I wrote them, but not especially in this in order I'm going to give them to you. One of them is the right-of-way. I understand it's a 300-foot right-of-way and the gas and electric is proposing to put a line down through that 300 foot. And they admitted up here a few weeks ago that they want to put two more lines on that same right-of-way, so they're impacting us not only once but three times. They want to put roads in and the roads are going to just — I asked them if they're going to stay within their right-of-way. They says where they can, otherwise they're going to go just anywhere they want and that's not going to work.

Fire. They said they will not fight the fires because it's too dangerous. But I asked them then I can go in there with a horse to get my cattle out and I'm in harms way but that's okay. They never answered.

It's going to diminish the value of my property. And everybody is in the Williamson Act in that country. And I've heard today that there's a possibility that the substations on Williamson Act impact

the Williamson Act. That was from the County today. So that is something that the PUC may want to look into.

There's endangered — it's going to affect the wildlife. If there is any Golden Eagles, they're going to get burned up by this thing. They're going to run into the wires or whatever, probably get electrocuted.

Let me see here, I'm jumping around. It's going to ruin the view. The view through Santa Ysabel Valley, it's going to look — it's going to be terrible. It's going to look like 395, when you go up off of 15 up 395 up toward Tehachapi.

To go underground is the way to go if you have to go underground. I mean, if you have to put it in, go underground even in my country. The whole thing should go from 79, 76, all the way through Santa Ysabel, that whole route should be underground. If it can't be underground, then it probably shouldn't go in.

I'm going to turn this letter in, these notes in. I talked with Mr. Murphy and I'm going to give them to you guys because I missed some stuff.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. DAVIS: I'm Jim Davis. I'm a rancher in Mesa Grande. I want to go on record as being opposed completely to the Sunrise Powerlink and would be in favor of the non-wire alternative of Resource Bundle No. 2.

In addition to being opposed, if we're looking at the project going through the Santa Ysabel view shed area is not just Santa Ysabel Valley, it's all the way from San Felipe clear to Ramona that you impact the view shed and having a negative impact.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Katy Moretti. Let me read ahead so you know who is coming up, Pat or Darrell Straube, David Lewis, Denis Trafecanty, Donna Sherrill and Tina Moretti.

MS. MORETTI: Hi, I'm Katy Moretti. I don't have a prepared speech. My family has been here since the 1890s along with the Feigels. The Santa Ysabel Ranch is a Spanish land grant. Part of that Spanish land grant was sold to the parks, which now we are told are too environmentally sensitive for this line. Those same environmental issues is on all the ranches because the same ranchers managed all of the ranch. So whatever is environmentally sensitive on the San Diego preserve is the same as our ranch.

We chose to put our ranch in the Williamson Act. We chose to be part of that preserve. And one of the things in the Williamson Act is that it acknowledges that the user maintenance of the land is an agricultural preserve in such a manner as to preserve its natural characteristics, beauty and openness for the benefit and enjoyment of the public and to provide an essential habitat for wildlife. We honored that. We have respected that in my family. We have been restricted to that.

One of the objections of this line is reliable energy. One of my concerns as being a person who lost her home in the Cedar Fire is the fire issues. These lines cannot just be shut down. They have to be de-energized. If they can't be de-energized, the firefighters aren't allowed to work under them. If it's a line that goes down and it's an active line, they have to stay at least two tower links away from the active line according to the National Safety — I have it written here, but the National Safety. Where

they're proposing the 69 line go overhead by my dad's house, they won't be able to get in there to him at all because it is more — the towers are closer than 1,000 foot to his home. And I know they say that the health issues are inconclusive, but how many here would want their 83-year-old father to be living under these towers.

It's a travesty to put these towers through Santa Ysabel. It's an environmental travesty. It's a travesty not only to the families who have been here to preserve the land, but to the public that enjoys it.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Pat or Darrell Straube.

MS. STRAUBE: My husband and I are business people from this area. And I live and enjoy this area, too. And I so appreciate these ranchers and these farmers who have kept this land so gentle for us so that we can come here. None of you are from this area and you don't see the hundreds of people, the thousands of people that come up here every week, every week because they can go into the openness of this open area and it's natural. It's not graded. The people who come back and say, "I saw a coyote. God, I saw a Turkey." This is country and we're entitled to this country. My husband and I also have land that is in the Williamson Act and we have to keep it that way.

I can tell you right now that you and you and you are here to protect the environment. The thing that bothers me is that we're here to discuss an alternative, an alternative that really hasn't been proven to be a necessity and why are we turning upside down our God-given natural protected environment here that is left for you who live in the city to come here. I see the people, they absolutely walk around, they're in a daze, they don't know where to look, they don't know where to take in all this openness. That you can think about going through public lands, going through public parks, going through that gorgeous valley there, it's beyond a travesty. You have the ability to stand up and do something for us. I have a feeling because it's an alternative that it is already a given fact that this is going to be. And now I hear everyday that it's going to be a maze of lines, not just one. My God, stop it now. It's not an alternative, it is insane.

MR. MICHAELSON: Could you just state your name for me.

MS. STRAUBE: Pat Straube.

MR. MICHAELSON: And if I could just remind people to state their names at the beginning, I would really appreciate it. The next speaker is David Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: I'm not exactly sure of my purpose in being here. I feel like these folks out here are like little Chinamen standing in front of tank in Tiananmen Square. We're just going to get run over.

One of the issues that you addressed earlier was the grading that was required for the substation that's going to be put up north there. But in this list of potential impacts, summary impacts, I see nothing that addressed what I would guess is going to be major grading. Everybody is concerned about these power lines and their visual impact, but nowhere have I seen any grading addressed that is going to need to be — to put these in, these power lines in. You got construction equipment, large construction equipment, I assume it is, to assemble these towers. And I assume it's going to take at least a 10 or a 12-foot wide road, which is not just a 10 or a 12-foot wide road, you got cuts and fills

on either side of that. That is going to be a major visual impact. And also you got the impact is location runoff and drainage being diverted across these sensitive ranches. And so I'd like to see that addressed.

That about covers it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Denis, before you get started can I just make a clarification and that is that the document has not been prepared yet so, for example, in the overview that Susan was trying to do she was giving you an idea of generally the primary impacts that might be looked at and the reasons they might be looking for alternatives. But as far as the actual analysis of all of these detailed impacts such as siltation, groundwater, all of those, they will be looked at in the document. The reason you may not see everything is because that document hasn't actually been prepared.

So, Denis, are you going to look this way occasionally?

MR. TRAFECANTY: Kick me. Denis Trafecanty. To use some of Norm's choice words, "We don't need this damn line."

The sun won't rise on the Sunrise Power Link. Let me tell you the issues I have with this line are as follows: No. 1, there's a green path north that goes around the east side of Salton Sea. Michael — I think it's Michael Peavy, but I'll say Mr. Peavy said, "You don't need both of the lines. You either use green path or you use the Sunrise Powerlink. You don't need both." All those renewables they're talking about building out there in Imperial Valley with unproven technology can go up to L.A.. By the way, when you look at these maps, do you notice it looks like a mountain? The reason it looks like a mountain is a lot. It comes from Imperial Valley, it goes up and comes back down, because it's going to L.A. That's where they need the power. They're running that dirty power from Mexicali that's creating tons of asthma problems for everybody in Imperial Valley. "It looks brown out there," one lady said the other day. And they're running it to L.A.

Now, the green path is already going in. Okay, another thing, in-basin generation. We don't need to run these lines through our state park through our back country for the purpose of the people in San Diego. They're going to increase a million people in San Diego in the next 10, 15, 20 years, whatever it is. They could easily provide that energy down there with South Bay and with renewable energy and all things they talked about, demand response. It's been proven, there's only 218 megabytes short as of 2010 and 478 to 2016. That's all they're short of. And they can build that down there.

MR. MICHAELSON: One minute, Denis.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Okay. Now I'm addressing to the Board and I appreciate you being here. I didn't see where you said there was significant impacts in the last bunch of information that came out. But let's talk about, I think you need to tell the CPUC that there's significant impacts to all of these. It wasn't in the report. Don't you think it's significant if we run these lines to affect our visual resources through Santa Ysabel Valley, through the state park? There's a gentleman here from Wyoming that says he lives near Yellowstone. They wouldn't let a line go through Yellowstone Park.

What about the significant impacts, the Golden Eagles that nest up here, the Bighorn sheep, the other sensitive bioresources, the oak trees, the agricultural preserves, Native American sites, they're all over all of our property out here in Santa Ysabel.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, Denis.

MR. TRAFECANTY: You're welcome.

MR. MICHAELSON: Again, a point of clarification, the Environmental Impact Report, the Environmental Impact Statement has not been prepared yet and that's where a determination of significance of environmental impacts is made, so that's why you have not seen it yet.

Tina Moretti-Plunkeh.

MS. MORETTI-PLUNKEH: Hi, I'm Tina Moretti-Plunkeh and my family has a ranch that this will impact greatly. I don't have a prepared speech, but my concern is why would anything be considered that could harm people, the wildlife and the cattle. I just — it's an inconclusive thing. In my opinion it would be you don't do it, if you don't know for sure. I'm very much opposed to it.

MR. MICHAELSON: I thought you were done.

MS. MORETTI-PLUNKEH: I'm finished.

MR. MICHAELSON: Billie asked me to point out in the project report that you all got hopefully when you came in, that on Page 28 there's Attachment One, Summary of Potential Impacts, and it actually goes into quite a bit of detail about a number, in fact, virtually all of the impacts have been mentioned.

MS. BLANCHARD: Preliminary.

MR. MICHAELSON: Preliminary. If you read a little further in your document, you will see that those are anticipated to be looked at. Thank you.

Our next set of speakers will be Sandy Moretti, Marco Moretti.

MR. MORETTI: I pass.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Rick Moretti.

MR. MORETTI: I pass also.

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm detecting a pattern here.

Art Kratz and Curt Nelson. All right.

MS. SHERRILL: You forgot me.

MR. MICHAELSON: Did I skip over somebody? I'm sorry, Donna Sherrill. Are you Donna? I'm sorry, you can come up after her.

MS. MORETTI: Hi, my name is Sandra Moretti. And one consideration we would like you to take into effect is that this is not just our homes or our yards, but this is our livelihood, this is what we do for a living and we are respectful of the land and we work the land and this goes against everything that we believe in and we stand for. And I also feel that some consideration should be taken into effect for the property owners that have already given easements over the years to the gas and electric companies, some of them one, two and three easements and most of them for no compensation. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay, thank you. Donna Sherrill. Sorry, there were two cards stuck together.

MS. SHERRILL: Yeah, likely story.

I'm not a very good speaker, but I'm so pissed off that I got to say something.

MR. MICHAELSON: Including your name.

MS. SHERRILL: Including my name. My name is Donna Sherrill. I'm from Sherill Orchards in Santa Ysabel and my ranch is in Mesa Grande. Not only will this affect me as well as my animals and my business. I have collected hundreds of signatures from tourists that have come from all over the United States that say they don't want to see those power lines going through Santa Ysabel. We don't want a power station in Santa Ysabel and we feel that since we're not going to benefit from this, we might just as well run it down I-8, up I-5, and up I-15, down 10, anywhere you want to go on the freeways but not through our back country, anywhere. I don't want underground lines and I don't want substations. We can generate our own electricity if we need to. We know how to conserve. The people in the city don't know how to conserve and I don't know why we should have to pay for it. So anywhere you go except through the back country suites me just fine. If the Federal Government is going to run a line or a fence or whatever down the border, why can't we put those transmission lines down the border.

MR. MICHAELSON: So we have a new alternative. Marco, I think you said you were going to pass. Was that Rick, I couldn't quite tell what Rick said.

MS. MORETTI: I'm going to fill in for my grandpa.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can I have your name, please.

MS. MORETTI: I'm Rowlynda Moretti and I don't have that much to say. All I want to say is this is something that will be forever. It's not going to go away. We are losing our ranch land and our farmland and this is my future and this is a lot of people's future that live here around here. And this isn't going to have a positive effect on us, so all I want to say is we're losing something and we're not getting anything for it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. The next speakers in order are going to be Art Kratz, Curt Nelson, Tom Larkin and David Van Cleve.

Art Kratz.

MR. KRATZ: I'm Art. I live down the street a little. I've lived here for a little over 60 years. I don't want to see a change anymore. It's changed enough.

Let's talk about electricity. Transmission lines are going to be a thing of the past. There's too much loss. They talk about 500,000 kV lines and 250,000 kV lines and they're talking about high voltage, you have to do this in order to get anything out of the other end of the wire. And the problem is that the alternators can't generate it at a high voltage. There's too much interference between their own landings, so it takes a transformer to bring this voltage up and what do we see there, we see a 20 percent loss at best. If you don't believe me, just look at these transformers and you'll see great, huge cooling pins. That's a waste of energy and we haven't got any energy to waste. The same thing

happened when they get to the end of the line, they have to reduce the voltage. Wow, another 20 percent loss, maybe a little better than a 20 percent but not much. So with all the power they put in this line, they're going to be very lucky to even get half of the power out the other end, plus causing all these people really an inconvenience. I would like to see the country like it is.

MR. MICHAELSON: Curt.

MR. NELSON: Curt Nelson. I'm a resident of Pine Hills and a business person. I have companies in the city, so I fully understand the need for reliable power, all our computers and servers run on it.

That said, as I understand the purpose of these hearings is to give you feedback on whether we agree or disagree on the alternatives, whether you should look at them as part of the EIR. Is that close?

MR. MICHAELSON: Yeah, good, close.

MR. NELSON: So while I'm opposed to all alternatives, other than the no-wires alternative or do nothing, I think you should look at every single alternative and I think you should look at it in depth. I think you should run up the billable hours and you should take as long as humanly possible to actually analyze all the impacts of this stretching out the schedule as long as you can. I think part of the EIR, of course, is that you have to look at the impact versus the benefit and it's very doubtful to me that there actually is a benefit here. And I think that's an important part of EIR.

You know, I read in the paper that U.S. Census Bureau says that the population of San Diego County is actually declining. I also read another day that some think-tank back East had said that the average per capita use of electricity is above flat, it's not growing.

I'm also suspicious of the motives of SDG&E and Sempra. As I understand it, it's a cost-plus business, so the more they spend, the more money they can make by having — by being reimbursed as authorized by the PUC. So any of the alternatives, the more they spend it just makes more money for them. Very suspicious of the motives.

The last thing I would like to say is as a business person, that as you go through these hearings and listen to input from people who claim to represent the business communities such as, for example, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, I would like you to remember that doesn't actually represent the feelings of the business community. What it actually represents is the five or six people whom are on the Public Policy Committee who get no real input from their overall membership. As a past chair of the American Electronics Association Council here in San Diego, I happen to know that that's how it works. And that the motives of the people that are on those public policy committees are very questionable. There's a number of people, specifically from the chamber, in leadership roles who now have jobs at SDG&E and at Sempra. And so when you hear the business community needs this, I would suggest to not believe it for a second.

This is a disastrous plan. And I can't agree more with all the people who have indicated the terrible impacts to our public lands and to their private lands. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Tom Larkin.

MR. LARKIN: Hi, I'm Tom Larkin, a 35-year resident of Ramona. I can't make the meeting tonight so I'm here this afternoon. I would like to first address several of SDG&E's objectives because

this affects what you determine to be feasible alternatives. One objective implies that location of transmission lines in wilderness areas, state parks, or rural communities is somehow acceptable or preferable to construction of transmission lines in urban areas. We find that not acceptable. We would like you to change that objective.

Another objective is designed to mitigate the potential exercise of local market power, which means that SDG&E wants to eliminate competition. This would maximize the profitability for Sempra and the return for the Sempra shareholders that as a previous speaker said, "It would be at the expense of the environment and the rate payers who would have to pay for a 50-mile transmission line." So we would like to have BLM and CPUC develop better basic objectives so that San Diego County can be served by a project that is feasible that has fewer impacts. And I've listed several objectives. I gave a letter to your person out front.

I would also like to talk about the Valley Rainbow Alternative. Page 24 of your scoping notice says that Valley Rainbow Alternative was denied by PUC in 2002 because the need for the project had not been demonstrated; however, if there's a need now for Sunrise Powerlink, then why couldn't the Valley Rainbow project be reinitiated now to meet that need? There are also statements in your report that a feasible corridor for Valley Rainbow does not exist and that no corridors are available that would reduce impacts in comparison to those of the proposed project. These statements are premature and not based on new analysis. Valley Rainbow was stopped because of a lack of need, not because it wasn't feasible. So I would ask you to renew your study of that alternative based on what you learned in the previous PEA and look for a feasible alternative for Valley Rainbow. It's a much shorter alignment and it should be compared in detail in your EIR/EIS, and let the PUC determine which of the alternatives would have the fewest impacts.

I also believe the EIR/EIS should look at a combined alternative. A environmentally preferred alternative would be new generation for all sources in the San Diego region, either this LEAPS transmission line or the Valley Rainbow line, and the use of an existing Southwest Powerlink or the green path to transmit Imperial County sources to San Diego County.

And then, finally, your schedule seems to me to be quite unrealistic. I appreciate that you've got a second scoping process, but you have only 40 days to respond to comments and that seems unrealistic, so I hope you're not in a rush to judgment on this project. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: David Van Cleve.

MR. VAN CLEVE: Good afternoon, my name is David Van Cleve. I live in the Ramona San Diego Country Estates. Most of my work for the last three years has been in the Santa Ysabel Valley, but prior to that for 22 years I worked in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, so you've really given me a trifecta here to be concerned about. You know, when you mentioned that Anza-Borrego is a regional significance, let me address that. I was chief scientist for the state park for eight years, after that I was the superintendent of the state park for 14 years. It's not only me that thinks it's a wonderful place, the Department of Interior declared it a national natural landmark. The United Nation's declared it a biosphere reserve. National Geographic Magazine said it was the best state park. Travelers said it was one of the finest surprise travel destinations in the world. So I think there's some support for Anza-Borrego State Park. And that is a regional attraction, a place of importance, international importance.

When you describe the impacts to wilderness, direct and indirect, I mean that should stop the conversation right there. That is a line that cannot be crossed in my view. You might as well say let's

go tear down some cathedrals and burn them for firewood, that's the same impact to me that you're having on an irreplaceable resource.

The two alternatives that I don't see really addressed thoroughly and I would encourage you to do more analysis on are splitting lines through the state park and putting it underground to two 230s. I think it's an alternative that is worthy of exploration and that is to put it along the border. If there's going to be a steel fence impassable on the border, we might as well concentrate on impact on places that are going to be screwed up and put the kV lines down there. So I would say that you haven't done an adequate job up to this point of exploring an alternative. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Betsy or Kelly, I don't know whether you can hear me outside. Has anyone else turned in any speaker cards?

I need to have you come up here to the microphone and give me your name and then you can speak.

MS. BERTOLINI: My name is Francesca Bertolini. I've only been here for about three years and that's a real newcomer when you talk about generations of families who have lived here since the 1800s, but which one of you is from SDG&E?

MR. MICHAELSON: No one.

MS. BERTOLINI: Okay. Well, too bad, because I'm not originally from California, but I can tell you I've heard of SDG&E, so has my mother, so has my father, so has all of my family and friends in the mid-west. And I know people in the east and I know people all around the world. This issue is not a local issue. This issue is a global issue. SDG&E already has a horrible reputation thank you to Erin Brockovich and generations from now will be watching that movie. SDG&E is seen as an evil force among millions, possibly billions of people. This is a wonderful opportunity for SDG&E to revamp it's horrible evil imagine that people have for it. This is a wonderful opportunity for SDG&E to find alternatives. And, frankly, most people in this world are really sick and tired of the same old, same old energy proposals and we're tired of sending our best and brightest to die for war.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, sir, come on up. Give us your name.

MR. BURKE: I'm Alanson Burke. I've lived and worked for many years in Japan. When Japan began its great electrification program after World War II, the Japanese government early on made a decision to use primarily nuclear power. As the nuclear power plants were built, fanning out from them to other small islands of Japan electric power lines had to be laid and it was necessary because of the geography that most of them were laid underground, under water, I should say, between the islands. They were laid carefully in such a way as to avoid things like sewage outfalls, which are very important, and to keep them along the depth at which ships were possibly anchored so that the lines would not be disturbed.

What I suggest is that you give consideration for running the Sunrise Powerlink from the origin out in the desert along the U.S. Mexico border to the ocean. The U.S. Mexico border is generally a kind of a wasteland. The part near the border is not very useful for most purposes. The same road that the Border Patrol uses to patrol the border could be used by SDG&E to service and maintain the power line perhaps reducing costs and you could do it perhaps on a cooperative basis.

What I suggest you do is ask the State Department in Washington to check with the government of Japan to see if they would entertain the trip by one of your officials to look at the system there, see how it's been done, how it might work, and come back and give your report on it. The offshore power line, as I understand it, would be mainly under federal jurisdiction which would greatly simplify many of your problems, so give it a thought.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Thank you.

MR. DROWN: Hi, my name is Glen Drown. I'm with the Cumming Trust and the Tulloch Family Partners and we're impacted by this line from Highway 78 right in Santa Ysabel on down past Mile Post 113. It's a pretty significant length of line there. There were some technical issues that I was going to bring to your attention, but some of them have already been addressed on the map, the undergrounding. The maps that are here are different than what were in the packet that were mailed out to us, so I'm going to submit pretty good written comments addressing those.

Also impacted on the Interstate 8 alternative, we have property there. And the south — or the Central Substation, the alternative substation is on our land. And I guess what I would like to do is invite each of you as you go to Ramona, stop and take a tour with me through that part of the ranch. The Cleveland National Forest Alternative is on very, very rough terrain and cutting the new road and avoiding the forest is just ludicrous. There's already a road through there and crossing the forest service is the most reasonable thing to do. It would take about an hour of time, we would have a nice view of the sunset and we can go take that tour on your way and go right into the estates from there.

I will be submitting some written comments. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else? If you want to make it, go ahead and make it as a comment and we'll finish all the comments and if there's any kind of question that needs addressed, I will —

MR. BOWMAN: Are you going to require off road permits for all the tractors, cranes, concrete masons for foundations to these towers in Borrego and the other places? Robert Bowman, resident of Julian long time.

MR. MICHAELSON: What is your name, sir?

MR. BOWMAN: Robert Bowman. Are you going to answer the question? Are you going to require off road permits?

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm going to finish with all the comments and see if there's any questions that they can respond to. Is there anyone else that hasn't spoken today?

MS. COSTANZO: My name is Claudia Costanzo and I would rather die than speak in front of a group of people, but I have listened to so much heartfelt things that were said today. And something that really surprised me is at one of the meetings I was joking around, I suggested why not put transmission lines along an already blighted area which would be the border. And I was joking. And today I heard three other people suggest the same thing, why don't they put all the ugly in one spot, because it is pretty ugly, and concentrate all the blight in one area. Anyhow I just thought that was interesting that I heard that from three other people and I was joking about it.

And then I heard the suggestion of sharing the road and the maintenance with the Federal Government and sharing the costs, and being kind of a pragmatic thinker and how can we keep the costs down, I kind of like that idea.

So, anyhow, my husband and I had some land passed down to us in Mesa Grande. It's about 40 acres. We haven't built anything on it. I don't think we're going to. And we see ourselves as God's custodians of that 40 acres. And I really hope to God that this project doesn't happen. Amen.

MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else? Come on up.

MS. McGRATH: Hi, my name is Christie McGrath and I live in Mesa Grande. I would like to know if your commission has any information on the potential income that San Diego Gas & Electric and the shareholders who receive long-term from this project? I think it's really important because it's about money unfortunately. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Let me make sure everyone gets a chance to speak.

MS. LEWIS: This isn't my favorite place either. My name is Donna Lewis. And everybody has covered the part that I would normally speak about, but no one has brought up what just or fair price is going to be. If it ever goes through, what is a fair market value for these people's property. I just had it happen to me in another state, Long Island, I have two acres there. And they put in a preserve. Now I can't build on it. I can't do anything to it. And back there I called a real estate lady, I said, "What is a acre of bare land worth back there in South Hampton and she said about \$100,000." Well, I have two acres. That was really good. The county is offering me 28,000. So think about it. When you're wrecking somebody's land, you're wrecking their life, their future, their family's future, you're wrecking everything. Who is going to get that great piece of land under that power — when they have to break — maybe someday down the line they will have to break the ranch up, who's the lucky person that gets the part with the power line on it. Think about it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. CHILDS: Welcome to our back country home out here. My name is Ken Childs. And our supervisor Diane Jacobs asked me to pass this on to you. It's her public comments if you haven't received them yet.

MR. MICHAELSON: I understand she's going to speak down in Ramona today.

MR. CHILDS: Our family ranch is out here near Santa Ysabel and some of my friends out here, the old-timers probably still consider me a newcomer to the area. We've been here 27 years and in that 27 years I have seen so little changes out here in the back country. The land is just as it has always been. And a project like this is going to have such a huge impact on so many of our — so many people's lifestyles. The visual impact to not only the people that live here, but the tourists that come out to the back country and they support us. We welcome them out here. So I find it very disturbing that this project is going to disturb a lot of this land that has been undisturbed.

I also find it odd that we're all sitting here when there is a legitimate question on the purpose and the need for this power line and all of us are having to adjust our lifestyle to address these issues, when you would think that the need for this project would be addressed first. The question is coming from some very legitimate sources. And I just find that we're all very upset about this as you can tell. And you would think that this needs be addressed before we all have our life's disrupted. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. SCOTT: Hi, my name is Travis Scott. I used to live up here in Julian, now I'm a resident of Ramona and the estates. And my understanding is you can't put power lines overhead in the estates because they have a rule that there are no power lines. So some of that thought kind of comes to me when we were talking about the back country, because I don't think that power lines belong back here and it should be a rule.

Some of the other things that people brought up with the power lines down to border has been brought up by many people I know down in San Diego City that this doesn't reflect upon, so that should be an alternative that looks forward.

Some other things is health concerns. I have about 16 inches of metal rods in my body, how healthy is that for me to be underneath a 500 kilovolt line or near one. The firefighting issue is very big. That's how the 2003 Cedar fire started was with power lines. Now they want to go through national forest and put up more possible starts to fires. There's the issue with the easements on these people's property. And my understanding is you can't build within certain feet of these easements, so you're going to take a 300-foot road or a 100-foot road and you're going to add this easement that the County sets aside for building. And that's going to take land away from people even more than they're probably thinking. So I thank you for listening and I hope you take some of that into consideration.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. WESTCOTT: Thank you to the members up here and also to all the residents of Julian. I don't work up here and I don't live up here. I play up here. I live in San Diego and I have everything to benefit from the power that's going to come through your land and give me power so I can play in my city. I grew up in San Diego, but I've come up here all my life to play, play in the snow, eat apple pie, go hiking, fight fires. And I think there's a lot we can find viable alternatives to that powerlink coming through — through our treasured natural land. We can find someplace else of screwing up, somewhere else rather than coming through your land. My name is Debbie Westcott.

MR. MICHAELSON: If there's no one else, I was going to turn to both Billie and Susan and see if there were any other questions that were asked that you felt you could address immediately here or if it's something you need to take under advisement. There was one about the —

MS. LEE: I don't know the answer to the permit.

MR. MICHAELSON: You don't know the answer to the permit question. You have to look that one up. I don't either.

MS. GREEN: Bobbi Green speaking. And I am of the endangered species. I am in need of protection. My fellow Julianites, back countryites, all of us need your protection. We are endangered. There is land that we helped buy, public land, and we are still supporting it with our taxes. We have given easements to government issues, lines, roads, whatever. We are endangered. And this link through our back country will just spread more pressure onto those of us that don't happen to be in direct line with it. Please protect us and put this mess maybe into some government land that we've paid for.

MR. MICHAELSON: Do you want to speak?

MR. GORDON: My name is Ken Gordon. I'm a Mesa Grande landowner and a Julian resident. I've noticed along the coast whenever they had big projects of one kind or another they were required to put up story poles, they're big PVC things, perhaps you have seen them. And they actually mimic what is going to be there after it's there. It gives the community a chance to see the visual impacts. Well, I propose that SDG&E should have to put up some story poles, so to speak, and either erect a couple of those things along the road before they do any of this and see how people like it and build it out of PVC or whatever. I'm sure it would get quite an effect. It would have a very chilling effect, I'm sure.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you.

Well, we've got a lot of people commenting today. I think almost half the room ended up at the microphone. We really appreciate you taking the time out. We're really happy we came to Wynola. We came as close to your backyard as we could for the second round so we could hear from all of you. So if you have additional questions or additional comments, you can make those in writing. There's plenty of ways to get in contact with the people on the project. We thank you for being here. We're adjourned.

[Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 3:52 p.m.]