PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

We would certainly encourage you to put your thoughts in writing as comments to the draft EIR as well.

MR. COLTRAIN: They are. I just handed them.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Okay. But also there's a formal process for submitting comments to the draft EIR. You could — if you wanted to, you could talk to either Susan Lee or Billie Blanchard in the back of the room, and they could explain that to you; but encourage you to produce that information there as well.

MR. COLTRAIN: Okay. Thank you very much.

ALJ WEISSMAN: All right. Thank you for coming out.

STATEMENT OF MR. KJONEGAARD

MR. KJONEGAARD: Good evening. My name is Dan Kjonegaard. I'm a member of the Jamul/Dulzura Community Planning Group. We went on record December 12, 2006, opposing the entire project.

Currently, the alternative energy sources that are flaunted here, they haven't been developed along the project line, the proposed project, by any of them. We must recognize that the damage that's going to occur to the ecosystem during construction and subsequently to the maintenance, this is inevitable. There is no way it can be mitigated out, the continued erosion and overdriving of the adjacent areas of the roads.

Don't discount the potential fire hazards of the existing system that is in place as well as any proposed construction, especially in our area. And there are continued disruptions during wildfires. The Cedar Fire is a perfect example. What happened to the Southwest Powerlink at that time?

I would urge the powers that be to look to retrofitting existing power plants that lay predominantly idle within San Diego County right now that are already tied into the network, the grid system that exists. I think their money perhaps would be better spent retrofitting these and bringing them up to current acceptable EPA standards.

Thank you for your time.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MR. RUSCH

MR. RUSCH: Good evening. My name is Randy Rusch. I'm a resident of Alpine.

And going through the DEIR report, there's one item that really comes near and dear to my heart, and that's dealing with the agricultural side of the house. And in reference to this — this is the California Land Act of 1965, the Williams Land Act. And it says on your Section AG-4, it says, the EIR states the proposed project would convert 254 acres of the Williams Land Act to nonagricultural use.

What the DEIR does not say, under the rule — I did some research through this — and under the rules of the Land Act, parcels that are enrolled under this program were to remain and be maintained as agricultural land for tax relief to the property owners under the Tax & Revenue Code Section 423.3. The Williams Land Act stipulates that the property will be bound into a 10-year contract with the State of California and only can choose to opt for a nonrenewal. Upon the issue of the

C0100-1

C0100-2

C0100-3

C0101-1

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

nonrenewal, a request of a minimum — a minimum — of nine years will have to pass before the release of the contract can be granted by the board of supervisors.

My questions here are: Has the proper nonrenewal of the program been submitted and approved?

Just as a sideline to that, termination dates by the contract are to take place November 1st of any year, and it will take nine to ten years after that for that contract to expire.

Second question is: Is the property owner aware that a fee of 12.5 percent of the full market value of the property will be assessed on the property when released from the Williams Land Act. And this is in the — written in the revenue taxation code.

An example of that: One acre of land estimated a thousand dollars would have a fee of \$2500 imposed on it for early termination.

My question is there: Have the owners of these properties been aware of that?

Also, in August of 1968, the law was amended by State Bond 1182 that established The Farmland Security Zones under the Farm Bureau-sponsored Super Williams Act that allows land owners an additional 35 percent for tax reduction of lands for property taxes on this condition the property be maintained in the program for at least 20 years. In this it does not say anything about any of this line being under that program.

And also, going into more, there is also as of January 1, 2004, they also came out with — there's severe penalties up to 25 percent of unrestricted fair value, market value, for any other lands, but also the buildings and related improvements on the land. And once again, this is not stipulated in the EIR.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MR. JERNEY

MR. JERNEY: Good evening, sir. Good evening, madam. My name is Calvin Raymond Jerney. I represent myself and also my family trust. I've lived in Alpine since 1951, and so I've been here a little while and seen some changes.

I believe you are being played by San Diego Gas & Electric and Sempra Energy. They only make money when they buy power cheap, when they ship it a great distance and when they sell it expensively.

During the power crisis, they overcharged us a billion plus. They got to keep half of the overcharge. So they've already established that they're liars, cheats and thieves in my opinion.

Now on Figure ES-11, it shows the Mexico side of the generating facilities. You could plainly see what SDG&E's purpose is. It's to buy power cheap in Mexico, export it as far as they can up north, and sell it. Don't be misled.

Now also the Modified Route D Alternative Star Valley Option will border my brother's land on the west side. The Modified Route D Alternative also will be within 100 feet of my property lines along Interstate 8.

SDG&E, my mother owns stock. We had geothermal leases in Imperial Valley. SDG&E and Sempra say they're very green. That's a plain damn lie. SDG&E with solar one, they've put enough in to keep them just alive for political purposes.

C0101-1 cont.

C0101-2

C0102-1

Final EIR/EIS 3-1776 October 2008

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

Don't believe anything they say unless you can verify it by at least two or three other independent sources.

C0102-1 cont.

Thank you for your time.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Jerney.

STATEMENT OF MR. WARNER

MR. WARNER: My name is Richard Warner. We live on Buckman Springs Road in Campo, and we're close to the power line, the line that is proposed. And it would be very visible.

But anyhow, my concern is that the buffer between we as the ratepayers who are going to pay for all of this is the PUC. We hope that your staff research all of these proposals that the power company is putting out because you are the ones that have to do this for us.

I am opposed to spending a huge amount of money on undergrounding. Undergrounding is good for the power company because they are going to get their money back from the investments that they're putting in, so — but anyhow, since I can't speak very well, I'm going to just close by — one of the points that I think we would like to have you really look at is the route that goes along the Interstate 8 because it has access to the pole line for repair, and so on. But some of these back areas are isolated.

Anyhow, I'm not opposed to renewable energy. I think that that's the way we have to go eventually, but is this going to be able to fit into that.

I'm going to close and let you have your time.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Warner. I appreciate your comments.

STATEMENT OF MR. LENAC

MR. LENAC: Good evening. I'm Randy Lenac, and my wife is Barbara Lenac. And I don't think you're going to give us two two-minute sessions, so I'll speak for both of us.

We are opposed to the Southern Power Line Option, the Modified Route D Option. And I want to address what I feel or what we feel are some inadequacies in the EIR regarding environmental justice, the environmental justice first from a subregional perspective.

If for some reason that this southern power line or this power line has to be built, and we hope it isn't, then the Southern Option is the worst travesty because it clearly targets the poorest communities of San Diego County. The I-8 Corridor North Modified D Alternative traverses Jacumba, Boulevard, Campo and Potrero as well as three of the poorest Indian reservations in San Diego County, Campo, La Posta and Manzanita. These poor and minority communities already struggle with the unmitigated impacts of the Southwest Powerlink, which was built 20 years ago, and Interstate 8. Adding another power line for the primary benefit of the affluent coastal regions when there are alternatives available is an unfair burden on these communities.

I'd like to close with addressing the impact of the environmental injustice from a private property perspective. There are literally hundreds of private tax-paying land owners who find themselves in the direct route of this power line — my wife and I are one of those — and they've received lip service in the EIR regarding the unmitigatable impact on their private properties. Whereas the federal and the state government agencies seem to have had a place at the table in determining the environmental impact on public lands, the private land owners are left to fend for themselves.

C0103-1

C0104-1

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

The Public Utility Commission is responsible for looking out for the public's interest and should first and foremost consider building any proposed power line on a public land versus private land. There's a great option to do this. The Campo Cumaya Nation, our friends at the Campo-Cumaya Nation, have now officially opposed the Southern Option which triggers a clause in the EIR to go up and around the three Indian reservations in a very circuitous route that follows what they generally refer to as the B, C, D Route. Despite this lengthy workaround, the EIR still brings the power line back down and around and links back into the I-8 Corridor on the west side of the Indian reservations, so that they can go down all the way around our communities.

If there has to be a Southern Option, the right and just decision would be to follow the original proposed B, C, D Route through the Cleveland National Forest and avoid the hundreds of private land owners in Campo, Potrero and Japatul Valley and save the ratepayers millions of dollars on a long power line that's unnecessary.

Your Honor, our request is that you make sure that the final decision takes into consideration environmental justice.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lenac.

STATEMENT OF MR. SMITH

MR. SMITH: My name is Dave Smith, and I live in Descanso. And I'm absolutely opposed to the Powerlink.

Just to put a little bit of a personal face on the impact, the gentleman just preceded me touched a little bit on private property owners' impact. And what happened was about six months ago, I received a packet of information in the mail from SDG&E. And in looking through this — it took a while to figure out exactly what was going on, but there was one line that went through Cleveland National Forest about a quarter mile to the north of my property. And there was also another line that seemed to go right through my house, which caught my attention.

I have lived in this beautiful valley for 25 years. I built a home with my own hands. I really hoped to some day leave this to my grandchildren. It's an irreplaceable, beautiful spot. And the impact on someone when it's your home that is destroyed is absolute. The environmental impact is great, but to the individuals that are going to lose their homes, this can be an absolute impact. And I'd just like to have you remember that when you consider what's going on.

Thank you very much.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

STATEMENT OF MR. BUTLER

MR. BUTLER: Hi. My name is Tom Butler. I live off of Star Valley Road. And I oppose the entire project in its entirety, especially the one Modified D.

I — when I bought my piece of property in Alpine, I was — I was so excelled by the beauty of the sunrises and the sunsets, and they just generated so many beautiful hues of lights and colors over the entire valley and the roaming hills.

I was also excited about the eagles that we have out there and the turkey vultures and the quail and the red-tailed hawks. All of these animals will be subjected to a great hardship with the iron giants that will be staggered across our property and our hillsides along with the buzzing wires that will chase everything away. We really need your help in this.

C0104-1 cont.

C0105-1

C0106-1

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

And understand one thing. Put yourselves, your Honor and Commissioner, in our spot. What would you do if that was your piece of property and that was your iron giant that was going to be looking at you for the rest of your life?

C0106-1 cont.

Because let me tell you something: You're not going to be able to sell that piece of property. My property value has already gone down, not because the value of the property in San Diego County has gone down anyway, but it's gone down because of the scare, the scare that this is coming through. I cannot sell my property for what I bought it for and I probably never will be able to.

I thank you very much.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Butler.

STATEMENT OF MR. NOLAND

MR. NOLAND: Thank you for coming.

My name is Chris Noland. I'm a professional geologist licensed to practice in California and Arizona. And I am a resident of Boulevard, and I oppose the entire project. However, if this unnecessary project should be approved, there are some significant items that need to be addressed in the final EIR/EIS.

In Appendix G, the cumulative impacts of construction processes are detailed, but not all are mentioned. To place the steel transmission tower or transmission facility into the ground requires a footprint for that tower or facility to be built.

Many times slopes may need to be cut or grading done for towers or facilities to be built. Larger areas may need grading done for towers or facilities. The cutting of slopes may sometimes be done mechanically based on the ability of the material. In some cases, such as those in hard rock, which is widely present in our project area here, blasting is the only way to remove the material.

Much of the proposed project and alternative routes travel through areas that may need the use of explosives to remove material for tower and/or facility construction. In most areas of eastern and northern San Diego County, residents rely on groundwater wells for their water supply. Many wells that are located within fractured rocks are open wells, which means that they have no outer casings to prevent cave-ins or sedimentation. Many times these wells are constructed at depths greater than 500 feet and cost thousands of dollars to construct. These are the land owners' only alternative for water supply.

The footprints of the transmission towers have been located in residential areas where groundwater is the only water supply. Blasting and the subsequent seismic waves created during tower construction can damage these wells to the point of uselessness. It can create cave-ins or softer sediments create a well that's completely fouled with sediments. Both of these scenarios can create significant impact to the residents.

Blasting can also alter the water flow through fractures within the aquifer which may have adverse effects of a wider influence.

Let me get to Table 12.6. Table D 12-6 discusses the proposed mitigation measures for water resources. And one of them numbered WQAPM-6 states: SDG&E will ensure — will — SDG&E will negotiate with the affected land owners to provide alternative water supplies in the event the supply well or springs dry up directly caused by project activities.

The preceding sentence should be edited as follows: SDG&E will ensure that adequate alternative water supplies will be provided to affected land owners in the event a supply well or springs

C0107-1

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

dry up directly caused by project activities. And SDG&E will also respond immediately by either rehabilitating or reconstructing a new water supply for the land owner at the expense of SDG&E.

There is no reason that the land owner should have to negotiate with SDG&E to provide them with water supplies.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: That you very much, Mr. Noland.

STATEMENT OF MR. HAZELTON

MR. HAZELTON: Good evening. My name is Scott Hazelton. I live on Live Oak Springs Road. I have run a ranch, 1200-acre ranch, on that road there. Been a resident for the last 40 years in the Mountain Empire area. And in coming here, I can't add much more to what people have said. We do oppose it. We've given a lot of good reasons.

I do want to make one statement, is that we're not people with, like the saying, not in our backyard. The fact is we have an awful lot in our backyard already that's been shipped up here to us from the downtown and such.

The property I work on and live on right now has over six easements alone from San Diego Gas & Electric running through it, as well as many county easements and such like that. They've taken my property and devalued it considerably. This would devalue it even more. So we do oppose this and such.

But I want to ask you, with all these things going on, the environmental issues and everything else, I can't help but think that if it wasn't my child out there running around but quino checker butterfly or arrovo toad, they wouldn't come through our ranch.

I would ask that you give the same consideration for us as you would for the toads and the birds.

And thank you very much.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. MYERS

MR. MYERS: Thank you. My name is Tom Myers. And my wife Judy and I live in Alpine.

We're opposed to the project, and instead we would support renewable energy close to the source or point of use.

The 21st Century is still young, still searching for the truths that will define its course. The Sunrise Powerlink Project is of the old century. Constructing 150 miles of transmission line from the Imperial Valley to western San Diego County does nothing to encourage conservation. It is costly, environmentally damaging, increases the risk of wildfire and adversely impacts cultural, historic, agricultural, recreational and scenic resources.

Most importantly, only one-third of the power generated in the Imperial Valley will ever reach its point of use. Two-thirds will be lost through generation and line losses due to the length of the transmission lines.

We believe there is a better solution. San Diego Smart Energy 2020 Plan offers a paradigm-shifting alternative. This plan offers a move away from reliance on fossil fuels and imported power by reducing demand through conservation measures, reducing energy losses through improved grid management and providing the needed peak energy through solar photovoltaic solutions.

C0107-1 cont.

C0108-1

C0109-1

C0109-2

C0109-3

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

This plan offers significant greenhouse gas reduction, less reliance on natural gas for power generation and greatly expanded local, renewable energy generating clean power where it is most needed. The environmental impacts and the life-cycle costs of this program are estimated to be significantly less than that the impacts and life-cycle costs of the Sunrise Powerlink.

C0109-3 cont.

We encourage the California Public Utilities Commission and the Bureau of Land Management to give full consideration to the Smart Energy 2020 Plan and to rank this plan among the available options of the SPL Project.

Some will say it's too late to consider yet another alternative. But we believe it's never to late to consider an alternative that could save consumers billions of dollars, significantly increase the use of renewable energy and preserve and protect our fragile environment.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. MILLIGAN

MR. MILLIGAN: Good evening. My name is Michael Milligan. I'm a long-time resident of Alpine. I live on Star Valley Road, which shows on your alternative map as the route where the line is coming right along the sideline of Star Valley Road. I totally oppose this proposal. I believe there are other alternative methods to provide power from the desert and not through Star Valley Road. And thank you for your time.

C0110-1

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MS. HEDLUN

MS. HEDLUN: My name is Jan Hedlun and I am from Potrero. I am on the Potrero Planning Group. We went on record on 10/11/07 as being against the Powerlink in its entirety, but I'm here as a private citizen.

C0111-1

The back country should not suffer the numerous financial impacts of the Sunrise Powerlink when the ultimate goal of the project is to increase power to the Los Angeles area. We are going to be dealing with visual degradation. We have the Pacific Coast Trail that people will now be looking down upon the towers. We have fire danger. The tower height alone poses a danger to aircraft and helicopter traffic which is extremely heavy in our area due to Border Patrol activity.

I'm also speaking for Caron and Lena Serrano who are chemically sensitive who will be directly impacted by the EMF danger.

C0111-2

We have the noise, the cost. There are other alternatives. We are a sole-source aquifer in this entire area and will be impacted by any hazardous waste.

C0111-3

The community effect to Boulevard, Campo Potrero and Barrett can be — we're going to be dealing with the potential for eminent domain. And property values are already being degraded by the presence or the possibility.

0111-4

The need, there is no proven need for the Sunrise Powerlink in San Diego that we know of.

And we would like you very much to say no to this project in its entirety.

C0111-5

Thank you very much.

(Applause).

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

October 2008 3-1781 Final FIR/FIS

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

STATEMENT OF MS. COSTA

MS. COSTA: Hi. My name is Jean Costa. I've lived in La Mesa since 1964, but I'm here to support the communities who oppose this awful project and who live in this beautiful back country that we want to preserve.

I was at the hearing this morning and I noticed that many of the proponents of the project said that there was a need to address global warming on the one hand; but on the other hand, they spoke of the inevitable expansion of development in our area and the need for more and more and more energy.

I have a few questions that really concern me. Number one may be very controversial, but it's a question I think we need to ask.

Why is nobody talking about limiting the population of our area to the carrying capacity of the region? Atlanta, Georgia is facing this question finally because they have a serious water problem. And we have a serious water problem too.

Question No. 2: Why is nobody linking growth and growth and more growth with the emission of greenhouse gases?

As somebody said, growth is the ideology of the cancer cell.

Another question: What is the advantage of thousands of people hooked up to and depending on one huge grid? What happened a few areas ago in the northeast? Huge blackout.

Another question: Why should we depend on imported energy from Sempra plants in Mexico and LNG from Russia and Indonesia where, by the way, the extraction of this energy affects native peoples there in those countries who have no political power to fight it.

Why aren't we talking more about conservation and efficiency and local generation of power?

And lastly, who participated in the so-called energy crisis we faced here in Southern California? Who can trust Sempra Energy after that corporate scam?

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Ms. Costa.

STATEMENT OF MR. HICKETHIER

MR. HICKETHIER: Hi. I'm Don Hickethier and I live in Pine Valley. And 14 years ago, my wife and I we bought a house up here. We have our little acre of the valley and we love it. And I'm not opposed if San Diego Gas & Electric need another power line. I don't think they do. But it looks like they're going out of their way to put one right in my front yard. I don't want to be a NIMBY. But you know, if they put it in my front yard, I'm done. And I worked my life to have that house that I've got now for my kids and my grand kids.

And it seems like it would be — if they have to have it, it would be so much easier to follow the transportation corridor instead of veering away, going through Pine Valley, Guatay, Descanso. It seems like they want to go out of their way to inconvenience us instead of — you know, we're just the little people. We've got very little say.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

Larry Johnson.

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHNSON

C0112-1

C0112-2

C0112-3

C0112-4

C0112-5

C0113-1

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

MR. JOHNSON: Hi. I'm Larry Johnson, 1259 Dewey Place, Campo, California. I'm speaking as an individual. I'm also on the local Campo community planning group.

First, I'd like to thank the CPUC for holding the meeting here in Campo and giving everybody a chance to talk. I've got a few simple points.

I'm in the area — support the CPUC's EIR top choice of new in-area, all-source generation as the number one alternative. In addition to the basin photovoltaic range rooftop microturbines should be given serious consideration as low profile conversion units that can be integrated into the design of new green buildings and retrofitted buildings. SDG&E can meet and exceed its 20 percent renewable energy requirement locally without putting billions of dollars into a string of towers.

SDG&E makes decisions mostly based on future profit potential. The CPUC could provide decisions and guidelines that would produce financial incentives that encourages SDG&E to adopt Alternative No. 1 and become a model organization that takes them and us towards a more self-reliant, energy conservative, forward-thinking, smart electrical distribution network owner and generator.

The CPUC recently approved Docket No. Resolution E-4137 which allows feed-in tariffs for small generating facilities. However, while this applies to several Southern California utilities, this does not seem to apply to SDG&E for electricity yet. This is an excellent tool to encourage many homeowners, small businesses, and large building complexes to build a wide variety of renewable energy generating sources that would be widely distributed over San Diego County area.

While enough in-basin generation of power, there could be capacity freed up — with enough inbasin generation power, there could be capacity freed up on the existing Southwest Powerlink to bring in peak power when needed.

The San Diego Smart Energy 2020 report by Bill Powers is an excellent compilation of important information which supports the CPUC's EIR No. 1 choice and the state of California legislation such as AB 32, 1969, AB 1, and the 2008 update Energy Action Plan and other significant, forward-looking legislative law.

I thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

Let's take a short break. Let's take a ten-minute break, give the reporters a chance to rest their fingers and give everybody a chance to stretch.

(Recess taken)

ALJ WEISSMAN: On the record.

We're ready for Nicki Field followed by Jeff White.

STATEMENT OF MS. FIELD

MS. FIELD: Hi. I'm Nicki Field. I live in Pine Valley. I'm opposed to the project. First of all, giant power lines don't belong in national forest or state parks or anywhere in the back country. I moved to Pine Valley because it's so beautiful. I can leave my house and in a few minutes be somewhere where I don't see anything manmade. If this project goes through, that likely will change.

At this point, it doesn't seem like the project will provide any new renewable energy. In Southern California where it's sunny 99 percent of the time, other than renewable such as solar.

I've heard this project is needed because of how vulnerable San Diego's energy sources are from being cut off from natural disasters such as fires. But this power line with its hundred-plus miles

C0114-1

C0114-2

C0115-1

C0115-2

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

is going to be just as vulnerable, particularly the southern route being very close to the Southwest Powerlink which could be cut off from the same fire. The energy needs to be produced where it's needed to avoid that problem.

And most importantly, the power line goes through already fire prone areas. We know the power line starts fire. And after 2003 and 2007, I'm just appalled that anyone would propose to put another fire hazard through the back country.

So please, don't let this project happen. Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. WHITE

MR. WHITE: I don't know if you can understand me. My voice is a little raspy today. But I thought I was opposed to this project. But I live here. I work for the largest drilling foundation drilling contractor in the United States, and I'm thinking about all this drilling that we have to do.

I had this one geologist here this brought up some good points.

There was another fellow that brought up this map right here, this map of some power lines. If I came in and drilled these holes, this isn't going to work because this up here, we have about 3500 psi minimum rock and you need big flat spots for the equipment that I need to drill that. Actually, I need a 50 by 50 footprint just for the drill rig to stand its tower to drill these holes.

In this 3500 psi rock, I need no less than nine 1300 cfm compressors that we get from Germany to drill these holes to excavate these shafts.

When we're done in the soft area, like at your place, Randy, we have soft material, soft dirt a lot of water, which means I have to use steel casing and polymer. So we are going to be contaminating the soil with polymers, with acids, with chemicals. To do that I need at least four 22,000 gallon storage tanks for the water. So in effect, each one of those towers whether it be soft drilling or hard drilling, I'm going to need a space about as big as this gym just to facilitate the equipment I need to install these casons to hold this up, the foundation to hold it up. The impact is severe.

I don't know what these books are. I'm probably not smart enough to read half of them. But that's what I need as a contractor to go out and drill these holes.

It's going to be real intrusive to the area, to the groundwater, to your wells. When we are using blasting and drop-chisels, any of those deep excavated water wells, they're going to collapse. We put in, we call them dewatering wells on jobs where we need to remove the water to put in an excavation pit like downtown. They don't put those in until I leave because they're all going to fail, just like your wells would.

I'm out of time.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much. Appreciate your comments.

STATEMENT OF MR. LANDT

MR. LANDT: Good evening. I'm George Landt from Alpine. Grew up down here in Alpine, along Alpine Boulevard. And don't really believe that we need this Powerlink as it's been presented to us now.

If do you go ahead, seems like what I've heard tonight, the only viable alternative would be following the transportation corridor and undergrounding. Everything else is extremely invasive.

C0115-2 cont.

C0116-1

C0117-1

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA February 25, 2008 - 6:50 P.M.

My primary concern is the fire and safety issues. And having lived through the Viejas fire, the Laguna fire, the Cedar fire, obviously one thing you must admit is that — the Laguna fire was caused by SDG&E power lines going down. The Cedar fire was caused by a hunter who should have been hunted. The Rice fire and the Witch Creek fire both were caused by SDG&E power lines going down. These were 170,000 acres with the Laguna fire, the largest in state history until the Witch Creek fire came along and superceded it.

We have a tremendous loss of back country land. We have a lot of homes that have been devastated, and the loss of life has just been incredible and inexcusable.

If you looked at the news during the Rice Canyon fire when it was burning through the Valley Oaks Mobile Home Park, it didn't take any one with very much intelligence to listen and realize that SDG&E/Sempra had tree trimming efforts going on while our mobile home park was still smoldering. That's not a legitimate participant in this community.

SDG&E has not acted responsibly in over 30 years. They learned nothing from the Laguna fire and it was even less performance during the Cedar fire and Witch Creek fire.

I would like to specifically address the Modified Route D Alternative with the Star Valley option. Sounds ominously like a federal tax return. That pretty much tells us what it's going to be doing to us financially. It would be devastating the visual impact.

As you're returning to San Diego this evening and going down the grade, make sure SDG&E includes enough money to remove the viewpoint, the Ellis Wayside Park because it wouldn't be necessary once those power lines go off at Elk Bluff and across the Sweet Water River.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MS. GOODMAN

MS. GOODMAN: Lucille Goodman. I'm a resident of Pine Valley since the past 23 years. I'm also a member of the Pine Valley Planning Group, but I'm here as a individual. And I'm against the Sunrise Powerlink. I'd like to speak to you on the reliability issue, energy reliability, and also the issue of fire.

On the reliability issue, during the 2007 wildfires, the Southwest Powerlink, as you know, went down. And also the route that the Southwest — that the Sunrise Powerlink would take, the fire ran through it. So, so much for the reliability.

Also, both the Southwest and the Sunrise Powerlink would be linked up to a power station in Imperial Valley. That's not a very good idea for energy reliability. The problem with the fire issues too is that the fire fighters cannot fight the fires underneath the power lines. That means power has to be turned off. That takes maybe an hour, maybe two hours of lost time in which lives can be lost and property can be lost.

There was an article in the San Diego Union regarding the fact that the lines that are not contained can spark and cause fires. This study was denigrated by SDG&E. They must learn that these power lines are a problem and needs to be studied further. So please vote no on this project.

Thank you very much.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you. STATEMENT OF MS. HANSON C0117-2

C0117-3

C0118-1