Comment Set D1

BEAUMONT, CALIFORNIA, JUNE 7, 2006 – 7:12 P.M.

* * * * *

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE TERKEURST: Please come to order.

This is the time and place for a public hearing Application 05-04-015, the Commission's proceeding in the matter of the application of Southern California Edison Company for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity concerning the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 transmission line project.

My name is Charlotte TerKeurst. I'm the administrative law judge assigned to this proceeding.

There is another public participation hearing scheduled tomorrow evening at seven o'clock at the UC Riverside Palm Desert Campus, Room B-114. The address is 75080 Frank Sinatra Drive in Palm Desert, California. If you have additional thoughts after this evening's meeting or if you know of anyone else who might want to participate, please let them know about that meeting. We will be there as well. And there is another environmental workshop in the afternoon from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. at the same location if you want to talk with the environmental staff further about the project.

I think we've already mentioned Billie Blanchard -- in the green in the back of the room -- is the project manager on the environmental analysis that is being undertaken on this project.
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We have representatives here -- I believe John Kalish is here -- from the Bureau of Land Management. We're doing a joint environmental review of the project with the Bureau of Land Management.

There are representatives from Southern California Edison here. And if you could identify yourself.

MR. HORN: Jack Horn.
MR. PEARSON: And Dan Pearson.
ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.
MS. JUNIPER: And Lynn Juniper.
ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

So if anyone has questions of them, they should be available for a little while at least after we end this hearing for you to discuss with them.

The environmental review that is being undertaken is one part of the formal process that the Commission undertakes in reviewing a utility's request to build a project like the transmission project that Edison has proposed in this proceeding.

The environmental impact documents that are provided are for the Commission's use, but we also have a more formal process where we take evidence about not just environmental issues but the need for the project, the costs for the project, any other matters that the Commission needs to consider as it considers the utility's application.

We had one set of hearings in January on
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the economic analysis that has been done. One of the primary reasons that Southern California Edison has given for wanting to build this line is the ability to access less expensive power in Arizona and bring it into California. So we've taken testimony on how they did that, the economic analysis; how other parties did the economic analysis.

The California Independent System Operator submitted testimony on their economic analysis. The Commission's own Division of Ratepayer Advocates, which is a separate group from the environmental group, submitted testimony, and we had hearings. And I'm in the process of preparing a proposed decision for the Commission's consideration on the methodology.

We have additional hearings scheduled in mid July, at which time we will be looking at the environmental issues based on the environmental impact report that you've been looking at at the back of the room. We will also be looking at final cost estimates that Edison has prepared based on the environmental information that has become available.

And then there will be briefs on the evidentiary issues and I will prepare a proposed Decision for the Commission's consideration. The expectation is is that the Commission will issue a decision on Edison's request by the end of this year.

That is the basic explanation of the process. Does anyone have any questions about it?
Comment Set D1, cont.

1. MR. SMITH: A question.
2. ALJ TERKEURST: Yes. And could you identify yourself.
4. Regarding the cost: I realize that the cost will be picked up by individual users of the electricity as time goes on in the future; is that correct?
5. ALJ TERKEURST: That's a simplification of it.
6. And Edison might be able to provide you a more detailed explanation, but I can give you my understanding --
7. MR. SMITH: Mm-hmm.
8. ALJ TERKEURST: -- at a high level.
9. At this point, the entire transmission system that is controlled by the California Independent System Operator has transmission rates that are charged for the entire area. So the costs of this project would be added to the costs that are used to set the rates. So, yes, at the end of the day, yes, the ratepayers do end up paying for it.
10. MR. SMITH: Okay. One other side issue of that.
11. That is as we all know, the cost of fabrication and construction keeps going up month to month, if not year to year, like if Boston and their tunnel for example, it's way over price from what they estimated. Have you allowed or has -- whoever is analyzing the problem, have they allowed for an overrun of some magnitude in case the costs of moving towers and all that construction exceeds their estimates? Have they allowed some part
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1 of -- for that problem?
2 ALJ TERKEURST: That's one of the issues that is
3 in the July hearings. And Southern California Edison's
4 testimony was just submitted last week. I've not
5 reviewed it yet. But you could ask Edison if that is in
6 their estimates.
7 MR. SMITH: Okay.
8 ALJ TERKEURST: Anyone else?
9 (No response).
10 ALJ TERKEURST: No one has signed up to submit
11 comments this evening, so I guess this will be a fairly
12 short hearing.
13 The comment period at this point is open on
14 the Environmental Impact Report through July 5th. And
15 you can submit written comments on the Draft
16 Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact
17 Statement. And you can get the address if you don't
18 have it from Billie Blanchard. I won't read it into the
19 record. You won't have the transcript so that won't
20 help you. But even after that period closes, you can
21 submit written comments up until the Commission issues
22 its decision to me or to the Commission. So once
23 the environmental impact review period ends, that
24 doesn't mean that your opportunity to let the Commission
25 know about your concerns has terminated.
26 And the Commission's address is 505 Van Ness
27 Avenue in San Francisco, 94102. You would need to
28 reference the application number in your letter so that
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it gets circulated and filed in the correspondence file in the proceeding properly.

You can direct -- you can send it either to me, Charlotte TerKeurst. You can also send it to the Docket Office -- Process Office probably, and then it would get routed to me. But probably the easiest thing would be if you just send it directly to me and then I would make sure it gets circulated to the commissioners and then placed in the correspondence file in the proceeding.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ms. TerKeurst, can you spell your last name for me.

ALJ TERKEURST: T-e-r-k-e-u-r-s-t.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What was the first name again?

ALJ TERKEURST: Charlotte. C-h-a-r-l-o-t-t-e.

Is there anything else this evening?

(No response).

ALJ TERKEURST: If not, then this public participation hearing is adjourned.

I really appreciate everyone coming out, the interest that you've shown. I hope that Ms. Blanchard and the other people here have been able to answer your questions. And if you do have further comments, do let us know.

Thank you.
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1  (Whereupon, at the hour of 7:20 p.m.,
2  this matter having been continued to
3  7:00 p.m., June 7, 2006 at Palm Desert,
4  California, the Commission then
5  adjourned.)

6  * * * * *
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Ralph Smith

D1-1 Please refer to the response by Administrative Law Judge Charlotte TerKeurst included in the transcripts of this hearing (see Comment Set D1) for a description of how the cost of the Proposed Project would be incorporated into statewide transmission rates.
PALM DESERT, CALIFORNIA, JUNE 8, 2006 - 7:20 P.M.

* * * * *

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE TERKEURST: Please come to order.

This is the time and place for a second public participation hearing Application 05-04-015, the application of Southern California Edison Company for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity concerning the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 transmission line project.

I am Charlotte TerKeurst, the administrative law judge assigned to the proceeding.

It is 7:35 and one member of the public has appeared this evening and wishes to make a statement on the record, and I will ask him to go forward at this time.

This is Julian Veselkov. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF MR. VESELKOVD2-1

MR. VESELKOVD2-1: Okay. What it is the new proposed line will come very close to my property especially to my house. And actually the bus cable, the conductor will be very top of the corner of my property which is -- and the house will be 200 feet from the cable which is going to carry about half a million volt electricity. Even more than half a million volt.

In certain conditions the cables can be deadly. It's -- I had a letter and I explained in the letter because towers which going to support
the cables are along the road and it could happen a
truck to hit the tower and the cables can fall on
the house. That's one thing.

The other thing is it's possible the airport,
which is very close there, also something to happen with
the airplane to fall on the cables. And that's
mechanical failure on the cables besides the electrical
danger of the cables. If something happen, these cables
not -- under not normal conditions, operating
conditions.

And the other thing is case of emergency,
these cables, when they're fully loaded and one station
shuts down, the cable is fully loaded and the current
will shrink and will shoot -- zap actually. It's going
to be like thunderstorm light. It can happen throughout
the whole length of the cables, but I'm still there
about 200 feet from them. And that's my real concern
about the danger of these cables.

I spoke with the magnetic field engineer from
Edison and there was no, the engineer said to me we
don't measure the magnetic -- the electric field because
it's not something we measure; we measure only magnetic
fields.

And at the moment, the existing lines at the
very end, which is on my property which is very close to
the lines, what I've drawn over there (indicating)is
when I put up any chain-link fence I notice the cables
are inducting at least into the chain-link fence. And
if they come close another 100 to 120 feet closer, that
chain-link fence will be basically electrically loaded
because the magnetic field will pulsate and will induct
into the chain-link fence. That's the fourth thing
which actually makes my property basically useless
around the cables over there.

I think Edison should relocate me and make
that safe corridor for their cables for their operation.
I propose to Edison to move because Edison has -- owns
900 feet of corridor behind my property. I propose to
them to move the new line to move it instead to be
the edge of the corridor to move it into the middle.
And I didn't hear any response about that in positive
way. They, Edison wants to put it on the edge, which
gonna be on the side of my house and all these problems
will rise.

I -- that's pretty much all.

MR. HORNE: I guess just for the sake of
the record, you referred to a letter that you sent. And
I think, Susan, you pointed out that that was during
the scoping meetings.

MS. LEE: That's correct.

MR. HORNE: That letter is part of the scoping
report that CPUC published.

ALJ TERKEURST: Can you identify yourself.

MR. HORNE: I'm Jack Horne with SCE.

ALJ TERKEURST: And we probably need
Mr. Veselkov's address in the record.
You'd written down P.O. Box 580453 in North Palm Springs.

MR. VESELKOV: California, 92258.

ALJ TERKEURST: Do we need a street address though so we can identify the location?

MS. LEE: He had written it up there.

MR. VESELKOV: My street address is 64639 Dillon Road. And my mailing address is 580453 P.O. Box. North Palm Springs, California 92258.

ALJ TERKEURST: All right. And Mr. Horne, you said that Edison has done some research into this problem?

MR. HORNE: We've done some. The gentleman referred to our EMF -- one of our EMF specialists Brian Thorson has been --

MR. VESELKOV: He came to convince me the magnetic field which is emitting the line, the existing line, the magnetic field is sharply diminished with the distance from the cables.

I am not concerned about the magnetic field. I'm concerned about the electric shock and inducing electricity into metal objects around the cables. Because even with Brian Thorson, I had my multimeter and the multimeter was showing zaps over a thousand volts. They're momentarily, but they are there, the existing distance from existing line. And the proposed line will come --

Another 120 feet?
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1  MS. LEE: 130 feet from the existing towers.
2  MR. VESELKOVA: Is going to be 130 feet closer. So
3  what happen at the moment at the edge of my property is
4  going to be -- is going to happen to the front step of
5  my house.
6  ALJ TERKEURST: Do any of your neighbors have
7  similar problems?
8  MR. VESELKOVA: Pretty much alone in
9  the development out there. It's only residence and
10  the big -- around me is open desert because the lots are
11  big, something like 40 acres, and they're not, they're
12  just -- it's only my house over there.
13  MR. HORNE: You did mention one property adjacent
14  to yours.
15  MR. VESELKOVA: Yes. There's a guy whose house is
16  going to be directly under the cables. It's shown on
17  the aerial pictures. And his house will be directly
18  under the power lines, but he's not at the meeting at
19  the moment.
20  MR. HORNE: And you're not sure, without talking
21  to him. To date, you're not sure that he has any
22  issues?
23  MR. VESELKOVA: He doesn't live in the house. He
24  lives in the Los Angeles area. And he's an older man.
25  And I don't have contacts with him at all.
26  MR. HORNE: So we don't know if he does or does
27  not have any issues, is that fair to say?
28  MR. VESELKOVA: I don't know that.
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I know there is two more houses which are along the power lines which going to face the same situation in that area. And there's four residence which are same situation like mine. I actually -- maybe that's only four houses entire length of the new line.

MR. HORNE: So of the four, you're one in four?
MR. VESELKOV: I'm one of the four. The most vocal.

MR. HORNE: The most vocal. The one that's here. But of those four, the only one we're sure that has an issue is you. The other three we don't know.

MR. VESELKOV: They probably don't know what is going to happen. They don't probably speak or read English or -- I don't know. I cannot represent them.

MR. HORNE: Right. Right.

MR. VESELKOV: But on the aerial picture, I can prove they're the same distance from the cables what I am. They're going to face the same problems what I am facing -- if this line come closer to the house.

MR. HORNE: In our conversation earlier, were you concerned that -- or at least pointing out specifically that where your house is located happens to fall midway through the --

MR. VESELKOV: Yes.
MR. HORNE: -- two towers.
MR. VESELKOV: My house is in between the two towers, right in the middle. And the cables when they
are suspended, they make the belly. And for some
engineer reason, the belly of these cables is almost
40 feet above the ground. So the cable is really,
really low there. And that that kind of multiplied
the magnetic fields which induces into the metal objects
around the cable. The higher they are, the less
induction there will be. The more loaded the cables are
during the summer time, the more electricity will be
inducing metal objects. Like carrying copper pipes or
anything metal around, goes to the cables, will induce
this current.

MR. HORNE: So it's fair to say because of where
you happen to be located, the lowest distance, the place
where the lines sag to the lowest point, right, between
the two towers?

MR. VESELIKOV: It happen this way with my house.
MR. HORNE: That's unique to your property. It
may be a difference with the other three property.
MR. VESELIKOV: I did not pay close attention: are
they also in the middle or between towers or not. We
may check on the aerial pictures because in the aerial
pictures it's shown exact location on the houses. And
the existing and proposed towers. So they may face the
same problem also.

MR. HORNE: And they may not; we just don't know.
MR. VESELIKOV: I don't know. I cannot speak to
that.

MR. HORNE: Right.
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1    ALJ TERKEURST: But we have the information that
2    would allow that to be determined?
3    MS. LEE: Right.
4    ALJ TERKEURST: Also, there was a comment that
5    the lines may go over some of the existing houses.
6    MR. VESELKOV: Yes. My neighbor, which will be on
7    the west side, because the power line is cutting about
8    45-degree to the property lines, his house is coming
9    closer to the meeting point to where the cables will
10    come -- the new line will come. And his house basically
11    will be on the end of the existing -- of the proposed
12    line. That's the guy who isn't present now. He's very
13    old man with diabetes and legally blind. So maybe
14    that's only reason he doesn't come here because old age
15    and he really can't do anything at that point.
16    MR. HORNE: Can I ask just a question for
17    clarification? In your view the new line, which isn't
18    there yet, might, you're saying, go directly over
19    the structure of his house?
20    MR. VESELKOV: Something very close to that.
21    I pretty much -- I'm pretty sure it's going to be if
22    it's not 30 feet, maybe 30 or 40 feet or maybe directly
23    under the cable. I cannot say exactly because
24    the situation with my fence and the general direction of
25    the lines and what I see from the aerial pictures, his
26    house will be very close to the lines.
27    MR. HORNE: So do you know if your other neighbors
28    that you mentioned have talked to Edison?
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MR. VESELKOV: There's only four people. One is this guy. His name is Emil Kollar. He's from Hungary. There's another lady lives pretty much in the middle of the desert very close to the cables. And then it's another house which is across the Dillon Road, close going up south and west. That's only four houses which gonna be at that distance. And there's open desert everywhere after that point.

ALJ TERKEURST: And Ms. Lee, this is something that the environmental experts can look at to determine how close the cables would actually come to the existing structure?

MS. LEE: The issue that we looked at in the environmental impact report slash statement was the question of whether the induced current would cause a safety concern because the public health and safety is one of the concerns we look at in the environmental report. So we have a mitigation measure in the environmental report that I asked him to look at and let us know if he thought it resolved the question that he had raised in the scoping. And he wanted to make his comment saying that, I think, that he doesn't believe that would resolve the question. So we want to go through that.

ALJ TERKEURST: I guess the question I was trying to get at, and I'm not trying to put you on the spot, if you know where the proposed towers would be, you can look at the location of the existing houses and
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determine how close to the houses the cable would be.

MS. LEE: With Edison's help, we could do that
because they have the property boundaries. So yeah,
between the two of us, we can figure that out very
fairly exactly.

ALJ TERKEURST: All right. Thank you.

MR. VESELKOV: Me and the Edison engineer, we were
exactly on the spot. I brought my measuring 200-feet
measuring tape and we measure where exactly, exactly
the point the cables will go. Because he knew
the distance between centers of the cable -- between
centers of the lines. So when you are under the cable,
you know exactly where the cable sits. And we measured
with the tape the distance at some feet -- I forgot
exactly, 120, 130 feet. I forgot. And it comes exactly
where the existing corner of my property is. That's
exactly where the cable will be. And he made a little
note on his noting book and he give me a paper, a list,
a piece of paper with the measurements of the magnetic
field to show me how the magnetic field diminish 40, 50,
and 80 feet under the lines, and when we get away from
the lines, how the magnetic field diminish. Then we got
inside my yard because the cables are outside my yard.
Then we got inside my yard and we got I got my Fluke.
It's a multimeter which measures current. And I show
him the current fluctuates between 17 to 25 volts. When
you hook it up to the chain-link fence, and from time to
time my meter is going out of range which is over a
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thousand volts zaps at current time when the cables are
far away. And when they came close, this thing will be
every day. If I grab my doorknob, there will be
current. I cannot escape the magnetic field.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

MR. HORNE: Did you mean to say electric field?

MR. VESELKOV: The magnetic field will induce
electric current into any metal object. So this the one
coin with two faces.

ALJ TERKEURST: A diagram has been drawn on the
board at the back of the room. Is there any information
in that diagram that we need in the record?

MS. LEE: I took a photograph of it with my phone
and I think it will be usable to attach to the record if
that's acceptable.

Oh, you have a camera. That will be even
better quality.

ALJ TERKEURST: I don't think we will need it so
much in the PPH record.

MS. LEE: It will help us.

ALJ TERKEURST: You can treat it as an informal
comment that you received.

MR. VESELKOV: This is exactly what is in my
letter. I spread it throughout. Because it's the same
thing with the measurements and more precise in scale
because I draw it in scale based on Riverside County
maps. Those maps for -- property maps.

MR. HORNE: Plot maps or something?
MR. VESELOKOV: Plot maps, yes.

ALJ TERKEURST: Ms. Lee has indicated she has
taken a photograph of the drawing. And she can enter
that into the record as a comment on the EIR so we have
that information. That was my concern.

Is there anything else that would be an
official at this point?

MR. VESELOKOV: I -- that's -- I could not think of
anything else. That's pretty much quite a bit.

ALJ TERKEURST: Well, if you do have additional
comments, you can send them in. You can send them to
the environmental staff. And the information is on
the table here on how to do that.

After the comment period has closed on
the Environmental Impact Report, as long as the case is
still pending before the Commission, you can send
comments to me. And I'll give you my card.

MR. VESELOKOV: Okay.

ALJ TERKEURST: And those comments would not be
reflected in the Final Environmental Impact Report, but
they will still be available to the Commission --

MK. VESELOKOV: To look at them.

ALJ TERKEURST: -- in deciding the case.

MR. VESELOKOV: Okay. I will do a letter with --
I'll do it again.

ALJ TERKEURST: All right.

MR. VESELOKOV: With small drawings in scale. And
I'll -- and also I can -- it's visible on a Google
Internet, Google site on the map, on maps. It's one-to-one aerial picture. And the cables is visible on the Google map. So it's no -- everything is there.

ALJ TERKEURST: All right. Thank you. All right.

Anything else?

(No response).

ALJ TERKEURST: And I really appreciate your coming in. I hope that this has been helpful to you and that we can do the further investigation into your situation.

MR. VESELKOV: Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Anything else at this time?

(No response).

ALJ TERKEURST: If not, then this public participation hearing is adjourned. Thank you all very much.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 7:55 p.m., this Prehearing Conference was adjourned)

* * * * *
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Julian Veselkov

D2-1 SCE is required to design the transmission line in accordance with safety requirements of the CPUC’s General Order (G.O.) 95 and other applicable requirements. Other safety concerns, such as the possibilities stated by the commenter (the remote chance that a truck or airplane would hit a tower, causing damage to the commenter’s home) have a very small likelihood of occurring, and are considered to be less than significant.

D2-2 Electric and magnetic fields (EMF) and other field-related concerns are discussed in EIR/EIS Section D.10.11 and impacts are addressed in Section D.10.12.2. Induced currents and shock hazards in joint use corridors (Impact PS-2) do not pose a threat in the environment if the conducting objects are properly grounded. Mitigation Measure PS-2a (Implement grounding measures) has been proposed to reduce this potentially significant impact to less than significant. This measure requires that as part of the siting and construction process for the Proposed Project, SCE shall identify objects (such as fences, metal buildings, and pipelines) within and near the right-of-way that have the potential for induced voltages and shall implement electrical grounding of metallic objects in accordance with SCE’s standards. The identification of objects shall document the threshold electric field strength and metallic object size at which grounding becomes necessary.

D2-3 Please refer to Response D2-2 for a discussion of induced currents and the recommended mitigation measure for this concern.

Regarding the commenter’s request that SCE purchase his property and relocate him, this would likely occur only if the property were within the transmission line right-of-way. The commenter’s property is immediately adjacent to the corridor, but not within the right-of-way that has been defined at this time. It is noted that there are approximately 6 residences that are similarly close to the edge of the DPV2 ROW between the Devers Substation and the Harquahala Switchyard.

D2-4 Please refer to Response D2-2 for a discussion of EMF and induced current impacts. The commenter’s address (64639 Dillon Road) is noted. SCE was present at the Public Participation Meeting and by publishing this comment, SCE has been informed of the commenter’s preference to be relocated.

Responses to Comment Set D3

Approximately nine individuals attended the Public Information Workshop; however, no one commented at the Beaumont Public Participation Hearing.