

Comment Set PPH1
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

1 SANTEE, CALIFORNIA, MAY 10, 2004 - 4:02 P.M.

2 * * * * *

3 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE BARNETT: The Commission
4 will be in order.

5 This is the time and place for the public
6 participation hearing in regard to San Diego Gas &
7 Electric Company's application A.02-07-022 to obtain a
8 certificate of public convenience and necessity in order
9 to construct the proposed Miguel-Mission 230 kV No. 2
10 Project.

11 My name is Robert Barnett. I'm an
12 Administrative Law Judge with the Commission, and it is
13 my function to conduct this hearing.

14 On my right is Commissioner Loretta Lynch.
15 She is a Commissioner, one of the five, in San Francisco
16 who is the Assigned Commissioner to this application
17 and, of course, is one of those who will be voting on
18 whether to grant or deny the certificate of public
19 convenience and necessity.

20 Now, what we have here is a public
21 participation hearing. We are interested in getting the
22 input from members of the public regarding this project.

23 Essentially we are here to discuss the
24 environmental impact report or the draft environmental
25 impact report that, I believe, all of you have received
26 or is available, and the executive summary. I might
27 give you a little background on that.

28 The CPUC, that is this Commission, is the

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

2

1 state lead agency responsible for compliance with the
2 California Environmental Quality Act. A draft
3 environmental impact report has been prepared by the
4 Commission in compliance with CEQA guidelines. The EIR
5 discloses the environmental impacts expected to result
6 from the construction and operation of SDG&E's proposed
7 project and proposed mitigation measures.

8 Now, the important thing that I would like you
9 to understand about this particular hearing is that we
10 are here to discuss the draft environmental impact
11 report, that is to find out your comments regarding it
12 not -- we are not here to discuss whether or not we
13 should approve the project or not approve the project.
14 However, in the course of these things those people who
15 do not feel that the draft environmental impact report
16 is adequate will probably be saying don't approve the
17 project; those who think it is adequate will be saying
18 approve the project.

19 But basically we are here to discuss the
20 environmental impacts or the proposed impacts of this
21 project, and we want to find out what the public feels
22 about the environmental impacts.

23 Now the way we are going to conduct this
24 hearing this afternoon is that Aspen Environmental
25 Group, the people under contract with the Public
26 Utilities Commission to prepare the draft environmental
27 impact report, will make a 15 -- a presentation which
28 will be about 15 minutes. After that time all those

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

3

1 members of the public who wish to comment regarding this
2 draft environmental impact report will have that
3 opportunity.

4 We have a court reporter. This is an official
5 meeting of the California Public Utilities Commission.
6 Your comments will be placed on the record in a booklet
7 form. It will be distributed to all the Commissioners
8 and to everybody else who wishes to be informed about
9 this, and it will be considered by the Commission when
10 it renders its decision.

11 Now this decision is not going to come out
12 next week or next month. These things take time. But
13 your comments are important. We want to hear them, and
14 they will be considered.

15 So with that, I would like to turn the meeting
16 over to Aspen Environmental Group. Mr. Tom Murphy, I
17 believe, is going to give the initial presentation.

18 MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Judge Barnett.

19 ALJ BARNETT: Excuse me.

20 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Actually, I would like to say
21 a couple of things.

22 I understand that this is focused on the
23 environmental impact report, but since this will be the
24 only opportunity we have to hear citizens' comments
25 regarding this project, I'm very interested if you have
26 broader comments and want to tell us now, this is a good
27 time to tell us since we don't have additional public
28 meetings in the San Diego area planned.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

4

1 So while formally we are accepting comments on
2 the environmental impact report, I would love to hear
3 from folks about what you think of the project and if
4 you have -- if you're in support or if you have concerns
5 in a broader context given that this is our only
6 opportunity to speak face-to-face.

7 STATEMENT OF MR. MURPHY

8 MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Commissioner Lynch.

9 My name is Tom Murphy with Aspen Environmental
10 Group. I'm the project manager for the Miguel-Mission
11 230 kV No. 2 Project EIR.

12 I would like to give a brief presentation of
13 the proposed project and milestones associated with this
14 project.

15 SDG&E filed a CPCN/PEA on July 12th, 2002.

16 ALJ BARNETT: Excuse me, Mr. Murphy. Could you
17 slow down a little bit.

18 MR. MURPHY: The application was reviewed by the
19 CEQA team in January of 2003.

20 We conducted -- most of the scoping process
21 was conducted in September and October of 2003, and
22 there was a report issued December '03 in that same
23 year.

24 The EIR analysis was conducted primarily in
25 November 2003 through March 2004, and we released a
26 draft EIR on April 1st, 2004.

27 This slide shows the flow chart of the EIR
28 process. We're at the draft EIR review where interested

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

5

1 parties are able to review the draft EIR and provide
2 comments to the CPUC on the analysis conducted in the
3 draft EIR.

4 Following the public review period we will
5 respond to your comments, the public's comments, make
6 any changes necessary to the draft EIR, and prepare a
7 final EIR that goes to the CPUC for its use in the
8 decision on the project.

9 Let me give a brief description of SDG&E's
10 proposed project. There's three basic components to the
11 project. The installation of a new 35-mile, single
12 circuit 230 kV transmission circuit between Miguel and
13 Mission substations. In order to do that, they need to
14 relocate the existing 138 and 69 kV circuits onto newly
15 constructed alignment of wood and steel poles within
16 SDG&E's existing right-of-way. And in order to
17 accommodate this new circuit, it will need to modify the
18 existing Miguel and Mission substations.

19 This is the route or the existing right-of-way
20 that the 230 kV circuit would follow. The red segment
21 is the area where the 138 and the 69 kV circuits will be
22 relocated to new wood and steel poles, and the 230 kV
23 circuit would be installed on the modified steel lattice
24 structure. The green segment is -- SDG&E proposes just
25 to reconductor that segment of the Miguel-Mission
26 right-of-way with the 230 kV circuit.

27 We also conducted an extensive alternative
28 screening process in the last six months. We looked at

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

6

1 14 route alternatives between Miguel and Mission
2 substations throughout San Diego. All alternatives were
3 evaluated based on the three CEQA criteria: meet the
4 project objectives, make sure it is feasible from a
5 regulatory, technical, and legal standpoint, and able to
6 reduce or eliminate significant impacts associated with
7 the proposed project.

8 A lot of this information is summarized in
9 Appendix 2 and Section C of the draft EIR. I think
10 there's approximately 110 or 120 pages of just
11 alternative screening analysis that we went through.

12 Besides the route alternatives, we also looked
13 at nonwire alternatives, looking at conservation,
14 distributed generation, looking at solar power and so
15 forth.

16 This is a map that shows all the routes that
17 we looked at in the draft EIR. As you can see, it not
18 only goes -- looks along the Miguel-Mission right-of-way
19 but looked across the entire San Diego area. We tried
20 to find different ways to get from Miguel to Mission,
21 possibly shorter routes directly from Miguel to Mission
22 as well as routes along the bay area.

23 The 14 alternatives were screened down to five
24 route alternatives that were carried forward in the
25 draft EIR, three alternatives in Jamacha Valley and two
26 alternatives in the City of Santee.

27 And after the public participation hearing, I
28 would be happy to go into detail with anybody and talk

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

7

1 about these alternatives that we looked at. A lot of
2 them are on these posters right up here in the front.

3 Overall we found that the environmentally
4 superior alternative was the proposed project with the
5 following alternative segments, which was the Jamacha
6 Valley 138 kV/69 kV underground. That alternative
7 followed Willow Glen Road for 3.5 miles in Jamacha
8 Valley. And we also found that the City of Santee 138
9 kV/69 kV underground was the preferred option, and that
10 also -- that follows Princess Joann Road in the City of
11 Santee.

12 The final decision regarding the route and
13 project approval will be made by the CPUC in upcoming
14 months.

15 And with that, I would like to turn it over to
16 Chris Keller to talk about the next steps that occur in
17 the EIR process.

18 STATEMENT OF MS. KELLER

19 MS. KELLER: Thank you, and good afternoon. My
20 name is Chris Keller. I'm a member of the Aspen
21 Environmental team, and I will be assisting Aspen in the
22 preparation of the final EIR and responding to the
23 comments that are received on the draft.

24 As Tom mentioned, he has been reviewing where
25 we are in the process. The draft EIR public review
26 period will be ending a week from now, May 17th.
27 Following that the comments that are received on the
28 draft will be responded to, and the schedule is to

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

8

1 release the final EIR in June 2004.

2 The EIR is an information document. It is not
3 a decision document. The Commission will vote on the
4 proposed decision in upcoming months. The EIR will be
5 certified by the final CPUC decision. If the project
6 proposed by SDG&E or one of the alternatives is
7 approved, the decision will require mitigation,
8 monitoring, and reporting as part of project
9 implementation.

10 As mentioned, the public review period for the
11 draft extends to May 17th. Oral comments will be
12 received today. All of the written comments must be
13 postmarked by the 17th. They can also be faxed or
14 e-mailed.

15 I hope everybody who is attending today -- we
16 have in the back of the room copies of these slides
17 which also include the information in terms of where to
18 submit those comments.

19 The handout also includes information about
20 where you can find full copies of the EIR depositories
21 at local libraries, and also the public can e-mail or
22 call Aspen directly.

23 The other comment that I just want to make is
24 following this public participation hearing, a number of
25 the Aspen team members are here today, and we're here
26 to, you know, help you if you have any questions about
27 the documents so that when you prepare your letters
28 hopefully we can answer any questions that you have in

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

9

1 that regard.

2 And with that, I'll turn it back over to ALJ
3 Barnett.

4 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much.

5 I wish to reemphasize that after we take
6 comments from the public, the Aspen Environmental Group
7 will remain here in this room. And those members of the
8 public that have more detailed questions for them may
9 ask those questions and have a give and take, what we
10 would call a workshop, to see if your questions can be
11 answered properly, or they will take it into
12 consideration when doing their environmental impact --
13 their final environmental impact reported.

14 But at this time I would like to have the
15 comments from the public. If you would stand and come
16 up to the lectern, speak slowly, please, because we have
17 a court reporter here who is taking down all of the
18 comments.

19 I only have two people who have signed up.

20 Don't be bashful. We're here. We came a long
21 way to hear you, and we want to hear you. I mean,
22 that's what they pay us for. So take advantage of it.

23 Are there any members of the Santee City
24 Council or City of Santee representatives who wish to
25 make a comment?

26 (No response)

27 ALJ BARNETT: All right. Mary Youngman.

28 Please state your full name, spell your last

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

10

1 name, and give us your address.

2 STATEMENT OF MS. YOUNGMAN

3 MS. YOUNGMAN: My name is Mary Youngman,
4 Y-o-u-n-g-m-a-n. And I'm at Allied Plaza, which is 7777
5 Alvarado Road in La Mesa, California.

6 Commissioner Lynch, I'm here to answer some of
7 Your questions that you were asking which are on the
8 transmission lines.

9 The transmission lines are incredibly
10 important for San Diego County because we need to have
11 competitive pricing. I run a high-rise building with
12 tenants in it that are treated as if they are a major
13 user, and so they have not had the benefit of being a
14 small user even though they are small tenants.

15 I really believe the transmission lines that
16 we can come in with for this enhancement project, which
17 are along the right-of-way already owned by SDG&E, will
18 allow us to get that competitive pricing that we need to
19 keep our businesses going. The transmission lines that
20 we have currently won't get us as far as we need. We
21 need to look out into the future. So I'm truly hoping
22 that this line goes through, and we get the additional
23 use that we need.

24 Thank you.

25 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Ms. Youngman.

26 I'm not sure. Glen Urie.

27 STATEMENT OF MR. URIE

28 MR. URIE: My name is Glenn Urie, U-r-i-e. I

PPH1-1

PPH1-2

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

11

PPH1-2

1 reside at 10891 East Haven Court in Santee.

2 I am very concerned about the placement of
3 these transmission lines. As the lines currently exist,
4 they fall well within the allowable limits if I had been
5 an elementary school. I think my property line is
6 within 100 feet of the current transmission lines, and
7 any new transmission lines would place them closer.

8 I'm very concerned about the electromagnetic
9 field transmission problems. I understand that those
10 are inconclusive studies; they do not prove one way or
11 the other. But as such, they should be taken in
12 conservative measure. They should be taken as if they
13 do cause problems until it can be conclusively proven
14 that they don't cause problems.

15 My recommendation is if it is determined that
16 this is required, that when the transmission lines fall
17 within the parameters of housing, especially the current
18 housing, that they be placed underground to ensure those
19 residents around them that they are properly protected
20 from EMF so they can feel comfortable.

21 And also the property values with these
22 transmission lines going through and the more hodgepodge
23 nature of having three and four lines going through or
24 three sets of power poles go through very much detracts
25 from not only the aesthetics but the property value, and
26 that, as near as I can tell, has never been taken into
27 consideration. But it is an impact of those who own
28 houses within the right-of-way.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

12

1 Thank you.

2 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Urie.

3 Are there others who would -- yes, sir.

4 STATEMENT OF MR. DECKER

5 MR. DECKER: Good afternoon. My name is Ken

6 Decker, D-e-c-k-e-r. I live at 9738 Settle Road in

7 Santee, and I'm here representing myself and a local

8 environmental group, Preserve Wild Santee.

9 Preserve Wild Santee questions, number one,
10 the need for this transmission line.

11 We generally support Governor
12 Schwaarzenegger's proposal of installing solar on
13 50 percent of new homes that are built. The CPUC has
14 funded a number of solar projects. I hope there's more
15 money forthcoming for that.

16 As you're well aware, the typical demand for
17 electric is during the hot summer months, during the
18 peak days. This is the same time that solar is at its
19 optimum, producing the most amount of energy and the
20 most good.

21 I also concur with the previous gentleman's
22 concerns about EMF, particularly from overhead lines. I
23 have not heard any detail about EMF radiating from
24 underground lines, because I understand they are a
25 coaxial line. And whether that contains all of the
26 possible radiation, I would like to hear something about
27 that, too. I have to assume it would, but I'm not
28 convinced yet.

PPH1-2

PPH1-3

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

13

1 As far as overhead lines and open lattice
2 towers, we have environmental concerns about the open
3 lattice towers. They are perfect for raptors. And if
4 this goes through environmentally sensitive areas --
5 like, we have gnatcatchers. There's other
6 semi-endangered species. They're excellent perches for
7 the raptors. In those cases, the tubular type towers
8 would be -- would not present as much of a perch for
9 raptors.

10 I guess if we have to have something through
11 here, I would throw my support to underground through
12 the Princess Joann direction.

13 Thank you very much.

14 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Decker.

15 Are there others who wish to speak? I'm
16 willing to take a five-minute recess so you can get up
17 your courage to come up here and tell us what you
18 believe we should be hearing.

19 Yes, sir.

20 STATEMENT OF MR. MEACHAM

21 MR. MEACHAM: My name is Mike Meacham. I'm with
22 the City of Chula Vista.

23 ALJ BARNETT: Will you spell your last name,
24 please?

25 MR. MEACHAM: Yes. It's M-e-a-c-h-a-m. I'm the
26 director of conservation and environmental services, and
27 I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you.

28 ALJ BARNETT: Speak slowly, please.

PPH1-3

PPH1-4

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

14

PPH1-4

1 MR. MEACHAM: I appreciate the opportunity to
2 speak before you, and I appreciate the hosting by the
3 City of Santee.

4 The City of Chula Vista has already submitted
5 a letter requesting additional hearings on this matter
6 in the areas of southwestern San Diego. Honestly, I do
7 not know at this time how this application fits into the
8 other application referred to as the Otay Mesa Power
9 Procurement Proposal. It appears to be a portion of
10 that or at least complement that program.

11 And I am not a CEQA expert, but I wonder under
12 CEQA if it is in fact a part of that, or if the case
13 will be made later that additional 230 kV lines will
14 need to be added directly through Chula Vista, as are
15 listed in the Otay Mesa power procurement proposal, and
16 through downtown San Diego and National City; that this
17 case should be considered at once rather than
18 incrementally, as I believe is not appropriate under
19 CEQA.

20 In addition to that, I think that -- and, by
21 the way, the City of Chula Vista has approximately
22 200,000 people. There are a number of people obviously
23 in the downtown area of San Diego/National City that
24 would be affected if this is just one part of the
25 proposal.

26 Additionally, I think it's important to note
27 that the San Diego Regional Energy Infrastructure Study
28 pointed out that while transmission was an important

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

15

PPH1-4

1 concern and interest in -- the development of
2 transmission was an important interest and concern of
3 the region, I think it placed an emphasis on
4 transmission for connecting local sources, particularly
5 opportunities to increase local sources, whether it be
6 efficient, natural gas fired facilities or renewable
7 facilities.

8 I also think you have a couple of communities,
9 particularly in Chula Vista and the Port of San Diego,
10 which have embraced, uniquely in the State of California
11 today, uniquely embraced looking at the potential of
12 repowering the South Bay Power Plant as one of the
13 options. And the infrastructure study calls for
14 repowering the two existing base load plants in
15 San Diego in addition to the need of the additional
16 plants that are currently proposed or other plants that
17 are currently proposed, such as the Otay Mesa power
18 plant and the Palomar plant or facility in Escondido, in
19 addition to increases of renewable energy of which the
20 proposal encouraged more development in San Diego
21 county.

22 The trans-- while the comment was made
23 earlier that transmission lines could generate an
24 opportunity for competition, my concern is that it does
25 not do that. In fact, Commissioner Lynch knows better
26 than I that in the crisis, at least rate crisis we
27 experienced in 2000 and 2001, a great deal of that
28 crisis came from power that came from outside the region

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

16

PPH1-4

1 or outside the state.

2 In San Diego we import more than half of our
3 power from outside the region. Spending the kinds of
4 money they're talking about in the Otay Mesa power plant
5 purchase, I believe \$155 million in that case, is a
6 significant amount of money that deserves to followed or
7 at least considered in the intent and the spirit of the
8 regional energy infrastructure study. Again, the
9 purpose of that was to connect local transmission to
10 local power facilities.

11 So I think the combination of having
12 communities that are willing to site those facilities
13 and are interested in pursuing a more balanced portfolio
14 to avoid those energy crises that occurred in 2000 and
15 2001 deserves another look and closer look particularly
16 if the case will be made in the future that this project
17 is really the first step in the larger 52-mile line
18 that's designed or talked about in the Otay Mesa power
19 procurement program.

20 Thank you.

21 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Meacham.

22 Excuse me. Before you go, Commissioner Lynch
23 would like to --

24 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Actually, I would like to ask
25 them to address that question.

26 It is my belief that any transmission lines
27 for the Otay Mesa project would be in addition to the
28 transmission lines we're considering now. But if Aspen

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

17

1 could respond.

2 MR. MURPHY: That's correct. Actually, part of
3 the Otay Mesa power project would install within the
4 existing Miguel to Fanita Junction and then on to
5 Sycamore Canyon right-of-way. We took a look at that in
6 the Miguel-Mission 230 kV No. 2 Project EIR. We didn't
7 analyze the circuit that heads to the west that is
8 parallel to the bay area -- or the bay, but that will be
9 addressed in the new EIR that CPUC are taking right now.

10 MR. MEACHAM: I apologize. I still don't
11 understand. The 52 miles of transmission lines that are
12 proposed in the Otay Mesa power project, which in itself
13 is a surprise, Commissioner Lynch was, I believe, at the
14 meeting when the Otay Mesa power plant itself was going
15 through hearings. And I asked the question at that time
16 how much transmission -- how many lines and where are
17 they going to go. And that project, I believe,
18 described about a \$16 million cost for substation
19 interconnection type facilities, and I believe less than
20 a quarter of a mile of transmission.

21 And now under this new case we are hearing
22 that it requires 52 miles, and it appears that
23 everything north of Miguel to Fanita Junction is exactly
24 the same as what is proposed tonight.

25 MR. MURPHY: That's correct. A portion of that
26 52 miles is within the existing right-of-way between
27 Miguel and Fanita Junction.

28 MR. MEACHAM: I would say it's just as important

PPH1-5

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

18

1 now as it would have been when the Otay Mesa power plant
2 was originally proposed to try to get this right the
3 first time and give the public the full picture of what
4 really is occurring before the step is taken and leads
5 to the necessity of another step that's not being
6 described this evening.

7 Thank you.

8 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Meacham.

9 Are there others with comments at this time?

10 Yes, ma'am.

11 STATEMENT OF MS. STARK

12 MS. STARK: Hi. I'm Sherise Stark.

13 ALJ BARNETT: Could you spell your last name?

14 MS. STARK: S-t-a-r-k, S-h-e-r-i-s-e.

15 ALJ BARNETT: What is your address?

16 MS. STARK: 10417 Ironwood Avenue, Santee.

17 My comments are pretty brief because I have to
18 admit I need to do a lot more reading to get educated
19 because I recently became aware of the project. I hope
20 my comments are accurate.

21 But my main concern would be that I would want
22 to consider any alternative underground routes that we
23 could consider. And that comes out of, one, a concern
24 about EMFs.

25 And, again, I know I need to do more reading,
26 but there was a concern in another area of our community
27 with excessive EMFs. And if there is any increased EMFs
28 as a result of the project, that would be a concern for

PPH1-5

PPH1-6

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

19

1 me.

2 But also because our community could really
3 benefit from having greater access to using solar power
4 as well, because of the eastern region and the amount of
5 sun, I would like to consider that strongly as a
6 possible alternative. And you'll be getting a letter
7 from me and I appreciate you holding the hearing today.

8 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much.

9 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: I would note if you want your
10 letter formally to be a comment that's on our
11 evidentiary record, we actually need your letter by a
12 week from today, postmarked by a week from today.

13 MS. STARK: Thank you.

14 ALJ BARNETT: Mr. Doughty. I'm not sure --

15 MS. KUSH: I think was it Melanie.

16 ALJ BARNETT: No.

17 Are you Melanie Kush?

18 MS. KUSH: Yes.

19 ALJ BARNETT: No, I have a Ted. It looks like
20 Doughty.

21 STATEMENT OF MR. DOUGHTY

22 MR. DOUGHTY: Thank you. Good afternoon.

23 ALJ BARNETT: Could you spell your name, please.

24 MR. DOUGHTY: First name Ted, T-e-d,
25 D-o-u-g-h-t-y.

26 ALJ BARNETT: And your address, please.

27 MR. DOUGHTY: My working address is here in
28 Santee. My home address is in Descanso, California.

PPH1-6

PPH1-7

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

20

1 ALJ BARNETT: Your Santee address.

2 MR. DOUGHTY: 980 Hoffman Lane.

3 I'm here speaking on behalf of the
4 superintendent of Santee schools, Liz Johnson, and I
5 want to speak briefly about the importance of power to
6 the school district and our teaching and learning
7 environment.

8 Obviously our students are very important to
9 us here in this community. They are our future. In
10 this day and age we have a lot of technology demands,
11 air conditioning demands, lighting demands. And to be
12 able to guarantee this power structure, the transmission
13 of power to the district is very important, particularly
14 if we become more competitive, have more supply, and
15 keep the costs down. Of course, the costs are always
16 something to consider, and our budgets are tight, seem
17 to be getting tighter every year.

18 The ability for this project to provide better
19 power resource for us, I think, needs to be considered.

20 Again, our students are our future, and being
21 able to supply them with energy that they need to keep
22 their quality educational environment in place I think
23 is very important.

24 Thank you.

25 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Doughty.

26 Ms. Kush.

27 STATEMENT OF MS. KUSH

28 MS. KUSH: Thank you, sir. Melanie Kush, city

PPH1-7

PPH1-8

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

21

PPH1-8

1 planner, City of Santee. The address is 10601 Magnolia
2 Avenue in Santee.

3 The City of Santee is here to just go on
4 record that we intend to submit a letter within your
5 deadline, May 17th.

6 We, in general terms, we've read the EIR and
7 support the complete undergrounding of the system in
8 Santee. If that is proven to be infeasible, certainly
9 the complete undergrounding of the 138/69 kV lines in
10 Santee.

11 We recognize that the EIR identifies that as
12 one of the preferred alternatives, and we thank you for
13 that. We think you can go further.

14 Our letter will be on the city council agenda
15 on May 12th, for those of you who wish to attend.

16 Thank you.

17 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much, Ms. Kush.

18 Is there any other comment from the public?

19 (No response)

20 ALJ BARNETT: Shall we take a five-minute recess?

21 There will be further discussion informally
22 with the Aspen Environmental Group, those who prepared
23 the draft EIR. There is also a member of the Commission
24 environmental staff in the audience today who can answer
25 your questions.

26 So we are now going to adjourn the public
27 participation hearing. We are now going to go off the
28 record, but everyone who wishes to get more information

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH1, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.

22

1 regarding the project stay here and the Aspen people
2 will be up here and will be happy to answer all of your
3 questions.

4 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: And if anyone is driving home
5 and thinks, shoot, I should have told those guys x, y,
6 z, we'll be here at seven o'clock for another hearing
7 for folks who couldn't make this one, and we'll also be
8 in Spring Valley and El Cajon tomorrow. So feel free to
9 come back at 7:00 or to join us in those other public
10 locations tomorrow if you have comments on this issue.

11 And we really appreciate you being here. Your
12 comments are very important to us, both your support and
13 your concerns. We need to understand what you think in
14 the community before we move forward.

15 Thank you.

16 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you all very much.

17 We are adjourned until seven o'clock tonight
18 in this hearing room.

19 (Whereupon, at the hour of 4:37 p.m.,
20 this matter having been continued to 7:00
21 p.m., May 10, 2004, in Santee,
California, the Commission then
adjourned.)

22

23 * * * * *

24

25

26

27

28

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

**Responses to Comment Set PPH1
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 4 p.m.**

Mary Youngman

PPH1-1 The commenter's support for the Proposed Project is noted. The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is discussed in Section A.2 of the Draft EIR, but it is not an issue specifically determined by CEQA. One of SDG&E's objectives of the Proposed Project (see page A-3 of the Draft EIR) is to reduce transmission constraints within SDG&E's electric system, which would reduce system congestion costs and would provide economic benefit to SDG&E and CAISO consumers. As discussed in General Response GR-1, the need for this project has already been approved and it is not decided within this EIR.

Glen Urie

PPH1-2 Please see General Response GR-2 for a discussion of electromagnetic fields and Response to Comment 3-2 and General Response GR-4 for a discussion of property value effects.

The commenter's support for undergrounding the lines, especially within the vicinity of housing, is noted. Two underground alternatives were carried forward for full analysis in the Draft EIR: the Jamacha Valley 138 kV/69 kV Underground Alternative, discussed in Section C.4.2.1 (see page C-9), and the City of Santee 138 kV/69 kV Underground Alternative, discussed in Section C.4.2.4 (see page C-30). The EIR analysis in Section E (Comparison of Alternatives) concluded that the underground alternatives, including one within the City of Santee, are preferable to SDG&E's Proposed Project and these route modifications have been incorporated into the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Ken Decker, representing Preserve Wild Santee

PPH1-3 The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is discussed in Section A.2 of the Draft EIR, but it is not an issue specifically determined by CEQA. Therefore, the need for this project is not decided within this EIR. Please refer to General Response GR-1.

A discussion of solar power is presented in Section C.5.4.1 (Renewable Resource Alternatives) on page C-51 of the Draft EIR and also in Section 4.5.2.2 of Appendix 2 on page Ap.2-86 of the Draft EIR. While the use of solar technology may be appropriate for some peaker plants, solar energy technologies cannot provide full-time availability or regional reliability given the current state of the industry. Therefore, currently solar technology does not meet the objectives of the Proposed Project. In addition, use of solar resources would not eliminate the need for new transmission lines to be constructed with impacts similar to or greater than the Proposed Project. Due to these reasons, solar technology was eliminated from full consideration in the Draft EIR.

The CPUC currently has an open proceeding on the Renewable Portfolio Standard (R.04-04-026) concerning the selling and procurement of renewable power, which may apply to the situation of individual excess renewable generation; however, this topic is outside of the scope of this project. The Renewable Portfolio Standard is also discussed in Section 4.5.1 of Appendix 2 of the Draft EIR (see page Ap.2-82).

The underground lines would be collocated in a vault, however, the cables themselves would be solid dielectric cables and would not be coaxial. Please refer to Section D.9 (pages D.9-31 to D.9-33) for a discussion of EMF levels of underground alternatives and how EMF levels radiate/diminish from the centerline. Magnetic field levels for underground lines are shown in Figure D.9-5. See also General Response GR-2 for a discussion of EMF.

Project Protocol PP-51 would minimize perching opportunities for raptors near habitats supporting sensitive prey species by requiring that SDG&E selects structures that would incorporate a design to discourage raptor perching. According to Table B-1 on page B-9 of the Draft EIR, sixty existing lattice towers would be modified to accommodate the 230 kV line and approximately 150 new poles (31 of which are replacements) would be built for the new 230 kV circuit and for the relocation of the existing 138 kV/69 kV lines; however, no new lattice structures would be built as a result of the Proposed Project.

The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative or an underground alternative along Princess Joann Road is noted.

Mike Meacham, representing the City of Chula Vista

PPH1-4 Although the Miguel-Mission 230 kV #2 Project includes a discussion of the future circuit, which is included as part of the Otay Mesa Power Purchase Agreement Transmission Project (Application No. A.04-03-008), the Otay Mesa Project is a separate project with its own CEQA environmental review process. Please see also Response to Comment E-1 and General Response GR-1.

Non-wires and generation alternatives, including distributed generation, are discussed in Section 4.5 of the Alternatives Screening Report in Appendix 2, as well as in Section C.5.4 (Non-Wires Alternatives). The future circuit, analyzed under each issue area in Section D, and Otay Mesa Power Purchase Agreement are intended to connect to the Otay Mesa Power Plant in western San Diego County. Please refer to Response to Comment 14-1 for a discussion of bringing power plants, such as the South Bay Power Plant, online.

CEQA does not address cost in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives. Cost of the project and alternatives is addressed by the CPUC in the General Proceeding on the project. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 4-1, SD-1, and SD-2. The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is discussed in Section A.2 of the Draft EIR, but it is not an issue specifically determined by CEQA. One of SDG&E's objectives of the Proposed Project (see page A-3 of the Draft EIR) is to reduce transmission constraints within SDG&E's electric system, which would reduce system congestion costs and would provide economic benefit to SDG&E customers. The need for this project is not decided within this EIR and please refer to General Response GR-1.

PPH1-5 Please see Response to Comment E-1 and General Response GR-1 for a discussion of the relationship of the Miguel-Mission 230 kV #2 Project with the Otay Mesa Power Purchase Agreement Transmission Project (Application No. A.04-03-008).

Sherise Stark

PPH1-6 The commenter's support for an underground route is noted. Please refer to General Response GR-2 for a discussion of EMF and GR-3 regarding undergrounding transmission lines. Two underground alternatives were carried forward for full analysis in the Draft EIR: the Jamacha Valley 138 kV/69 kV Underground Alternative, discussed in Section C.4.2.1 (see page C-9), and the City of Santee 138 kV/69 kV Underground Alternative, discussed in Section C.4.2.4 (see page C-30). The EIR analysis in Section E (Comparison of Alternatives) concluded that the underground alternatives, including one within the City of Santee, are preferable to SDG&E's Proposed Project and these route modifications have been incorporated into the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Please see Response to Comment PPH1-3 for a discussion of solar power.

Ted Doughty, speaking on behalf of Liz Johnson, Superintendent of Santee Schools

PPH1-7 The commenter's support for the Proposed Project and its ability to provide a better power resource are noted. The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is discussed in Section A.2 of the Draft EIR, but it is not an issue specifically determined by CEQA. One of SDG&E's objectives of the Proposed Project (see page A-3 of the Draft EIR) is to reduce transmission constraints within SDG&E's electric system, which would reduce system congestion costs and would provide economic benefit to SDG&E and CAISO consumers. The cost of and need for this project are not decided within this EIR. Cost issues will be considered separately by the CPUC in the general proceeding for the Proposed Project. On February 27, 2003, the CPUC made a finding of need for the Miguel-Mission Project citing economic benefits (see Decision D.03-02-069 in docket No. I.00-11-001) (DEIR, page A-3). Please see General Response GR-1.

Melanie Kush, representing the City of Santee

PPH1-8 The commenter's support for the complete undergrounding of the transmission system in Santee is noted. Please refer to Responses to Comment Set E for responses to the letter from the City of Santee.

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

24

1 to all people.

2 We also want your opinion on that, and we also
3 want your opinion regarding whether or not this project
4 should go forward or it should be -- or should it be
5 modified in some way.

6 Now we have a court reporter here. The
7 reporter is going to take down all of the statements.
8 Those will be transcribed and delivered to all the
9 parties and, of course, to the Commissioners. When the
10 Commission basis its final decision on this, part of the
11 basis of that decision will be what the public
12 participation record consists of. So please be concise
13 in your comments, but give us as much as you want to
14 discuss regarding this. We want to listen to it. It
15 will be considered. That's very important.

16 Now, the main topic this evening is the
17 environmental impact report of which there is a draft.
18 And that has been prepared by the Aspen Environmental
19 Group, which was retained by the Commission to prepare
20 this report. They are going to start the hearing with a
21 presentation giving you an overview of what they have
22 put into their report, and you may comment on that.

23 After they have made their presentation, then
24 we will call on members of the public and anybody who
25 wishes to, if you're here, come on, come up to the
26 lectern, state your name and address and give us your
27 opinion on exactly what is before this Commission at
28 this time.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

25

1 So with that, we will start with the
2 presentation of the Aspen Environmental Group.

3 STATEMENT OF MR. MURPHY

4 MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Judge Barnett.

5 My name is Tom Murphy with Aspen Environment
6 Group. I'm the project manager for the Miguel-Mission
7 230 kV No. 2 Project EIR.

8 I would like to give a brief presentation of
9 the proposed presentation and milestones.

10 SDG&E filed a CPCN/PEA on July 12th, 2002, to
11 the California Public Utilities Commission. The
12 application was reviewed by the CEQA team and deemed
13 complete in January of 2003. A majority of the scoping
14 process occurred in September and October of 2003. We
15 had two scoping meetings, one on September 15th and one
16 on September 16th; one in the City of Santee and one in
17 Spring Valley.

18 The scoping report was issued December 2003,
19 and that's available on the Miguel-Mission website.
20 There was -- most of the EIR analysis and alternative
21 screening process was conducted in November 2003 through
22 March 2004, and we released the draft EIR on April 1st,
23 2004.

24 This slide shows the chart of the EIR process.
25 We're at the draft EIR review period where interested
26 parties are able to review the draft EIR and provide
27 comments to the CPUC analysis conducted in the draft
28 environmental report.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

26

1 Following the public review period, we will
2 respond to your comments, make any changes necessary to
3 the draft EIR, and prepare a final EIR that goes to the
4 California Public Utilities Commission for its use in
5 the decision on the project.

6 I'm going to briefly summarize San Diego Gas &
7 Electric's proposed project. If you would like more
8 detail, there is a draft environmental impact report in
9 the back, and we also have a number of posters up front
10 that show the proposed project and some of the
11 alternatives.

12 There are three basic components associated
13 with the Miguel-Mission 230 kV No. 2 Project.
14 Installation of a new, 35-mile, single circuit 230 kV
15 transmission circuit between Miguel and Mission
16 substations. It's within their existing right-of-way.

17 In order to put that 230 kV circuit within
18 that right of way, they need to relocate their existing
19 138 kV and 69 kV circuits onto newly constructed
20 alignment of wood and steel pole structures within their
21 existing right-of-way. In order to accommodate that
22 230 kV circuit, they would also have to modify their
23 existing -- the existing Miguel-Mission substations.

24 This figure shows the existing right-of-way
25 and the proposed project right-of-way. The red segment
26 shows the -- where SDG&E plans to relocate the 138 and
27 69 kV circuits on a new alignment of pole structures,
28 and the 230 kV circuit would be installed on modified

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

27

1 steel lattice structures. The green segment, the 230 kV
2 circuit would only be reconductored on existing poles.
3 No new poles would be installed between Fanita Junction
4 and Mission substation.

5 We also conducted an extensive alternative
6 screening process. We looked at 14 route alternatives
7 between Miguel and Mission substations. All
8 alternatives were evaluated for the ability to meet
9 three CEQA criteria, meet most of the project objectives
10 feasible from regulatory, technical, and legal
11 standpoint, and the third is is to reduce or eliminate
12 significant impacts of the proposed project. All
13 this -- the information on the 14 alternatives are
14 summarized in Appendix 2 and Section C of the draft EIR
15 that are presented in the back of the room.

16 Besides the route alternatives, we also looked
17 at nonwire alternatives such as distributed generation,
18 conservation, and solar power.

19 This figure provides -- shows the number of
20 alternatives that we took a look at throughout the
21 San Diego area. We looked at a number of routes between
22 Miguel-Mission substations that a lot of them were in
23 the northern part of that figure. We also looked at
24 some that were along the southern or western boundary
25 along the bay area, and we also looked at some shorter
26 segments around some key issues that we identified in
27 the process.

28 The 14 alternatives were screened down to five

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

28

1 route alternatives that were carried forward in the
2 draft EIR, three were in Jamacha Valley and two were in
3 the City of Santee. Some of these posters up front
4 illustrates those alternatives.

5 These five alternatives I can spend some time
6 with you after the public participation hearing to go
7 over some of these alternatives if you have any
8 questions.

9 Overall we found that the environmentally
10 superior alternative was a proposed project with the
11 following alternative segments which was the Jamacha
12 Valley 138/69 kV underground. It was a 3.5-mile segment
13 along Willow Glen Drive as well as the City of Santee
14 138 kV/69 kV underground which would be along Princess
15 Joann Road.

16 The final decision regarding the route and
17 project approval will be made by the CPUC in upcoming
18 months.

19 I would like to turn it over to Chris Keller
20 to discuss what occurs after the draft EIR.

21 STATEMENT OF MS. KELLER

22 MS. KELLER: Good evening. My name is Chris
23 Keller, and I'm a member of the Aspen Environmental
24 Group team and will be assisting Aspen in the
25 preparation of the final EIR used and the review of the
26 comments on the draft.

27 I just want to spend a couple of minutes
28 talking about the steps completing the CEQA process. As

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

29

1 Tom mentioned, we are in the process of receiving
2 comments on the draft. All of the written comments on
3 the draft EIR must be received by May 17th and those
4 comments will be addressed in the final.

5 It's important to remember that the EIR is an
6 information document. It's not a decision document.
7 The Commission will vote on a proposed decision
8 following the preparation of the final EIR, which is
9 scheduled to be published in June of this year.

10 The EIR will be certified by the final CPUC
11 decision, and if SDG&E's proposed project or one of the
12 alternatives is selected or approved, the decision will
13 require a mitigation monitoring program be implemented.

14 In the back of the room there are handouts
15 which show the slides that we're going through tonight,
16 and I just want to draw your attention to several at the
17 back of that handout which, again, identifies May 17th
18 as the due date. It provides you also the address; it
19 provides you comments. Those comments can be faxed,
20 e-mailed or submitted by mail. There's also information
21 on how the Internet can be used to access the document
22 and where the full document is available at public
23 libraries. Aspen also has a phone that you can contact
24 if you have any questions.

25 And following the public participation hearing
26 tonight, there are a number of people here from the
27 Aspen Environmental Group that are here to help you
28 understand anything about the document that you may need

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

30

1 some clarification on to help you provide comments on
2 the draft.

3 Thank you.

4 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Ms. Keller.

5 At this time we are ready to take the public
6 comment.

7 Please, when you come, please come up to the
8 microphone, speak into the microphone, state your name
9 and address and then make your presentation.

10 I have a list of five people.

11 Don't be shy. We'll listen to you. We'll
12 listen to whatever you have to say.

13 After the public participation hearing is
14 over, the Aspen Group, the people who prepared the
15 environmental impact report, will remain to answer more
16 detailed questions if you have them.

17 So we will start with Mr. Guenther.

18 STATEMENT OF MR. GUENTHER

19 MR. GUENTHER: Gregg Guenther, G-u-e-n-t-h-e-r,
20 10749 Ramsgate Drive, Santee.

21 Thank you for the opportunity to express the
22 thoughts, ideas, and desires of many of my neighbors and
23 friends.

24 Thank you Aspen, also, for your extensive
25 research in disclosing the health hazard that will exist
26 with this project. Your acknowledgement of the EMF
27 issue shows that the research and conclusions by the
28 California Department of Health Services and the World

PPH2-1

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

31

PPH2-1

1 Health Organization is serious and warrants serious
2 attention. The logic as well as the facts used to
3 develop the Santee undergrounding alternative speaks
4 volumes about your attention to the environment where
5 humans live.

6 In the executive summary, page ES-44, you
7 reference the IARC & DHS studies which have concluded
8 that EMF levels in the 3 to 4 milligauss range and
9 higher increase risks to children for leukemia. That
10 language needs to be included in that area to bring
11 continuity to the report instead of being buried in
12 Appendix 5.5.

13 In the same section, page ES-45, you identify
14 EMF levels for the Santee alternative in excess of that
15 range to more than ten times the level that those health
16 agencies have found hazardous and that have a
17 significant impact on humans. The only justification
18 offered is a 4 percent benchmark cost for EMF reduction.
19 Just 4 percent is what the PUC decides this society can
20 afford to prevent a debilitating disease that devastates
21 a family.

22 There is no moral, ethical or economic reason
23 to imperil people, children, and infants to this risk.
24 You would spend more than 4 percent on precautionary
25 measures for your babies: car seats, seat belts,
26 avoiding secondhand smoke, don't play in the streets.
27 Precautions.

28 The San Diego County Department of Health and

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

32

1 Human Services concurs with their colleagues at the DHS
2 and World Health Organizations that EMF levels above 3
3 to 4 milligauss have a significant impact on humans, and
4 yet the Santee alternative fails to fully mitigate this
5 adverse impact.

6 Coupled with the City of Santee's policy to
7 underground new utilities, you have a picture that
8 undeniable. Experts saying elevated EMFs from this
9 project are hazardous. People saying they don't want to
10 be exposed to EMFs, and your own recognition that
11 relocation with shielded undergrounding reduces EMFs.

12 The revelation that these homes and children's
13 bedrooms will be included in a constructed field of very
14 dangerous and hazardous milligauss levels is reason
15 enough to go back and design a totally shielded
16 underground alternative, not just half of one. You can
17 do it, and it won't cost one child their life to do it.
18 Failure to protect children is not an option.

19 Thank you.

20 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Guenther.

21 Holaway, Ms. Holaway.

22 STATEMENT OF MS. HOLAWAY

23 MS. HOLAWAY: Mrs. Ellen Holaway, H-o-l-a-w-a-y,
24 9716 Yellowstone Place, Santee. And I also represent
25 Santee Citizens For Safe Power.

26 ALJ BARNETT: Could you speak a little closer to
27 the microphone.

28 MS. HOLAWAY: Bend a little.

PPH2-1

PPH2-2

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

33

PPH2-2

1 Warning messages to the public. The following
2 warnings have been made by SDG&E:
3 Keep children away from electrical
4 transmission lines, electrical
5 equipment, and power poles;
6 2. Laboratory experiments have
7 shown that EMF can cause changes
8 in living cells;
9 3. Increase your distance from
10 EMF sources.
11 This is about precaution. This is about
12 children's health, my neighbors' health, my fellow
13 citizens' health.
14 Precaution is the ultimate responsibility of
15 parents, leaders, and a community.
16 Precaution, especially for our children, is
17 more than a challenge. Precaution is a reality.
18 Safety is the distance from an EMF source.
19 The California Department of Health Services
20 agrees, and I quote the following:
21 To one degree or another, all
22 three of the DHS scientists are
23 inclined to believe that EMF can
24 cause increased risks of childhood
25 leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou
26 Gehrig's disease, and
27 miscarriages.
28 The National Institute of Environmental

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

34

PPH2-2

1 Health quotes:
2 The panel classified EMF as
3 possible cariogenic to humans
4 based on a fairly early consistent
5 statistical association between a
6 doubling of risk of childhood
7 leukemia and magnetic exposure
8 above 4 milligauss.
9 The international agency for research on
10 cancer, the World Health Organization quotes:
11 EMFs were classified as possible
12 carcinogenic to humans based on
13 epidemiological studies of
14 childhood leukemia.
15 In a population exposed to average
16 magnetic fields in excess of 3 to
17 4 milligauss, twice as many
18 children might develop leukemia
19 compared to a population with
20 lower exposure.
21 The San Diego Department of Health and Human
22 Services quotes:
23 The elevated EMF source along the
24 right-of-way in the backyards is a
25 significant impact on human
26 beings.
27 Quotes: Take precautionary
28 measures.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

35

PPH2-2

1 Quotes: Distance yourself from
2 the EMF source.
3 Safety is the distance from the EMF source.
4 This is a new age, the 21st century. Now is
5 the time to change old policies. Take a look at the
6 4 percent benchmark of low cost/no cost measures to
7 reduce magnetic field levels.
8 I ask the CPUC if they would only allot
9 4 percent of their income to protect their children.
10 Is it doing enough to protect the children
11 from the risk of leukemia? Should we be thinking of
12 safety first and profit second? Should we put a price
13 on a child's life; whose child?
14 This new age has found a way to make
15 electricity safe and cost effective. We can co-exist
16 with electricity that we need and we want. You have
17 already shown it can be done, now you must make it
18 complete.
19 You have taken the first steps in
20 recognizing the hazard to people from the elevated
21 EMFs produced by these lines. You have taken a
22 partial step to mitigate those hazards, now you must
23 go back and complete the steps that prevent imprudent
24 precaution any further adverse health impacts.
25 We need responsibility and accountability
26 from our utility companies and the ruling board, the
27 CPUC.
28 The San Diego region should not have to pay

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

36

PPH2-2

1 the price with devaluation of property and the risk of
2 health for power needed here and elsewhere in the
3 state.

4 Now is the time to implement the complete
5 alternatives, to prevent more pain and suffering for
6 families by demanding safe undergrounding and
7 shielding policies. Make human safety a top priority.

8 The decisions that you make are the ones
9 that will be with you the rest of your life, every
10 second, every minute, every hour of every day.

11 You can save one more child's life from the
12 possible risk of leukemia, pain, suffering, death.
13 What is just one child's life worth?

14 Remember the children, for they are our
15 future.

16 ALJ BARNETT: Ms. Holaway, would you give a copy
17 of what you've said to the reporter. It would make sure
18 that your remarks are reported completely.

19 MS. HOLAWAY: Sure. I'll put my name on it.

20 ALJ BARNETT: I forgot to mention that for those
21 of you reading, if you would provide a copy to the
22 reporter after or before you read your statement, that
23 would be very helpful, and it guarantees the accuracy of
24 your statement.

25 The next one is Stacey whose name I cannot
26 pronounce.

27 MS. LOMEDICO: That's LoMedico.

28 ALJ BARNETT: Of course.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

37

PPH2-3

1 STATEMENT OF MS. LOMEDICO

2 MS. LOMEDICO: I live at 10963 Hill Creek Road in
3 Santee.

4 ALJ BARNETT: Could you spell your last name
5 please.

6 MS. LOMEDICO: L-o capital M-e-d-i-c-o.

7 I'm a little disadvantaged because I heard
8 about this public hearing late last week and haven't had
9 a chance to go online to read the entire environmental
10 document, not to say that I would read the entire
11 document but to try to get a grasp.

12 I have picked up the summary, and I've looked
13 at the summary and the class impacts under each item,
14 and my concern actually is not so much with the summary
15 of impacts, because it's -- so far from what I've read,
16 there's no Class 1 impacts that are not mitigatable.
17 However, my concern is the lack of time to get the
18 transmission lines up and running.

19 I have a severe concern in that I remember
20 several years ago when we didn't have electricity, and I
21 also -- I have a personal experience with my family that
22 owns a personal private business in which they have been
23 asked to give back power during certain times when
24 there's not enough power to give to the rest of the
25 county residents.

26 So while, unfortunately, I would like to talk
27 to the environmental impacts, but I haven't had an
28 opportunity, I would urge you to proceed as quickly as

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

38

1 possible. Because the study showed, even when we were
2 going through this in 2001 and 2002, not only did we not
3 have enough stations, we didn't have enough transmission
4 lines to get power to where it's at.

5 So I would encourage you to move forward as
6 quickly as possible.

7 Thank you.

8 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Ms. LoMedico.

9 Mr. Evans.

10 STATEMENT OF MR. EVANS

11 MR. EVANS: My name is Mike Evans. I live at 6194
12 Camino Rico, San Diego, California, 92120.

13 Commissioner Lynch, Administrative Law Judge
14 Barnett, Commission staff and consultants, members of
15 the public, my name is Mike Evans. I'm a resident of
16 San Diego County. I live in the City of San Diego, and
17 I work in the energy industry.

18 I've been following the Mission-Miguel 230 kV
19 transition line upgrade project for Coral Energy since
20 2000.

21 I urge the Commission to approve the EIR for
22 the original proposed project and issue the CPCN for
23 this line by June of 2004 for operation by June of 2006,
24 and I urge the Commission to not delay approval of this
25 line and the savings associated with the line to
26 ratepayers any longer.

27 This line is a cost effective addition to the
28 grid. It's \$83 million cost, about \$80 per kilowatt

PPH2-3

PPH2-4

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

39

PPH2-4

1 installed, to increase imports by 1,000 megawatts is a
2 good deal for ratepayers.

3 By comparison, for a similar amount of energy,
4 1,200 megawatts, SDG&E has proposed to purchase one
5 power plant and contract for energy for ten years from
6 another power plant as part of the current RFP
7 short-term energy procurement proceeding. The industry
8 standard cost for these plants is between 800 million
9 and a billion dollars, about \$750 per kilowatt
10 installed. \$80 per kilowatt versus \$750 per kilowatt.
11 The capital cost of this line is cheap by a factor of
12 10.

13 Further, this transmission line will provide
14 ratepayers access to economic energy resulting in annual
15 ratepayer savings of \$62 million, which is net of the
16 cost of the new line. It will eliminate extra local
17 reliability must-run generation payments and congestion
18 costs of \$91 million per year.

19 To be clear, the cost to ratepayers, of which
20 I'm one, of delaying approval of this line another year
21 is \$153 million.

22 The addition of another 230 kV overhead
23 transmission line, which incidentally I can see from the
24 backyard of my home in the San Carlos area, will result
25 essentially in the same visual impact as currently
26 exists because it uses an existing overhead transmission
27 line right-of-way with several existing overhead
28 transmission lines.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

40

PPH2-4

1 Because all the proposed EIR alternatives
2 involve further delays to the project, I urge the
3 Commission to approve the EIR and issue the CPCN for
4 this line as originally proposed by June of 2004 for
5 operation by June of 2006.

6 Thank you very much.

7 ALJ BARNETT: One moment, please.

8 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Mr. Evans, is your argument
9 that we do not need either the Palomar or the Otay Mesa
10 stations, generating stations if this line is built?

11 MR. EVANS: I have no -- no, it's not.

12 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Because you were comparing
13 the cost of those power plants to the cost of this
14 transmission line and saying one is cheaper than the
15 other.

16 MR. EVANS: My point is solely to compare the cost
17 of gaining an additional thousand megawatts of energy to
18 ratepayers or through transmission upgrade or through a
19 new power plants, and what I wanted to show you and to
20 point out was that the transmission line is an extremely
21 cost effective upgrade as compared to the new power
22 plants. The RFP proceeding accomplishes an additional
23 function.

24 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Thank you.

25 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Evans. If you could
26 give that to the reporter please.

27 MR. EVANS: I'll mark it up.

28 ALJ BARNETT: Mr. Baron.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

41

1 STATEMENT OF MR. BARON

2 MR. BARON: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Dave
3 Baron, and I represent the Barona Indians located above
4 Lakeside here in San Diego.

5 The Barona Indians have --

6 ALJ BARNETT: Could you give us your address,
7 please.

8 MR. BARON: Yes, sir.

9 1095 Barona Road, Lakeside, California, 92040.

10 The Barona band of Mission Indians have over
11 500 residents living on the reservation. We have about
12 250 homes. We have K through 12 elementary school. We
13 have 3,000 employees.

14 And for the benefit of Barona, we need an
15 affordable and reliable source of energy. We have a
16 well system and service system that's relying on
17 electricity.

18 Last week, with the threats of blackouts, our
19 water system and sewage systems were devastated as well
20 as the Barona tribe and the people that live there. We
21 need -- we urge your support on this issue.

22 Thank you.

23 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you.

24 Mr. Green.

25 STATEMENT OF MR. GREEN

26 MR. GREEN: Commissioner Lynch, Judge Barnett. My
27 name is Ramsey Green. I coordinate energy policy for
28 the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, 402 West

PPH2-5

PPH2-6

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

42

PPH2-6

1 Broadway, Suite 1000, San Diego, California, 92101.

2 The chamber represents approximately 3,000
3 large and small businesses within the San Diego region
4 as well as 19 businesses within the City of Santee. I
5 thank you for the opportunity to speak with you
6 regarding this issue.

7 The chamber is actively involved in the
8 discussion of important public policy issues that impact
9 our members. And, in fact, one of the chambers major
10 priorities in 2004 is to work towards providing our
11 business members with reliable energy.

12 The bottom line is the current project
13 proposal by SDG&E ensures the reliable distribution of
14 energy to the region in San Diego including the Santee
15 community, and it must be expedited.

16 There were a number of causes of the
17 California energy crisis in 2000 to 2001 when
18 electricity prices skyrocketed to \$40 per megawatt hour
19 to 1500 per megawatt. One of these causes was our
20 significant lack of energy infrastructure.

21 ALJ BARNETT: Could you slow down a little,
22 please.

23 MR. GREEN: Sure.

24 We cannot forget the astronomical energy bills
25 forced upon our San Diego residents, nor can we neglect
26 to remember the thousands of small businesses throughout
27 California that were forced to close their doors because
28 of high energy costs.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

43

1 The chamber supports the rapid construction of
2 new transmission lines within the San Diego region and
3 does so because such lines increase sufficiency and
4 reliability.

5 Thank you for your time and consideration.

6 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Green.

7 Mr. Merrick.

8 STATEMENT OF MR. MERRICK

9 MR. MERRICK: Good evening folks. Charlie
10 Merrick, Hilton Hotels, 10950 North Torrey Pines Road in
11 La Jolla.

12 Our hotel does about 75 percent group
13 business, most of them from out of town.

14 When we had this crisis back in 2000, 2001 --

15 ALJ BARNETT: Speak closer to the microphone.

16 MR. MERRICK: A lot of our clients are from back
17 east, and what we wanted to sell -- they were very
18 deferent from coming to our hotel or our city because of
19 these blackouts.

20 Since then, since 9/11 and other matters,
21 we've been trying to recover in the hotel industry,
22 which is coming about slowly, although with these
23 electrical deferments -- like two weeks ago where SDG&E
24 is calling us to cut back -- it's very difficult. And
25 hopefully in the future we can find a better solution to
26 solve our electrical problems.

27 Now whether it is installing these new lines,
28 that's not my business. If it's environmentally unsafe,

PPH2-6

PPH2-7

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

44

1 I really have to read into that, and other people have
2 talked about that. But in our business people coming
3 from out of town is a big, huge thing for us, and it
4 still is a deterrent to them coming to our city,
5 especially in our business.

6 So hopefully we can get the capacity to give
7 the kilowatt consumption into the city so we can better
8 serve our clients.

9 That's about all I have to say. Thank you.

10 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Merrick.

11 Next name I can't read. So L -- something
12 Livison.

13 MR. LINSSEN: I'm not sure how my name got from
14 there to there.

15 ALJ BARNETT: What is your name?

16 MR. LINSSEN: My name is Phillip Linssen.

17 Good evening, my name is Phillip Linssen. I
18 live at --

19 ALJ BARNETT: Sir, could you spell your name,
20 please.

21 STATEMENT OF MR. LINSSEN

22 MR. LINSSEN: L-i-n-s-s-e-n. I live at 5336
23 Marlborough, San Diego, California, 92116.

24 I own the San Diego Ice Arena. It's 11048 Ice
25 Skate Place in San Diego, 92126.

26 We would like to have the ability to rely on
27 SDG&E to supply us with power to keep the ice in an ice
28 condition. Water, unfortunately, the young kids can't

PPH2-7

PPH2-8

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

45

1 skate on, and they don't like that.

2 And as a small businessman, all I'm really
3 interested in is eliminating uncertainty and creation of
4 certainty. And we expect our utility, one organization,
5 just to keep on supplying us constantly.

6 And with the last three years of ups and downs
7 of the PUC requiring small businessman to learn a whole
8 bunch of new issues and having to deal with that, I
9 think that is relatively unfair.

10 We need SDG&E to be responsible to get the
11 power to us, and we require them to be given every
12 opportunity that there is in an extremely fast manner to
13 get that certainty back on the drawing board.

14 That is about all I have to say as a small
15 businessman who has yet to understand all the concepts
16 at play.

17 Thank you very much.

18 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Linssen.

19 Well, I have run out of names of those who
20 wish to speak, so now I'm asking for those who didn't
21 want to put their names down who wish to speak.

22 We've come a long way, and we would like to
23 hear your opinions.

24 We have a volunteer.

25 State your name and address.

26 STATEMENT OF MR. DALE

27 MR. DALE: Good evening. My name is Jack Dale. I
28 live at 9502 Hinton in Santee.

PPH2-8

PPH2-9

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

46

PPH2-9

1 I'm ending my fifth term here as an elected
2 official on the city council or as the mayor.

3 I am grateful to Frank Curtis, who works for
4 SDG&E, who came to me a couple, three months ago and
5 explained to me about this project. And based on those
6 conversations and a couple of meetings, I brought to my
7 city council that we recommend that -- I presume you're
8 aware of this -- that we request that this project at
9 least in our city borders be undergrounded from the east
10 border to the west border, and I would still ask you to
11 continue to give that significant thought.

12 I believe our staff earlier today as well as
13 this week will be sending you more information on
14 specifics for that, but we very much ask to you
15 underground it.

16 As far as reliable power, as far as success of
17 businesses, not only Santee but for the whole region,
18 we're absolutely 100 percent behind that. However, I
19 think as we look around the region where we hear about
20 other projects that are being undergrounded in downtown
21 San Diego or other parts of the county, that it seems a
22 reasonable request for our city.

23 We have people that either live there now or
24 going to be living up there. Otherwise, it's habitat or
25 it's in a position that anywhere you drive through town
26 you can see it.

27 We're undergrounding highways for aesthetics,
28 for other reasons, and I think that it is reasonable

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

47

PPH2-9

1 request to do it here.

2 Other than that, I agree; let's move on. It's
3 a facility that is desperately needed for the region.
4 Everybody in my city wants the power as well. But as I
5 would presume from all these other fine people coming in
6 from outside Santee would say if it was in their area,
7 they, too, don't want to look at it either.

8 And to underground it as well as -- I cannot
9 quote the chapter and verse of -- these citizens here
10 can tell you about the health issues. They've come to
11 see us quite a bit. They can show you a lot of
12 information as far as the possible health issues,
13 talking about cancer.

14 I have a son that has cancer, so it's
15 obviously a significant concern to me. All the
16 information that we have suggests that it's a very real
17 possibility, but nothing says it is an absolute.

18 But every other new project in this community
19 that brings utility, we request them to underground it
20 and for not only the amenities and the aesthetics.

21 But if indeed there is a potential to help
22 with health issues and there is a potential this is
23 causing a problem for kids such as my son, then it would
24 make us more adamant that you would underground it.

25 With that, thanks.

26 ALJ BARNETT: Could you spell your name?

27 MR. DALE: D-a-l-e.

28 ALJ BARNETT: And are you currently a city

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

48

PPH2-9

1 councilman?

2 MR. DALE: Uh-huh.

3 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Dale.

4 Are there any other persons who wish to
5 address the Commission at this time?

6 (No response)

7 ALJ BARNETT: Well, then we are going to adjourn
8 this meeting, but the Aspen Environmental Group will be
9 here to answer any more detailed questions you may have.

10 But at this time -- excuse me, Commissioner
11 Lynch wishes to make a statement.

12 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: I would like to thank you for
13 coming out on a Monday night to tell us of both your
14 support and your concerns. We take this very seriously.
15 That's why we're here. I really appreciate the broad
16 range of views of folks who have come today.

17 I would just reiterate if you would like to
18 provide us written comments, for those who have written
19 comments, please give them to the court reporter so we
20 have them formally in our record, but also you can write
21 us or e-mail us by next Monday and that will become part
22 of our formal record and will be used by myself and my
23 colleagues as we move forward and make a decision.

24 So thank you so much for being here and
25 bringing your issues and perspectives to us. I really
26 appreciate it.

27 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you all.

28 We are adjourned.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Comment Set PPH2, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.

1 (Whereupon, at the hour of 7:44 p.m.,
2 this matter having been continued to 4:00
3 p.m., May 11, 2004, at Spring Valley,
 California, the Commission then
 adjourned.)

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

* * * * *

**Responses to Comment Set PPH2
Public Participation Hearing – Santee, 5/10/04, 7 p.m.**

Gregg Guenther

PPH2-1 Section D.9.6 of the Draft EIR states that the CPUC does not consider magnetic fields in the context of CEQA and determination of environmental impact, first because there is no agreement among scientists that EMF does create a potential health risk, and second because there are no defined or adopted CEQA standards nor adopted State or federal standards, for defining health risk from EMF. As a result, EMF information is presented for the benefit of the public and decision makers. The purpose of the Executive Summary is to summarize the more detailed information found within the EIR. Therefore, Section 3.8.3 of the Executive Summary says that the recent IARC and the DHS studies both classified EMF as a possible carcinogen, but more in-depth descriptions of all EMF studies are found in Appendix 5.5.

Please refer to General Response GR-2 for a discussion of EMF, as well as Responses to Comment Set 8 for responses to the letter from the Santee Citizens for Safe Power.

Ellen Holaway

PPH2-2 Please refer to General Response GR-2 for a discussion of EMF, as well as Responses to Comment Set 8 for responses to the letter from the Santee Citizens for Safe Power. Please also see General Response GR-4 and Response to Comment 3-2 for a discussion of property value effects. The commenter's support for safe undergrounding and shielding policies is noted.

Stacey LoMedico

PPH2-3 The commenter's support for an expeditious schedule is noted. Reducing transmission constraints and providing reliability benefits and operational flexibility for SDG&E's electric system are two of the three project objectives. The project Purpose and Need and the Statement of Objectives can be found in Section A.2 on page A-2 of the Draft EIR.

Mike Evans, representing Coral Energy

PPH2-4 The commenter's support for the Proposed Project and CPCN approval by June 2004 is noted. CEQA does not address cost in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives. Cost of the project and alternatives is addressed by the CPUC in the General Proceeding on the project. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 4-1, SD-1, and SD-2. The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is discussed in Section A.2 of the Draft EIR, but it is not an issue specifically determined by CEQA. One of SDG&E's objectives of the Proposed Project (see page A-3 of the Draft EIR) is to reduce transmission constraints within SDG&E's electric system, which would reduce system congestion costs and would provide economic benefit to SDG&E and CAISO consumers. The cost and need for this project are not decided within this EIR. Cost issues will be addressed separately by the CPUC in the general proceeding on the Proposed Project. On February 27, 2003, the CPUC made a finding of need for the Miguel-Mission Project citing economic benefits (see Decision D.03-02-069 in docket No. I.00-11-001) (DEIR, page A-3). Please see General Response GR-1.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures V-1 through V-6 would reduce all potential visual impacts to less than significant levels. These measures, which are listed in Table 13-9 on page D.13-130 of the Draft EIR, include mitigation that would act to minimize potential visual impacts, such as ensuring the conductors do not cause view obstructions from residences, using screening around construction staging areas, and minimizing ground disturbance to landscaping, etc. Please refer to General Response GR-5 for a discussion of aesthetic effects.

The independent engineering firm evaluating the project for the CPUC (Commonwealth Associates, Inc.) believes that with careful planning and scheduling, the construction of the two underground alternative segments (again, less than 5 miles in length) could be accomplished within the original schedule. Please see also Response to Comment SD-2.

Dave Baron, representing the Barona Indians

PPH2-5 The commenter's support for the Proposed Project and affordable and reliable energy is noted. Please refer to Response to Comment Set CC1 for responses to the letter from the Barona Band of Mission Indians.

Ramsey Green, representing San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce

PPH2-6 The commenter's support for the Proposed Project and an expeditious schedule is noted. Reducing transmission constraints and providing reliability benefits and operational flexibility for SDG&E's electric system are two of the three project objectives.

CEQA does not address cost in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives. Cost of the project and alternatives is addressed by the CPUC in the General Proceeding on the project. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 4-1, SD-1, and SD-2. The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is briefly discussed in Section A.2 of the Draft EIR, but it is not an issue specifically determined by CEQA. As mentioned earlier, one of SDG&E's objectives of the Proposed Project (see page A-3 of the Draft EIR) is to reduce transmission constraints within SDG&E's electric system, which would reduce system congestion costs and would provide economic benefit to SDG&E and CAISO consumers. The cost and need for this project are not decided within this EIR. Cost issues will be addressed separately by the CPUC in the General Proceeding on the Proposed Project. On February 27, 2003, the CPUC made a finding of need for the Miguel-Mission Project citing economic benefits (see Decision D.03-02-069 in docket No. I.00-11-001) (DEIR, page A-3). Please see General Response GR-1.

Charlie Merrick, representing Hilton Hotels (La Jolla)

PPH2-7 The commenter's support for the Proposed Project is noted. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures, all potential environmental impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Please see also Response to Comment PPH2-6.

Phillip Linssen, representing the San Diego Ice Arena

PPH2-8 The commenter's support for the Proposed Project is noted. Please see also Response to Comment PPH2-6.

Jack Dale, representing the City of Santee City Council

PPH2-9 The commenter's support for undergrounding the line within the City of Santee boundaries, as well as for reliable power, is noted. Providing reliability benefits and operational flexibility for SDG&E's electric system is one of the three project objectives. Implementation of Mitigation Measures V-1 through V-6 would reduce all potential visual impacts to less than significant levels with the Proposed Project. These measures, which are listed in Table 13-9 on page D.13-130 of the Draft EIR, include mitigation that would act to minimize potential visual impacts, such as ensuring the conductors do not cause view obstructions from residences, using screening around construction staging areas, and minimizing ground disturbance to landscaping, etc. Please refer to General Response GR-5 for a discussion of aesthetic effects.

Please see General Response GR-2 for a discussion of EMF. Please also refer to Responses to Comment Set E for responses to the letter from the City of Santee.