

Comment Set PPH3
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

50

1 SPRING VALLEY, CALIFORNIA, MAY 11, 2004 - 4:00 P.M.

2 * * * * *

3 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE BARNETT: Good afternoon,
4 ladies and gentlemen. The Commission will be in order.

5 This is a Commission meeting to discuss the
6 draft Environmental Impact Report for consideration of
7 the San Diego Gas & Electric Company's application to
8 build the Miguel-Mission 230 kV #2 project. Now, this
9 is what we call a public participation hearing. I am an
10 Administrative Law Judge with the California Public
11 Utilities Commission, and on my right is Commissioner
12 Lynch, one of the commissioners, the one who is assigned
13 to this case. The Commission consists of five people
14 with offices in San Francisco.

15 As I said, this is an official meeting of the
16 Commission. We have a court reporter here who will take
17 down everything that is said and who will transcribe it
18 and put it into a transcript that will be considered by
19 the Commission with all of the other material that comes
20 in in the course of these hearings. The point that I'm
21 trying to make is that what you say today is part of the
22 formal record of this case, and it will be considered by
23 the Commission at the time they decide the final
24 decision on this matter.

25 The way we will conduct the hearing today is
26 the consultants who did the Environmental Impact Report,
27 the Aspen Group, will make a presentation and give you a
28 broad outline of what they are proposing to the

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

51

1 Commission. And after that we will have members of the
2 public speak and tell us what you feel about the
3 proposal and any thoughts that you may have regarding
4 this proposal. After that you may then discuss it
5 individually with the Aspen Consulting Group. They will
6 remain here to discuss any aspect of the proposed
7 project that you wish to discuss.

8 So with that, I'll turn this over to members
9 of the Aspen Environmental Group.

10 STATEMENT OF MR. MURPHY

11 MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Judge Barnett. I'm Tom
12 Murphy with Aspen Environmental Group. I'm a project
13 manager for the Miguel-Mission 230 kV #2 project. I'd
14 like to give a brief presentation on the proposed
15 project and milestones.

16 SDG&E filed their CPCN PEA on July 12, 2002,
17 with the California Public Utilities Commission. The
18 application was reviewed by a CEQA team and deemed
19 complete in January of 2003. The scoping process
20 occurred in September and October of 2003. We had
21 scoping meetings on September 15th and 16th in Spring
22 Valley, which was this location, and also in the City of
23 Santee. The scoping report was issued in December of
24 2003, and most of the analysis was conducted in November
25 2003 through March 2004, and a draft EIR was released on
26 April 1st, 2004.

27 This slide shows a flow diagram, diagram of
28 the EIR process. We're at the draft EIR review phase

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

52

1 where interested parties are able to review the draft
2 EIR and provide comments to the CPUC on the analysis
3 conducted. Following the public review period we will
4 respond to your comments, make any changes necessary to
5 the draft EIR and prepare a final EIR that goes to the
6 California Public Utilities Commission for its use in
7 the decision of the project.

8 I just want to briefly summarize SDG&E's
9 proposed project. If you'd like more details, there's a
10 draft EIR in the back of the room. There's many posters
11 that also illustrate the proposed project. There are
12 three basic components associated with the
13 Miguel-Mission 230 kV #2 project: The installation of a
14 new 35-mile single circuit 230 kV transmission circuit
15 between Miguel and Mission Substation within their
16 existing right-of-way. In order to do that, they need
17 to relocate their existing 138 kV and 69 kV circuits
18 onto a newly constructed alignment of wood and steel
19 pole structures, also within their existing
20 right-of-way, and they will also need to modify their
21 Miguel and Mission Substations to accommodate the new
22 230 kV circuit.

23 This figure illustrates the right -- existing
24 right-of-way and also the proposed project routes for
25 the Miguel-Mission project. The red segment shows where
26 this 24 miles, and it illustrates where SDG&E proposes
27 to relocate their 138 kV and 69 kV poles and modify
28 their 230 kV -- actually, modify the lattice towers to

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

53

1 accommodate the 230 kV circuit.

2 The green segment, SDG&E only proposes to
3 reconductor those poles. There will be no new poles
4 along the green segment of the Miguel-Mission
5 right-of-way.

6 We also conducted extensive alternatives
7 screening process. We looked at 14 route alternatives
8 between Miguel and Mission Substation. All alternatives
9 were evaluated for ability to meet three CEQA criteria,
10 meet the project objectives, be feasible from a
11 regulatory, technical and legal standpoint, be able to
12 reduce or eliminate significant impacts of the proposed
13 project. All of this information is summarized in
14 detail in Appendix 2 and also in Section C of the draft
15 EIR. Besides the route alternatives, we also looked at
16 nonwire alternatives such as distributed generation,
17 solar power and conservation.

18 This slides illustrates the number of routes
19 we took a look at to try and reduce some of the issues
20 associated with the Miguel-Mission project. Again,
21 there's 14 routes we looked at between Miguel and
22 Mission. A lot of them were in the northern part of the
23 San Diego area, but there's also some, as you can see,
24 along the southern section along the bay area.

25 The 14 alternatives were screened down to five
26 route alternatives that we carried forward in the draft
27 EIR. Three are located in the Jamacha Valley, and the
28 other two are located in the City of Santee. And I

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

54

1 would be happy to spend sometime with you to go over
2 each one of these alternatives after the public
3 participation hearing.

4 Overall we found that the environmentally
5 superior alternative was the proposed project with the
6 following alternative segments, which was the Jamacha
7 Valley 138 kV/69 kV underground. This alternative
8 follows Willow Glen Drive for 3.5 miles. And we also
9 found the City of Santee 138 kV/69 kV underground was
10 the preferred option. And that follows Princess Joann
11 Road for about -- I think it's about one mile. The
12 final decision regarding the routes and project approval
13 will be made by the CPUC in upcoming months.

14 I just wanted to give you an important date,
15 which is May 17th. All comments on the draft EIR must
16 be received or postmarked by May 17th. And you can send
17 your comments to Mike Rosauer at this address, and we
18 have some information in the back if you want to take it
19 home and fax it to us or E-mail, or even I think you can
20 provide -- actually send it in by mail as well.

21 I'll turn it back over to Judge Barnett to
22 conduct the public participation hearing.

23 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much. The way we
24 will do it is for those people who wish to make a
25 presentation, just please stand, state your name, spell
26 your name and give us your address and then tell us
27 what -- give us the information you wish to convey to
28 the Commission. We'll start with Eric Thompson.

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

55

1
2
3
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

STATEMENT OF MR. THOMPSON

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. My name is Eric Thompson, E-R-I-C, T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N. I'm here this afternoon representing La Mesa/Spring Valley School District. I'm the supervisor of maintenance and operations, and I work daily with the demand side of the electrical power system as it services our schools. We have 22 schools and two other facilities in this area. I simply want to emphasize the importance of affordable electrical power and dependable electrical power systems. This particular area, Spring Valley, was affected by outages a couple of years ago when the electrical power supply became low and demand increased. It was during the hot weather, the time that we remember.

When rolling blackouts occurred, it affected the school on this street, Kempton Elementary School. It was affected by a curtailment. So we support any infrastructure improvements that help us maintain the services to our schools.

COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Do you have an opinion or does the school district have an opinion on this particular project and any of its alternatives in meeting the goals you've expressed?

MR. THOMPSON: No, not particularly with regard to the Environmental Impact Report. I just wanted to emphasize that we do support infrastructure improvements

PPH3-1

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

56

1 that keep dependable and affordable electrical power to
2 La Mesa/Spring Valley School District.

PPH3-1

3 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Thompson.
4 Next Mr. Duane Hipperson.

5 STATEMENT OF MR. HIPPERSON

6 MR. HIPPERSON: Good afternoon. My name is Duane
7 Hipperson, D-U-A-N-E, H-I-P-P-E-R-S-O-N. I'm from
8 Gen-Probe Incorporated up in Miro Mesa.

PPH3-2

9 ALJ BARNETT: Could you slow down a little bit,
10 speak a little louder. And what was the name of?

11 MR. HIPPERSON: The company I work for is
12 Gen-Probe Incorporated. Our concern is electrical
13 reliability. Our business relies heavily on selling
14 electrical power, and anything to improve the
15 infrastructure and reliability we feel is foremost and
16 must be acted on as soon as possible. Thank you.

17 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Hipperson.
18 Mr. Jeff Bruhn.

19 STATEMENT OF MR. BRUHN

20 MR. BRUHN: Jeff Bruhn, B-R-U-H-N. Address is
21 9032 Olive Drive, Spring Valley. Took a few notes here
22 so I won't ramble. I'll be brief. Again, my name is
23 Jeff Bruhn. I'm president of Atlas Tree Service here in
24 Spring Valley. We're a small business. We employ 50
25 people on a full-time basis. The nature of our business
26 is that we work on a very small margin and in a very
27 competitive environment. Any change to the general
28 business climate here in San Diego can have a dramatic

PPH3-3

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

57

PPH3-3

1 effect on our ability to turn a profit and therefore
2 keep our people employed.

3 It's for this reason I'm here to briefly talk
4 in support of making sure we have reliable power for the
5 region. Of course it's important for our company to
6 have reliable power. Like so many other small
7 businesses, we have become very computer dependent, and
8 if we can't use our computers, we will have great
9 difficulty in operating in an efficient manner.

10 However, the real importance lies for us in
11 what happens to our customer base. If our region faces
12 shortages in electricity, as we all know, reliable power
13 is critical to the region's economic growth, and if the
14 economy suffers, things like commercial and residential
15 development will slow down, whereby our business will
16 suffer as well. Also we're the type of business that is
17 the first to be cut in the event that our customers'
18 profit margins get squeezed. So if the economy suffers,
19 our customers suffer, and in turn we lose business which
20 we have come to depend on, which means we may have to
21 lay some people off.

22 So the bottom line for us is economic growth
23 depends on reliable power. Small businesses like our
24 own depend on economic growth. So therefore, we must
25 have reliable power. And in closing, I urge the CPUC to
26 move forward on this project immediately to ensure that
27 we have reliable power for our region.

28 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: What project alternative do

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

58

1 you favor?

2 MR. BRUHN: I'm not real familiar with the
3 specifics. I'm just very concerned about having
4 economical, cost-effective, reliable power for our
5 region.

6 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Bruhn. Ms.
7 England.

8 STATEMENT OF MS. ENGLAND

9 MS. ENGLAND: My name is Mary England,
10 E-N-G-L-A-N-D. Address is 7915 Nichals Street, Lemon
11 Grove, California. I am an elected official, but today
12 I am here as a citizen speaking to you. Reliable power
13 is critical to the region, but my main concern, being an
14 advocate for senior citizens, is that we keep power,
15 energy prices at a reasonable rate for our seniors. As
16 we all know, we're heading into a -- we've had rolling
17 blackouts last year. Our seniors are the backbone of
18 our community. They suffer immensely when we have
19 shortages. Many are on set incomes. Many do not turn
20 on their fans or use the air conditioning when it gets
21 really hot.

22 Here in East County we've seen that. I've
23 seen it by working with seniors and volunteering. So my
24 major plea to you today is, whatever -- we need reliable
25 power. We need to also keep at the forefront our senior
26 population. They do suffer, and they always do not have
27 lobbyists that come and share with you some of the
28 concerns they have. On set incomes food comes first.

PPH3-3

PPH3-4

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

59

1 Their creature comforts come second and third. So I
2 just wanted to bring that forward and let you know they
3 are a major concern for many, many people within East
4 County. And I'm sure I don't speak just for myself.
5 Thank you.

6 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Ms. England. Thomas
7 Frederick.

8 STATEMENT OF MR. FREDERICK

9 MR. FREDERICK: Hi. I'm Thomas Frederick,
10 F-R-E-D-E-R-I-C-K. I will E-mail a written statement.
11 Thank you very much.

12 ALJ BARNETT: Well, that's fine. Who are you
13 going to E-mail it to?

14 MR. MURPHY: You can E-mail it to Miguel.

15 MR. FREDERICK: I thought the Miguel-Mission,
16 Aspen.

17 MR. MURPHY: That would be fine.

18 ALJ BARNETT: And Hector Martinez.

19 STATEMENT OF MR. MARTINEZ

20 MR. MARTINEZ: My name is Hector Martinez. I work
21 for Sweetwater Water District. I'm here to speak in
22 favor of the construction of this transmission line. We
23 have a treatment plant less than half a mile away from
24 here that heavily relies on the reliability that SDG&E
25 provides to us to deliver water. Without the system
26 reliability, there have been situations where we had
27 close calls because we had outages, and luckily our
28 tanks were full enough that we could go ahead and

PPH3-4

PPH3-5

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

60

PPH3-5

1 provide service for our customers, but if it was an
2 extended power outage, we would be in serious trouble.
3 And customers, they don't care where the, you know,
4 where the power comes from. They just know that they
5 want to have the water. So we kind of rely of you to
6 have the power there. So we are heavily in favor of the
7 construction of this power line.

8 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Mr. Martinez, do you have a
9 preference or comments on which proposal of the power
10 line we should go for?

11 MR. MARTINEZ: I'm not an expert in power issues.
12 Just by looking at it and with my understanding of the
13 water system, the closer that the transmission line is
14 to us, I think the better off we are. And just by
15 looking at your map here, the one that goes from Los
16 Coches to Miguel Substation, the eastern side would
17 be -- I mean I know that you have other things that you
18 need to consider, like costs and other issues. Like
19 many of the people have expressed here, you guys are the
20 experts. Just make sure that we have the power there.
21 Make sure that rolling blackouts are not an issue
22 because we don't have the infrastructure. We need to
23 have it in there.

24 ALJ BARNETT: Do you have backup power at all?

25 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes. But not enough to run those
26 450 horsepower pumps. We have enough to keep the lights
27 on and telephones going, but not to treat water for long
28 periods of time.

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

61

1 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Martinez.
2 Are there others who wish to make a presentation to the
3 Commission? This is your opportunity. We're here, and
4 we do want to hear from you. So feel free to just stand
5 up and speak your mind. Anybody? Nothing?

6 (No response)

7 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: Well, I would say that in the
8 handout that you can get on the back table, or actually
9 outside, we are taking comments through Monday. You can
10 E-mail them or mail them to us. If you mail them, they
11 need to be postmarked by Monday. If you make a comment
12 to us, it becomes part of our official record. And it's
13 very important to us what folks think, whether or not
14 you support the project, whether you have concerns with
15 the project in general, but also specifically which
16 route you think we should take and whether what the
17 consultants have proposed to mitigate the environmental
18 effects in each route is enough, is more than enough.
19 Whatever you think on cost or which route or the need
20 for the project is very important to us as we move
21 forward.

22 We will consider your comments and your
23 support or concerns of the project as we move forward to
24 make a decision on both the project and which of the
25 alternatives we're going to accept and -- accept. So we
26 really need your thoughts.

27 ALJ BARNETT: Now, we're going to adjourn the
28 official part of this Commission hearing, but the Aspen

Comment Set PPH3, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.

62

1 Environmental Group will remain to take any questions
2 you may have regarding the details of the proposal and
3 the alternatives.

4 COMMISSIONER LYNCH: So if you have any particular
5 questions or issues that you want to understand more
6 thoroughly looking at the maps or looking at the
7 materials, these folks are the ones who have studied it
8 the most thoroughly, and they can answer your questions
9 on an informal basis, not in such a public setting, for
10 the next several hours if you'd like to stay and get
11 questions answered.

12 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much. We are
13 adjourned.

14 (Whereupon, at the hour of 4:20 p.m.,
15 this matter having been continued to 7:00
16 p.m., May 11, 2004, at El Cajon,
California, the Commission then
adjourned.)

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

* * * * *

**Responses to Comment Set PPH3
Public Participation Hearing – Spring Valley, 5/11/04, 4 p.m.**

Eric Thompson, representing the La Mesa/Spring Valley School District

PPH3-1 Please see Response to Comment PPH2-6.

Duane Hipperson, representing Gen-Probe Incorporated (Miro Mesa)

PPH3-2 Please see Response to Comment PPH2-6.

Jeff Bruhn, representing Atlas Tree Service (Spring Valley)

PPH3-3 The commenter's support for the Proposed Project and an expeditious schedule is noted. Please see Response to Comment PPH2-6.

Mary England

PPH3-4 The commenter's support for reliable power is noted. Please see Response to Comment PPH2-6.

Hector Martinez, representing Sweetwater Water District

PPH3-5 The commenter's support for the Proposed Project and reliable power, especially between Miguel and Los Coches Substations, is noted. Please see Response to Comment PPH2-6.

Comment Set PPH4
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

63

1 EL CAJON, CALIFORNIA, MAY 11, 2004 - 7:00 P.M.

2 * * * * *

3 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE BARNETT: Good evening,
4 ladies and gentlemen, and I thank those of you who came
5 here. The Commission will be in order.

6 This is the time and place set for the public
7 participation hearing in the matter of San Diego Gas &
8 Electric Company's application, Application A.02-07-022,
9 to obtain a certificate of public convenience and
10 necessity in order to construct the proposed
11 Miguel-Mission 230 kV #2 project.

12 This is a formal meeting of the California
13 Public Utilities Commission. My name is Robert Barnett.
14 I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission, and
15 it is my function to conduct this hearing. The purpose
16 of the hearing is to receive the comments of all those
17 who wish to speak today. And this is our fourth
18 meeting. We've had two meetings yesterday. We've had a
19 meeting this afternoon, and we're having this public
20 participation hearing this evening to get the comments
21 of concerned citizens regarding this proposed 230 kV
22 transmission line.

23 We have a court reporter here who is taking
24 down everything that will be said at this meeting, and
25 it will be transcribed, and that transcript will be part
26 of the formal record which will go to the Commissioners
27 who will eventually decide this matter. The Commission
28 consists of five people. Their offices are in San

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

64

1 Francisco. And they will decide this matter based upon
2 what will be a very elaborate record, and part of that
3 elaborate record will be the public participation
4 hearings that we are conducting, that we have conducted
5 these past few days and of course that we are conducting
6 this evening. So it is very important for those of you
7 who wish to speak and have your comments considered by
8 the Commission to let us know, to tell us.

9 Now, the way we're going to operate this
10 evening is that we have the people who have prepared the
11 draft Environmental Impact Report, and that is the Aspen
12 Environmental Group. They're seated to my right. They
13 will make a presentation giving you a broad outlook of
14 what they have done and what the result is. After that
15 we will hear the members of the public who wish to
16 address the Commission regarding their concerns about
17 this project. Then this formal phase of this hearing
18 will close, but the Aspen Environmental Group will
19 remain here so that those people who have specific
20 questions and want answers in greater detail to their
21 questions will be able to discuss it with the
22 environmental group and hopefully get explanations for
23 your concerns.

24 So with that, I will turn this hearing over to
25 Mr. Murphy of the Aspen Environmental Group.

26 STATEMENT OF MR. MURPHY

27 MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Judge Barnett. I'm Tom
28 Murphy with the Aspen Environmental Group. I'm the

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

65

1 project manager for the Miguel-Mission 230 kV #2 project
2 EIR. I'd like to give a brief presentation of the
3 proposed project and milestones of the Miguel-Mission
4 project.

5 SDG&E filed a CPCN PEA at the California
6 Public Utilities Commission on July 12th, 2002. The
7 application was reviewed by the CEQA team and deemed
8 complete in January of 2003. The CEQA process occurred
9 in September and October of 2003, the scoping meetings
10 on September 15th and 16th in Spring Valley and the City
11 of Santee. The scoping report was issued in December of
12 2003, and it's available on the Miguel-Mission web site.
13 The EIR analysis and the alternatives screening was
14 conducted in November 2003 through March 2004, and a
15 draft EIR was released on April 1st, 2004.

16 This slide shows a flow diagram of the EIR
17 process. We're at the draft EIR review period in the
18 yellow box here where interested parties are able to
19 review the draft EIR and provide comments to the CPUC on
20 the analysis conducted in the draft EIR. Following the
21 public review period, we will respond to your comments,
22 make any changes necessary to the draft EIR and prepare
23 a final EIR that goes to the CPUC for its use in the
24 decision of the project.

25 I want to briefly summarize SDG&E's proposed
26 project. If you'd like more detail, there's information
27 in the draft EIR in the back as well as there's many
28 posters in the back that illustrate the proposed

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

66

1 project.

2 There are three basic components associated
3 with the Miguel-Mission 230 kV #2 project. The first
4 component is the installation of a new 35-mile single
5 circuit 230 kV transmission circuit on modified lattice
6 cars between Miguel and Mission Substations. In order
7 to do that, they need to relocate the existing 138 kV/69
8 kV circuits onto a newly constructed alignment of wood
9 and steel poles within their existing right-of-way.

10 They will also need to modify the existing
11 Miguel and Mission substations to accommodate this new
12 230 kV circuit. This figure illustrates their existing
13 right-of-way plus the proposed project route. The red
14 segment illustrates the area where they're going to
15 relocate the 138 kV and 69 kV circuits onto new poles,
16 and they'll need to modify their existing lattice
17 structures to accommodate the 230 kV circuit.

18 The green segments, SDG&E proposes only to
19 reconductor their existing lines. There will be no new
20 poles in the green segment on this figure.

21 We also conducted extensive alternatives
22 screening process. We looked at 14 route alternatives
23 between Miguel and Mission substations. All the
24 alternatives were evaluated for the ability to meet
25 three CEQA criteria, meet the project objectives, be
26 regulatory, technical and legal feasible, reduce or
27 eliminate significant impacts of the proposed project.

28 All this information was summarized in

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

67

1 Appendix 2 of the draft EIR. There's about a hundred
2 pages of the screening report in Appendix 2, and then
3 it's summarized in Section C of the draft EIR. Besides
4 the wire alternatives, we looked at nonwire alternatives
5 such as distributed generation, solar power and so
6 forth.

7 This figure illustrates the number of
8 alternatives that we looked at. We looked at 14
9 alternatives between Miguel and Mission, including some
10 of the alternatives that head west towards the bay and
11 through downtown.

12 The 14 alternatives were screened down to five
13 route alternatives that were carried forward in the
14 draft EIR. Three were in Jamacha Valley, and two are in
15 the City of Santee. And I'd be happy to walk you
16 through any of the alternatives that we looked at in the
17 draft EIR after the public participation hearing.

18 Overall we found that the environmentally
19 superior alternative was the proposed project with the
20 following alternative segments: The Jamacha Valley 138
21 kV/69 kV underground, which follows Willow Glen Drive
22 for 3.5 miles in Jamacha Valley, as well as the City of
23 Santee, the 138 kV/69 kV underground, which follows
24 Princess Joann Road in the City of Santee.

25 The final decision regarding the routes and
26 project approval will be made by the CPUC in upcoming
27 months. And I'd like to turn it over to Chris Keller to
28 discuss what occurs after the draft EIR.

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

68

1 STATEMENT OF MS. KELLER

2 MS. KELLER: Good evening. My name is Chris
3 Keller. I'm a member of the Aspen team, and I will be
4 assisting Aspen in the preparation of the final EIR
5 which will be addressing your comments. The first thing
6 I want to say is that the public review period for the
7 draft EIR ends next Monday, May 17th. So that's an
8 important date that all comments must be received,
9 either postmarked or received by the Commission.

10 Following the receipt of the comments, the
11 final EIR will be prepared and issued in June of this
12 year, and that document will address your comments as
13 well as any other changes to the document that need to
14 be made.

15 It's important to understand that the EIR is
16 an information document, that the Commission will vote
17 on the proposed decision in the upcoming months and will
18 use the EIR as a piece of information to help in their
19 decision. The EIR will be certified by the final CPUC
20 decision.

21 Another important aspect of this process is
22 that if the Commission approves SDG&E's proposed project
23 or one of the alternatives, they will also require a
24 mitigation monitoring and reporting program to implement
25 the mitigation measures that they adopt.

26 This next slide again is showing some
27 important information about the time period when the
28 draft EIR public review ends. Again, that's May 17th.

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

69

1 Outside this room we have this entire slide presentation
2 as a handout. And so there's information contained in
3 there in terms of where you submit your comments. They
4 can be provided in writing by mail, postmarked or E-mail
5 or fax and submitted to the PUC at the address and
6 E-mail, fax numbers provided in this handout.

7 There's also additional information on the
8 web. The EIR is available for your review there. We
9 also have CDs available in the lobby tonight. Full
10 copies of the document are available at 12 area
11 libraries. And Aspen also has a hot line, and if you
12 have any questions that come up between now and next
13 Monday that you'd like additional information, please
14 contact us at those numbers. Thank you.

15 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much. All right.
16 Now we have come to the public participation phase of
17 this meeting this evening, and I see that I only have
18 four people who have signed up. You don't have to sign
19 up to present your comments to us. I would hope that
20 many of the people here who have not signed up would
21 give us comments. We came down here to find out what
22 the public in the area that is impacted by this power
23 line feels about it, and therefore, we want to hear from
24 you.

25 So we will start with Mr. Guenther. If you
26 would come up to the stand, state your name, spell your
27 name and give your address.

28

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

70

1 STATEMENT OF MR. GUENTHER

2 MR. GUENTHER: Good evening. My name is Gregg
3 Guenther, G-U-E-N-T-H-E-R, 10749 Ramsgate Drive, Santee.

4 Thank you for this opportunity. Thanks again
5 to Aspen for listening and responsibly reacting to the
6 many letters and comments from my neighbors and friends.
7 This has been an unequalled respect shown to a community
8 of careful and thoughtful people.

9 I shared some thoughts, ideas and desires with
10 you last night. Tonight I want to clarify the position
11 of the Santee Citizens for Safe Power. Contrary to some
12 beliefs and impressions expressed directly to me and in
13 the media, the operative word in our title is "for." We
14 want SDG&E to be our neighbor, and we want safe power.
15 The technology exists as described in the draft EIR.
16 The will to do it exists, both from the community and
17 the health officials whom we rely.

18 Now we want SDG&E, with your guidance, to be a
19 very good neighbor. To be that good neighbor, they need
20 help in expanding their view. It is time to think past
21 benchmarks. Aspen refers to SDG&E limiting their
22 efforts for safe power to 4 percent of a total project
23 cost. And SDG&E has been quoted in the press that they
24 are limited by the 4 percent.

25 By considering the Otay project and its costs,
26 the alternative of undergrounding cost is spread across
27 multiple projects that demonstrates a foresight
28 heretofore missing from SDG&E applications. Piecemeal

PPH4-1

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

71

1 projects either show incompetence in planning or a very
2 skillful manipulation of industry friendly rules. Now
3 is the time to think outside the perceived limits.
4 Benchmarks are for guidance.

5 Robert Kennedy's reference to George Bernard
6 Shaw rings true today. "Some men see things as they are
7 and say, 'Why?' I dream of things that never were and
8 say, 'Why not?'" I strongly urge Aspen and the PUC to
9 think outside the box, to see the world of children as
10 more than a 4 percent limit.

11 The fair and balanced disclosure of the health
12 hazards that will be a result of this project completely
13 contradict the partial alternatives. As I requested
14 last night, go back, Aspen, go back, and complete the
15 task for safe power. Look past limits. Take some time
16 to watch children playing at a park or a school. What
17 you will see is a generation of promise. Do not limit
18 even one child. Do assure that every opportunity to
19 exceed limits is available to them.

20 The far-reaching implications for safe power
21 will possibly prevent mass tort assaults on the
22 utilities of California. If Hawaiian Electric
23 Industries can spend \$5 million just for rerouting
24 transmission lines to provide a safe distance from
25 children's bedrooms, then we in California can spend
26 what is necessary to construct the needed safe power for
27 hotels in La Jolla and industry in Mission Valley.

28 Robert Kennedy is also attributed with this

PPH4-1

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

72

1 observation in part. Too much and too long we seem to
2 have surrendered community excellence and community
3 values in the mere accumulation of material things.
4 This measure does not allow for the evaluation of the
5 health of our children, the quality of their education
6 or the joy of their play. It measures not the
7 intelligence of our public debate. It measures neither
8 our wit nor our courage, neither our wisdom nor our
9 learning. Accumulation of material things measures
10 everything, in short, except that which makes life
11 worthwhile.

PPH4-1

12 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Guenther.
13 Ms. Holaway.

14 STATEMENT OF MS. HOLAWAY

15 MS. HOLAWAY: Good evening. Ellen Holaway, 9716
16 Yellowstone Place, Santee, California. Spelling of
17 Holaway is H-O-L, one L, A-W-A-Y.

PPH4-2

18 After speaking last night at the Santee
19 meeting, I wanted to set the record straight for SDG&E
20 and any one else. The Santee Citizens for Safe Power
21 are in favor of this project. We are definitely for the
22 project of the new power. However, we want safety to be
23 in play here.

24 We feel that the 4 percent benchmark for the
25 no cost, low cost measures to reduce magnetic field
26 levels needs to be rethought. I know from reading the
27 CPUC's material that the benchmark of 4 percent can be
28 changed from project to project. I encourage you to do

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

73

1 so, for this project is to make the alternatives -- to
2 make these alternatives complete.

3 We need to distance and shield ourselves from
4 EMFs. The principle of precautionary action, by
5 creating distance and shielding, is addressed clearly
6 and decisively in the undergrounding alternatives.
7 However, it falls short of completing of the safe power
8 goal. In fact, it constructs a danger zone in the
9 backyards and bedrooms of children as outlined in the
10 executive summary.

11 Discuss and deliberate as necessary.
12 Seriously consider the cost of just one child's health
13 and expand the cost allowance for safe power. Thank
14 you.

15 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Ms. Holaway. Ms. Watt.

16 STATEMENT OF MS. WATT

17 MS. WATT: Elaine Watt, that's E-L-A-I-N-E,
18 W-A-T-T, 10881 Oak Creek Drive in Lakeside. Good
19 evening. At my home in Lakeside fire is a serious
20 threat much of the year. If SDG&E and Sempra build a
21 huge 230 kilovolt transmission line and tower near my
22 home, then they should have to provide evidence that the
23 tower will not increase a wildfire's damaging ability.
24 They should have the burden to prove the towers and
25 lines will not pose an increased threat to my life and
26 property in case of fire. Will my fire insurance be
27 increased in price or cancelled?

28 SDG&E and Sempra should also have the burden

PPH4-2

PPH4-3

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

74

PPH4-3

1 of proving there is no short or long-term health risks
2 from exposure to the increased EMF level at 230
3 kilovolts. Have passive energy sources been fully
4 investigated and implemented? SDG&E and Sempra should
5 have to produce evidence that charging San Diego
6 ratepayers for these power lines and towers provides an
7 economic benefit to San Diegans.

8 The Miguel-Mission project does for Sempra and
9 SDG&E exactly what the Valley Rainbow project would have
10 done. Miguel-Mission is Sempra's contingency plan. The
11 Valley Rainbow project was denied because the project
12 could not be justified on the basis of reliability. The
13 valley Rainbow project could not provide positive
14 economic benefits to SDG&E ratepayers and California in
15 general. SDG&E and Sempra should have to produce
16 evidence that San Diego currently needs these huge power
17 lines and towers. The projected costs to ratepayers
18 exceeds the projected benefits.

19 Homeland security and terrorism in San Diego
20 is a new concern. If the news pundits are to be
21 believed, huge monoliths of energy transmission are
22 enticing targets for terrorists. Could putting these
23 power lines underground allow us more security?

24 My family and I live in an unincorporated part
25 of the county. It has been proposed that the project be
26 put underground within city limits. The viable argument
27 was the exposure to the EMF to children -- excuse me --
28 exposure of the EMF to children. If the project is

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

75

1 going underground to protect children, it should not be
2 limited to, quote, "within city limits," unquote. My
3 children as well as all children need to be protected
4 regardless of city limits. Thank you for your time.

5 ALJ BARNETT: Could you give a copy of that to the
6 reporter, please. Thank you, Ms. Watt. Ms. Principe.
7 I hope I pronounced that correctly.

8 STATEMENT OF MS. PRINCIPE

9 MS. PRINCIPE: My name is Marjorie Principe,
10 P-R-I-N-C-I-P-E, and I live in Lakeside. My address is
11 13505 Maple View Street. I hope what I have to say
12 makes sense, because I got a short notice for this and
13 my notes are all over the place.

14 All right. The Miguel-Mission project does
15 for Sempra and San Diego Gas & Electric exactly what the
16 Rainbow Valley project would have done. Miguel-Mission
17 is Sempra's contingency plan. Since Rainbow Valley
18 project is defeated, Sempra is moving swiftly to the
19 secondary plan, the Miguel-Mission project.

20 Sempra and San Diego Gas & Electric want to
21 build these transmission lines, and we protest this
22 because the building of these electrical transmission
23 lines and facilities is through our neighborhood. We
24 live very close to the Los Coches Substation. And they
25 are also building brand new tract homes directly across
26 the street from this.

27 The 230,000 V transmission lines are
28 significantly larger than the current lines, the 60,000

PPH4-3

PPH4-4

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

76

PPH4-4

1 lines and the 138,000 voltage transmission lines. Are
2 there health effects from the electric magnetic fields
3 specifically from concentrated 230,000 volt
4 transmissions? There has to be. There is from the
5 smaller ones.

6 What will the diesel fuels used to build these
7 facilities do to the air we breathe? What happens to
8 the birds and the foliage that happen to be in the
9 construction path of San Diego Gas & Electric's 230,000
10 volt facilities? What happens to my neighbors from
11 being exposed to the waste products from building this
12 expanded capacity?

13 San Diego Gas & Electric is avoiding the City
14 of San Diego entirely. Why? What does the San Diego
15 City Council say to San Diego Gas & Electric about its
16 230,000 volt transmission facility? San Diego Gas &
17 Electric is intentionally following the county lines for
18 these towers and lines. Why?

19 Also I don't like the fact that San Diego Gas
20 & Electric will charge us for these voltage lines. We
21 already pay too much money to San Diego Gas & Electric.
22 I think since San Diego Gas & Electric is the only
23 electric company here in San Diego, they should be
24 working for the people, not always gouging the people
25 and working against them.

26 These lines will be going to L.A. and other
27 places, and I understood that San Diego had enough power
28 for itself. We understand that they are -- San Diego's

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

77

1 current energy needs are met. We understand there are
2 passive energy sources that are not being tapped. Why
3 can't San Diego Gas & Electric do solar? Why does San
4 Diego Gas & Electric want to increase its carrying
5 capacity from the Mexican border? Thank you for
6 listening.

PPH4-4

7 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Ms. Principe. Well, that
8 concludes the statements from people who have signed up.
9 Now, what about people who haven't signed up? Any of
10 you care to make a statement? Yes, ma'am. A volunteer.
11 Thank you. Appreciate it.

12 STATEMENT OF MS. MARSH

13 MS. MARSH: You know what they say about
14 volunteers. Good evening, Judge Barnett. My name is
15 Katherine Marsh, and I'm here as a concerned citizen.
16 My address is 12520 Robison Boulevard, there's only one
17 N, Poway, California, 92064. My son is also coming, but
18 he's running a little late.

PPH4-5

19 We have not have had the opportunity yet to
20 review the DEIR. I spoke with Michael today. It was
21 not on the web site, but he assured me he would
22 overnight us with the DEIR. And my son is more familiar
23 with the technical terms in it, and I expect him within
24 ten minutes.

25 I am here as a concerned citizen to say that
26 the power lines we already have in place, according to
27 sources on the Internet, supply our maximum usage and
28 more than we need for years. Why does San Diego Gas &

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

78

PPH4-5

1 Electric want 230 kilovolt transmission lines and towers
2 in San Diego? I believe the Otay Mesa/Miguel-Mission
3 power project represent Semptra Power's contingency plan
4 for their Rainbow Valley project. Semptra Power wishes
5 to use its subsidiary, San Diego Gas & Electric, to move
6 dirty power from planned methane gasification plants off
7 the coast of Baja Mar in Mexico through San Diego. They
8 want to get their product to other cities and states and
9 use San Diego to do it, but in order to move the dirty
10 power past San Diego to other cities and states, Semptra
11 needs huge, very expensive, very long-range transmission
12 lines.

13 Yesterday the Hilton Hotel in La Jolla and the
14 Barona Indians told you that they needed power in 2002,
15 I believe. Brownouts had nothing to do with
16 transmission towers and lines in San Diego. We have
17 five sets of power circuits now in San Diego. The
18 Granite Hills power circuit represents the shortest
19 distance to the La Jolla Hilton. Why doesn't San Diego
20 Gas & Electric build 230 kilovolt circuitry through
21 Granite Hills to the La Jolla Hilton? What is the big
22 picture?

23 When you look at the whole San Diego Gas &
24 Electric map, Miguel-Mission represents one leg of a
25 grand project. The planned 230 kilovolt Otay Mesa power
26 project starts at Mexico. Now, the United States does
27 not allow gasification plants in this country. Every
28 time it's been approached, we have said no. Semptra

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

79

PPH4-5

1 Energy -- excuse me, excuse me. The 230 kilovolt Otay
2 Mesa project starts at the Mexican border and wanders
3 north to San Diego's northern borders in an apparently
4 roundabout way. But looking at it closely, one sees
5 something very interesting. With the exception of the
6 City of Santee, the whole Otay Mesa project wanders
7 through areas where the homeowners and citizens do not
8 have city councils or mayors. These citizens have no
9 city elected officials. So for Sempra Power there's no
10 accountability to city governments, elected mayors and
11 city attorneys who demand accountability for the health,
12 the safety and the cost of putting her citizens in the
13 way of huge 230 kilovolt transmission towers and lines.

14 It is three times longer meandering through
15 the county to give La Jolla Hilton cheap power from Otay
16 Mesa, Miguel, than it is from Granite Hills because that
17 way Sempra Power has no accountability to the San Diego
18 City Council. Thank you.

19 My son is coming, and he actually was going to
20 address certain other issues. I hope he makes it. We
21 expect him in five minutes. Thank you.

22 ALJ BARNETT: Did you read what you said?

23 MS. MARSH: Sir, it's not a clean copy, but you're
24 welcome to it.

25 ALJ BARNETT: Well, it's for the reporter.

26 MS. MARSH: I'm happy to give him this.

27 ALJ BARNETT: Sure.

28 MS. MARSH: Thank you, sir.

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

80

1 ALJ BARNETT: Are there others who would like to
2 address the Commission on this project? Well, since
3 the -- we will wait. We'll take a five-minute recess.
4 We'll be in recess for five minutes.

5 (Recess taken)

6

7 ALJ BARNETT: Back on the record. Are there
8 others who wish to address the Commission on this issue
9 of the power line?

10 MR. MARSH: I do.

11 ALJ BARNETT: Come forward. If you'll come up to
12 the lectern. If you'll state your name, spell your name
13 and give us your address.

14 STATEMENT OF MR. MARSH

15 MR. MARSH: Good evening. My name is Kevin Marsh.
16 It's spelled M-A-R-S-H. And I live at 12520 Robison
17 Boulevard, Poway, California. That's zip code 92064.

18 Good evening. I'm a concerned citizen of San
19 Diego County, and I believe there are serious issues
20 with the Miguel-Mission Project #2 that have not been
21 addressed.

22 ALJ BARNETT: Speak slowly.

23 MR. MARSH: Sorry. First, the draft Environmental
24 Impact Report does not address the possible air quality
25 issues due to increased generation south of the border
26 in Mexico. There are currently proposals for six new
27 gas power plants just across the border that are cited
28 in the proponents' environmental assessment plan that

PPH4-6

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

81

PPH4-6

1 they put on the web site. These plants will have a
2 capacity of 2,010 megawatts according to their numbers.
3 Interestingly, according to the California Independent
4 System Operator, the entire County of San Diego has a
5 generation capacity of 2,265 megawatts. While all the
6 plants in San Diego meet strict EPA and California
7 standards, plants in Mexico are not subject to the same
8 standards.

9 The Miguel-Mission project might encourage the
10 construction of plants in Mexico. The transmission
11 capacity of the current linkage between the Miguel and
12 Mission Substations is currently between 1100 and
13 1400 megawatts. This capacity would increase to
14 2100 megawatts according to the California Independent
15 Service Operator in their report to their stakeholders
16 on April 15th, 2004. This dovetails very nicely with
17 the 2400-megawatt transmission capability of the Mission
18 Substation with San Luis Rey and points farther north.

19 The DEIR should determine if the project will
20 influence the construction of power plants in Mexico.
21 If the plants will not be built without the transmission
22 lines through the county, then the project's DE -- if
23 they're going to be built because -- if these plants
24 will be built because there's going to be transmission
25 lines to deliver this power, then the draft
26 Environmental Impact Report should address those plants'
27 impact on the air quality in San Diego County.

28 This board here may be the only check on these

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

82

1 power plants, and this control of the transmission lines
2 may be the only power that the County of San Diego has
3 and that the state has over the building of power plants
4 in Mexico. This may be one of the only governmental
5 checks, and I really implore you to require that
6 research be done to see if power plants will be built
7 because these transmission lines will be constructed.
8 And if these transmission lines have an impact on the
9 construction of those power plants, I believe that the
10 environmental impact of those power plants needs to be
11 included in the plan.

PPH4-6

12 Second, I believe the Miguel-Mission project
13 will possibly also outsource jobs. If they encourage
14 the construction of power plants in Mexico as opposed to
15 the United States, then jobs will be created in Mexico
16 as opposed to the United States, and I would like to see
17 more jobs in the United States.

PPH4-7

18 Thirdly, the cost of any upgrades to the power
19 grid should be carried entirely by Sempra and not by
20 ratepayers. Sempra Energy is the parent of San Diego
21 Gas & Electric and has a market capitalization of over
22 \$7 billion, and they paid out approximately \$230 million
23 in dividends last year. So they clearly have enough
24 money to pay for capital upgrades. And the company has
25 a great potential to make money on this project because
26 they have a proposal for two power generation plants in
27 Mexico at the moment.

PPH4-8

28 Those are all my comments. Thank you very

Comment Set PPH4, cont.
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

83

1 much.

PPH4-8

2 ALJ BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Marsh. Are there
3 others who wish to make a presentation to the
4 Commission?

5 (No response)

6 ALJ BARNETT: Well, then hearing nothing, I thank
7 all of the people who have come here and participated
8 and listened. And we are -- oh, but before we adjourn,
9 I want to remind you that the Aspen Environmental Group
10 will remain here after we have adjourned to answer any
11 specific questions you may have certainly in greater
12 detail than we've been discussing or been listening to
13 for the past 50 minutes. So with that, I thank you
14 again, and we are adjourned.

15 (Whereupon, at the hour of 7:50 p.m.
16 the public participation hearing
concluded.)

17

18 * * * * *

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Responses to Comment Set PPH4
Public Participation Hearing – El Cajon, 5/11/04, 7 p.m.

Gregg Guenther

PPH4-1 Please refer to General Response GR-2 for a discussion of EMF, Responses to Comment Set 8 for responses to the letter from the Santee Citizens for Safe Power, and Response to Comment PPH2-1. See also General Response GR-1 for a discussion of the Proposed Project in relation to the Otay Mesa Power Purchase Agreement Project.

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.

Ellen Holaway

PPH4-2 The commenter's clarification of support for the project, if it brings "safe power," is noted. 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 and Response to Comment PPH2-2.

Elaine Watt

PPH4-3 A discussion of the San Diego Wildfires of 2003 and the effects of the Cedar Fire in the Miguel-Mission ROW are discussed in Section A.3 of the Draft EIR. SDG&E Project Protocol PP-20 allows for brush clearing as a form of fire protection.

Fire hazards from the arcing of transmission lines are discussed in Section D.9.6.2 on page D.9-18 of the Draft EIR. Impact PS-4 (Wind, Earthquake, and Fire Hazards), on page D.9-35, would be less than significant (Class III) because SDG&E would be required to design the transmission line in accordance with safety requirements of the CPUC's GO 95 and other applicable requirements.

Please refer to General Response GR-2 for a discussion of EMF. 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). 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 under CEQA. Please see also General Response GR-1.

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.

Protection of the transmission line from terrorism is not an environmental impact area that can be considered under CEQA, because there is no defined set of significance criteria against which the project can be analyzed. However, transmission line security and terrorism are issues that can be considered in the CPUC's General Proceeding.

Underground alternatives outside of “city limits” were evaluated as part of the Alternative Screening Report (see Appendix 2), including the Jamacha Valley 138 kV/69 kV Underground Alternative, which was found to be environmentally preferable to the Proposed Project. Eight other major underground or partially underground routing alternatives were developed and are discussed in Sections C.5.3.4 through C.5.3.11, as well as in Appendix 2, Sections 4.3 and 4.4. These alternatives were feasible and met all project objectives. However, in comparison to the Proposed Project, all eight alternatives would have resulted in substantial temporary environmental impacts to air quality, unknown cultural resources, hazardous materials, noise, and traffic as a result of underground construction of the new transmission line. In addition, there would have been a significant delay of the project schedule. Because of the high level of temporary adverse impacts associated with the underground transmission alternatives, they were eliminated from full consideration within the Draft EIR.

Marjorie Principe

PPH4-4 Please refer to General Response GR-2 for a discussion of EMF. The Proposed Project does enter the City of San Diego and the route was chosen primarily because it would follow an existing SDG&E transmission ROW. Response to Comment PPH2-6 discusses cost and need for the Proposed Project.

Sections D.2 (Air Quality), D.3 (Biological Resources), and D.9 (Public Health and Safety) present a discussion air quality, vegetation and wildlife, and hazardous materials potential impacts and associated mitigation measures that would reduce all potential impacts to less than significant levels. Please refer to Response to Comment PPH1-3 for a discussion of solar power.

Katherine Marsh

PPH4-5 Please see Responses to Comment Set 13.

Kevin Marsh

PPH4-6 Please see Responses to Comment Sets 13 and 14 and specifically Response to Comment 14-1, which discusses the effects of bringing new power plants online.

PPH4-7 Please see Response to Comment 14-6.

PPH4-8 Please refer to Responses to Comment Set 14. CEQA does not address cost in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives. Discussion of who should pay for the project is also beyond the scope of the EIR. Cost of the project and alternatives is addressed by the CPUC in the General Proceeding on the project. 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 under 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 need for this project is not addressed or decided within this EIR (see General Response GR-1). However, the CPUC has previously determined the need for the project in Decision D. 93-02-069 in docket No. I.00-11-011) (DEIR, page A-3).