

**SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT  
Reporter's Transcript of the CPUC/BLM Scoping Meeting  
for Preparation of a Draft EIR/EIS**

Held 4:00 p.m. October 3, 2006  
At Ramona, California

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

**STAFF PRESENTATION**

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

Presentation: pages 3 to 9  
Public Comments begin on page 10  
Q&A begins on page 20

**PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER**

Eric Larson ..... 10  
Mimi Limerez ..... 10  
Peter Schultz ..... 10, 17  
Jim Davis ..... 11  
Diane Conklin ..... 11, 14  
Paul Tarr ..... 12, 17  
Sharon Lynch ..... 13, 19  
Don Larson ..... 14  
Dennis Trafecanty ..... 14, 19  
John Bremer ..... 18

**Q&A, BY SPEAKER**

Diane Conklin ..... 20  
Dennis Trafecanty ..... 21  
John Bremer ..... 22  
Kelly Fuller ..... 22  
Sharon Lynch ..... 23  
Unidentified Speaker ..... 23

## STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. I ask everyone who is not presently seated to please take a seat. I encourage you to sit as far forward in the room as possible so that the acoustics are better and you can see the screen better as well. If the people at the posters could wrap up those conversations, it would be very distracting to the rest of the proceedings. So, Tom, that means you wrap this up, okay. You may want to turn off your cell phones and other things that beep.

My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work for a firm called Katz & Associates. We are under contract through Aspen to the California Public Utilities Commission to help support these public scoping meetings. I am here to moderate all these scoping meetings being held this week.

This meeting, as you may or may not know, is being held to satisfy both the federal requirement and the National Environmental Policy Act as well as the California Environmental Quality Act. That's both the EIR and the EIS, State and federal respectively.

Some of you may be unfamiliar with the scoping process under the EIR/EIS process. We want to make sure that we orient you so that you clearly understand where we are. This is a several-step process and this is the very beginning as far as the impact review and analysis. There's a very specific purpose to tonight's meeting.

In terms of who we have with us tonight, I introduced myself and I will be going over the scoping process. Seated directly to my right is Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group. She's going to be covering the description of the proposed project. Billie Blanchard with the California Public Utilities Commission seated next to her will talk about the CPUC process and the schedule. And then we have two representatives with the Bureau of Land Management, Lynda Kastoll and Tom Zale, who are going to talk about their special piece of this in terms of where the Bureau of Land Management plays into the process. Then Susan Lee will wrap up with some more details about what's to come and how the EIR/EIS is actually prepared and what you can expect as we go through that process. Then we're going to get to what is really the most important part of the scoping meeting and that is your opportunity to offer us your comments.

I've already have several speaker registration cards that have been handed to me. I will be calling those in the order in which they have been filled out. If you haven't done so and you want to speak, you can go back any time to Dan, who is seated there at the table, and fill one out and he'll get it up to me. If, however, you are like most Americans and afraid of public speaking, don't feel left out if you don't speak tonight. There are ample opportunities to give written comments. And written comments are given the same consideration as oral comments will be offered here tonight.

The purpose of scoping is to inform you, the public and responsible agencies, about an upcoming project for which the EIR/EIS is going to be prepared. It's to tell you about the review process, and more importantly, the input regarding the potential alternatives to the proposed project and the scope of issues to be studied the EIR/EIS. That's why it's called a scoping meeting.

We already had one meeting yesterday in El Centro. It went very well. It was very informative. And we've already picked up several new things to look at and to examine. If we can identify additional issues of concern, that means scoping is working. Then, a scoping report will be prepared and distributed to the repository and placed on the project website. So even if you don't go to all of the meetings, you'll be able to see what the differences or similarities were between what was offered in one location versus another as well as the written comments.

The key players, as you probably know, are first, the California Public Utilities Commission, which is the lead agency of the CEQA process, second, Bureau of Land Management, the agency for the NEPA process, and finally Aspen Environmental Group. As you quickly learn this is a world full of acronyms, so I hope you'll stay with me on this. An acronym you're probably already familiar with is SDG&E, the Applicant. They are not going to appear tonight. This is an opportunity for the agencies who are doing an environmental review to hear from you independently. There are a number of people here who are going to be involved in the environmental process so that they can hear your comments firsthand.

I want to emphasize that there is no decision being made tonight. Again, we're early in the process. This is really more information gathering, input, data gathering. The people here are not making decisions. They just want to hear all the comments as we go throughout the various locations in Imperial and San Diego County firsthand.

I'm going to turn it over to Susan Lee who is going to go through the description of the proposed project.

MS. LEE: I'm Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental Group and I'm managing the EIR/EIS environmental report on this project. I will briefly describe the project, but not in as much detail, to save time.

The Notice of Preparation that we've handed out to you has a fairly detailed description of the project itself on Pages 4 through 8 and also a fairly detailed set of maps.

One thing I want to make sure that you know that we can do for you is we can help you find your individual property on the really detailed maps we have in the back of the room. So feel free after the comment period is over and we're in a break to come find one of us to help find your own property on that map.

The Sunrise Powerlink project is 150 miles of new transmission line proposed by San Diego Gas & Electric. The first part is 500 kilovolt, which is the high voltage line primarily in Imperial County and coming into San Diego County up by Warner Springs, where there's a proposed new substation. The second part is a 230 kilovolt line that will run through the rest of San Diego County, including this area here just south of where we are in Ramona, and all the way out to the coast at the Penasquitos Substation.

To highlight on the maps that are included in the NOP: the parts surrounding the area where we are today are the maps shown on Figure 4A, which is what we're calling the Central Link. It's the upper part of the 500 kV portion running up near Warner Springs and down through Santa Ysabel. There's a very detailed map in here of the proposed substation, which is also fairly near Warner Springs, to give you a sense of the way the substation will be laid out. And then there are two maps of the Inland Valley Link. One that's an overview coming in from east of Ramona down towards Mussey Grade. Then there's an underground segment that's south along San Vicente and Gunn Stage Road that San Diego Gas & Electric has proposed. So if you have questions on where your properties are with respect to that, again, we'll be happy to talk to you afterwards.

There are a couple of other components of that property that are physically separate from there. There are some substation upgrades that will have to occur. I think there's one final map that shows the location of those upgrades, substations that are separate from the route itself.

So one other thing I would like to point out is, in addition to the Applicant, San Diego Gas & Electric, there's another utility entity that's involved in this project, the Imperial Irrigation District. And the IID has a Memorandum of Agreement, with San Diego Gas & Electric under which IID would ultimately own, operate and construct the 500 kV portion of the line in Imperial County and a little ways into San Diego County, ending at the Narrows Substation, which is shown on map Figure 1.

The next slide shows San Diego Gas & Electric's three main project goals. If you've been to their earlier meetings, I imagine you've heard this before. The number one goal that San Diego Gas & Electric has presented in its application is to maintain the reliability of the electric system. The second one is to promote renewable energy. The reason that SDG&E has proposed for building a line into Imperial County is to have access to the potential renewable resources out there, primarily being solar and geothermal, because there are solar resources in the desert and also the geothermal fields at the south end of Salton Sea. The third goal is to reduce energy costs. Having an additional line into San Diego would allow for the configuration of the electric system in a way that would reduce costs to San Diego rate payers.

This next slide shows the objectives of the project. There are eight of them. They're much more detailed, but they basically all tie into those project goals. They deal with reliability, with renewables. The last couple are land use principles that SDG&E used to define where they're siting the route based on a principle to avoid highly populated areas.

I will turn this over to Billie to talk about the CPUC process.

MS. BLANCHARD: Hi, I'm Billie Blanchard. I'm the CPUC project manager for the environmental document.

I just wanted to go over some things briefly about the CPUC review process and the schedule. The CPUC has two parallel review processes. One is the general proceeding with an administrative court judge. The second is the environmental review process that I'm mostly involved in.

The Certificate of Public Convenience Necessity of the general proceeding is being led by the Assigned Commissioner who is Dian Grueneich and Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman. You may have seen both of them at the prehearing conference if you attended that in Ramona on September 13th.

The scope of the CPCN is dictated through the Public Utilities Code Section 1002, which looks at the need for the project and also considers community values, aesthetic and historic issues, recreational and park issues, as well as, of course, the environmental impacts associated with the project under CEQA.

Where we are in the schedule for the general proceedings: there was a first prehearing conference in Ramona on January 31st. And then there was a second prehearing conference and public participation hearing in Ramona on September 13th. The ALJ has to now prepare a scoping memo for the proceedings, which will outline all the issues, the schedule, et cetera. That is scheduled to be completed and sent out within the first couple of weeks of October 2006.

Now, as far as the dates, the testimony and evidentiary hearings and decisions, those are not known at this time because he has not issued that scoping memo. So that is all that I can tell you at this time.

On our Environmental Review Schedule, what's taken place is that SDG&E filed an original CPCN application December 14th, 2005. Then they filed an amended application and a Proponent's Environmental Assessment, a PEA, on August 4th, 2006. The Notice of Intent to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement, the EIS, was published in the Federal Register on August 31st, 2006. Now we have sent out a Notice of Preparation for the EIR, the NOP, which started on September 15th, 2006. The public scoping for the EIR/EIS closes on October 20th. And the thing that we don't know at this point right now is the actual release of the Draft EIR/EIS and the Final certification. There is some analysis and information that's being assessed, so we don't have those dates yet, but hopefully will soon. When we know those dates, we're going to go ahead and send out a card to everybody on our CEQA/NEPA mailing list that will indicate those dates. So that's where we are at that point.

Okay. I want to turn it over to BLM at this point.

MR. ZALE: Thank you. My name is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are here representing the El Centro field office of the Bureau of Land Management. BLM is involved in this process because San Diego Gas & Electric filed an application for right-of-way crossing public lands. There are about 33 miles of public lands involved.

In addition, we've listed on the slide behind me Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. When the patent was issued for the Park in the 1930s, it included reservation for an existing power line right-of-way. There's some discussion or consideration about what role BLM might play in the issuing of a right-of-way grant for those lands as well that we're still working on. In addition to issuing a grant as part of this process, we will be required to amend the land use plan for this area, which is the California Desert Conservation Area Plan that was written back in 1980. And the requirement for a plan amendment is to propose a line that deviates from the designated utility corridors.

In addition to working on the federal side in complying with NEPA, BLM will be responsible for conducting government-to-government consultation for interested tribes. BLM will also have the lead in consulting with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

MS. LEE: One of the other responsibilities that the lead agencies have under NEPA/CEQA is preparing this environmental document in a way that serves the needs of all the other agencies that need to issue permits on this project. There are many, many of them. We listed just a few of them here. In our scoping process we have approached each one of these agencies with a copy of the NOP and asked them to give us comments and tell us what information we need to include in this document and to let us know what their concerns are about the project itself. So we've met with some of them. We're meeting with more and we'll have an ongoing discussion with these agencies over the next month or two.

The computer just went blank. Okay. You should have in front of you the handouts for this presentation, so let's pretend you're looking at the slide of the flow chart. The EIR/EIS process is shown in a flow chart in the handout. In the second box there's a shaded box that says "EIR/EIS scoping." The purpose of this flow chart is just to let you know that despite the fact that SDG&E has been here many times over the past year or so to hear your input and work on their project, for our project per the EIR/EIS this is the very beginning step. We're here to hear your comments so we can start work on the project, define what the alternatives are, evaluate the impact and look for mitigation measures. So the little flow chart and the handout there show what the other steps we'll be going through are. I'll talk about those just briefly.

We will be preparing a project description and looking at alternatives. I'll talk a little more in detail about alternatives because we know that's a really important issue. We will be back here after the draft EIR/EIS is issued. We'll be back here to hear public comments. We'll likely have a workshop to make sure everyone understands what the concerns are and what's included in the document. There will be a 90-day public comment period, as Tom mentioned. Then the Final EIR/EIS will be issued.

The slide following the flow chart is the one that talks about the general contents and purpose of the EIR/EIS. This is really an overview just to give you a sense of the type of information that's included. We'll have a very detailed description of the setting, which is what is the environment setting right now, what the biological resources are, what the land uses are, how far away are the homes from the right-of-way. We'll address the impacts both of the project and of the alternatives that are included in the environmental report and we'll present mitigation measures that result from the impact analysis.

The purpose of environmental document is really twofold. No. 1 is to give the two lead agencies, the CPUC and the BLM, the information they need to make a decision on the process on the project itself. And No. 2 is to allow the public to know what the impacts are and be able to provide input into the process.

So in order to do that, the major elements of the EIS/EIR are presented on that next slide. One of the reasons we include that and the slide next to that, which is the one showing the environmental disciplines, is so you know the kinds of comments that would be helpful to us when you're presenting spoken comments. If you have concerns about any of the disciplines that are listed on that environmental disciplines slide, such as visual impacts or biology or social resources, comments on those would be really helpful to us on the EIR/EIS process.

The next couple of slides deal with alternatives. This we know is a really important issue. As you may have heard, the CPUC Commissioner Dian Grueneich and the Administrative Law Judge were here on the 13th of September. The Commissioner specifically asked SDG&E to provide information on an alternative that did not pass through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, so that was actually supplied to the Commission yesterday. We just got a copy of it last night. I think there was an article in the paper today. It's very clear that an alternative analysis for this project needs to be very thorough and detailed.

The process that we use to look at alternatives under the NEPA/CEQA requirements is that an alternative must meet three main criteria. No. 1, an alternative must be consistent with most of the project objectives, not all of them. No. 2, it must be able to reduce or avoid the impacts of the proposed project. No. 3, it must be feasible, which is to say you have to be able to build it and get the permits that are required to build it. So those are our guiding principles in looking at alternatives. We're looking at a very wide range.

The next slide called "Alternatives Analysis" list the sources of information that we'll look at for alternatives. The types of alternatives we'll look at include route alternatives, or what are the different ways to provide energy into San Diego. The route that San Diego Gas & Electric has proposed is a start and we'll look at other ways, such as what the commissioner suggested, which is go around the park.

There are generation alternatives. As you probably know, there is new generation proposed within San Diego, the South Bay Power Plant, other power plants that are expected to be upgraded in

the future, so we'll look at that. And we'll relook at the alternatives that SDG&E originally proposed but did not pursue. So we look at all of these independently with our own experts.

When the EIR/EIS is finished, the CPUC and the BLM need to make decisions and they have different processes for this. The CPUC itself is made up of five members of the commission who are appointed by the Governor. They will ultimately need to vote on the approval of the project through the process that Billie already described.

The BLM also has a process that's different. After the final EIR/EIS, they have a 30-day comment period on the final. Then they have a Governor's Consistency Review and that's to prepare the Record of Decision.

I will now turn this back to Lewis for scoping comments.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. I have a unique vantage point, I could see the fan stop turning on the other projector and when it does that it overheats and automatically turns itself off. You're going to get it up just in time for my last slide, aren't you? That's good.

That slide is actually a reiteration that this point in time is the scoping period. The Draft document has not been prepared by the agencies and by the environmental consultant. The most useful scoping comments that you can provide us, again, identify the location and extent of environmental impacts that you perceive could result from the proposed project, and recommend alternatives that would avoid or reduce impacts of the proposed project. So hopefully you've come prepared to do that.

We have, as I said, five speaker slips right now, maybe more will come forward in time. As you probably know this is the first of two meetings. There is another one this evening. I'm sure there will be more people showing up for that.

We are using a standard time limit of three minutes for speakers. I have a very high tech way of letting you know when your time is up. When there is one minute left, I'll put up my index finger like this. That will allow you to find a comfortable way to wrap up. When your three minutes are up, I'll put my fist up like this.

Now, we want to run through all the speakers so that everyone gets an equal chance in the beginning. Given that there are a relatively small number of speakers, what we will be able to do at that point is anybody who wants to come back up when I call second helping, can go ahead and do that. So there's no need to rush through your comments if you feel like you need more than three minutes tonight.

As you probably have noticed, seated to my left is a court reporter. She's busy typing away everything that's said through the public address system. She's going to be keeping and making a verbatim transcript of this meeting for us. She's pretty fast, but if you get going really fast, she won't be able to keep up with you, so keep that in mind.

I will actually just call names so you know what order you're in and that way you'll be prepared to come up when it's your turn. If you don't mind using this microphone up there so she can hear you clearly. I'm seeing a gentleman holding his hand up in the back. That's difficult because I don't know if everyone is going to hear you. Is there something I can help you with, sir?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Will there be a point at which people can ask --



MR. MICHAELSON: He just got to the next thing I was going to say. Thank you. After we've taken all the comments, then we will have an opportunity for people to ask questions for clarification. I want to be clear about that. What I mean is if you want to ask questions about whether the impacts are "X" or "Y," they're not there yet. Obviously they have to be questions that they can answer at this stage of the process. Hopefully that should be things like the nature of the proposed project or what are the types of issues that they anticipate looking at, things like that. So to the degree it is a question answerable at this stage, they will make every attempt to do that.

So the names that I have, and I apologize in advance if I'm mispronouncing, Eric Larson, Mimi Limerez, Peter Schultz, Jim Davis and Diane Conklin. And, again, if you have lengthy comments, you can always hand them in as written comments. And up first is Eric Larson. I have another speaker right here. Thank you. I'm sorry, I have six, Paul Tarr, and Sharon Lynch. All right.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. LARSON: Thank you. I'm Eric Larson, Director of the San Diego County Farm Bureau. And in my comments today we have three direct CEQA concerns on the proposal. First, that NEPA would propose alternate routes to convert farmland to non-agricultural use to the physical structures of power substations and exclusion of cattle from grazing areas.

Our second CEQA concern is that the project will lead to changes in the existing environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Specifically the conversion occurs when land is no longer suitable for grazing, because cattle are physically excluded or shy away from grazing land because of added human activity. When cattle no longer use the land, it will not be farmland and, therefore, converted.

Third, while attention to scenic vistas has been concentrated on the Anza-Borrego State Park, the open farming grazing lands of the county create visual character that is a community asset and worth protection.

We believe the EIR should assess impact to agriculture on all route proposals, including visual, direct impact to agriculture, and indirect impact on the economical farming that could lead to financial losses for farmers and ranchers.

Then finally as an alternative we believe priority should be placed on alternatives as a way to keep the county's agricultural resources. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Next speaker is Mimi Limerez.

MS. LIMEREZ: My name is Mimi Limerez. I'm representing the People's Powerlink and the sustainable Julian Group. We have a single message for the California Public Utilities Commission. The project submitted by SDG&E in this application is not the real project being planned by SDG&E and its parent company Sempra. The real project being planned by these companies is a project that stretches from the SDG&E plant in Mexico to the Los Angeles area. There is ample evidence for this. If you need to see the evidence for yourself, we refer you to the People Powerlink website at [www.peoplespowerlink.org](http://www.peoplespowerlink.org) where you can view a movie using Google Earth that shows the enormous massive degeneration system and its associated transmission lines connecting to the El Centro Substation from which Sunrise Powerlink originates.

In addition to the impacts to the environment, our state parks, to the lives of all the residence affected by the route of this line, perhaps the greatest impact is on our integrity. Democracy is served best when in the light of honesty. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Peter Schultz.

MR. SCHULTZ: I'm speaking on behalf of Starlight Mountain Estates owners, a group of owners of property that is just east of San Diego Country Estates in the application's segment 10P and it's on your map Figure 5A. I'll give you just a -- we filed a protest on September 8th, and so I'm going to give you just a brief summary of that.

Essentially we're simply asking that the overhead facility that's proposed in the application be instead an underground facility for just 6/10ths of a mile from the point that SDG&E is proposing to go from underground to overhead.

And a quick summary of the reasons. We feel it's discriminatory against the owners in our community, because the same justification that applies in the PEA to taking it underground through Mount Gower, an open space preserve, are precisely the conditions that we have in our community. The visual impacts would be roughly three times the current impact of the 69 kV line that's running through our valley. We have reduced fire management and fire protection. And also topography in our valley is actually more conducive to an inexpensive construction of underground as opposed to the adjacent area.

Damage to property. They're asking for 200 feet width as opposed to a 60-foot width. And then we have issues with ELF, MEF, fear by the public and substantial aesthetic damage.

Now, according to the CEQA guidelines, the negative impact in a number of areas is substantial adverse effect is scenic vistas, substantially damaging scenic resources, substantially degrading an existing visual character, providing farm and unique farmland because of our soils type there to nonuse in a biological substantial adverse affect through habitat modification, substantially affecting the movement of native and resident migratory species, especially birds. We have a wide variety of Rafterns, falcons, hawks, Golden Eagles, and so on that hunt in this valley. And an overhead facility will impair their ability to live what they would think is a normal life.

MR. MICHAELSON: Mr. Schultz, your three minutes is up. You can come back if you want. Thank you. Thanks very much.

Jim Davis.

MR. DAVIS: My name is Jim Davis. I'm a rancher from Mesa Grande, Santa Ysabel area. I have some concerns that I would like to have addressed. One is I don't understand why SDG&E wants to build this powerlink prior to the approval of the renewable energy plant Sterling Energy is proposing to build. It seems to me that they're putting the cart before the horse.

The second issue is the Santa Ysabel area and basically all this back country is an open space area where the residence of San Diego County move every weekend. On the roads you'll see hundreds and hundreds of cars coming into this area to enjoy the open spaces, the agricultural endeavors that are going on, and this power line will basically reduce their ability to enjoy these open spaces.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Diane Conklin is next.

MS. CONKLIN: My name is Diane Conklin and I'm representing Mussey Grade Road Alliance, which is located here in Ramona. The alliance was formed in 1999 to preserve and protect Mussey Grade Road, which is a historic road recognized by the State for Preservation Office.

Along with many other groups in the county, the collation of CUSP, Communities United for Sensible Power, and I'm also speaking with recognition to that collation.

I'm going to speak and I hope to come back because I don't want to rush. Thank you for the opportunity to have this meeting here in Ramona. We have become very popular during this process and we hope that you like us and will come back here, right here in the Charles Nunn Performing Arts Center, for your post EIR/EIS written or draft sessions.

I will be augmenting my comments with specific comments that will be emailed to you by the deadline of October 20th. But I did want to tell you, and you may have heard this from other people, but none of us have received a hard copy of the PEA, which is over 1,000 pages. And we only have one copy in the library. This makes it extremely difficult for people to intelligently comment, particularly in the quite speeded up process by which you need comments by 10/20. So if you have any way to ask the company to get copies to individuals who request them, we would appreciate that. And I would like to ask you to request a copy for me, Diane Conklin, the Mussey Grade Road Alliance, because I haven't been able to get one.

I would like to talk in this order about project alternatives. the CPUC development of alternatives, and the overall problem with this line.

What does that mean?

MR. MICHAELSON: That means you have one minute.

THE WITNESS: My goodness. Well, I'm going to come back up a couple of times.

SDG&E has stated the reliability with locals and lowering costs is the basis of this line. I'd like to point out as you well know that all of these lines come out of the El Centro Substation and that is in itself a reliability problem, but SDG&E has never talked about that. They only talk about the fact that they don't want to use the southwest corridor because of reliability. They don't talk about all of these lines emanating from El Centro.

As far as the renewables, I would like to talk about the Sterling Engine prototype. It is not a working example of a new and yet proven technology. And it might interest you and everyone else here to know the spokesperson for SDG&E was talking about -- excuse me, the spokesperson for Sterling is Bud Shop who used to work for SDG&E. And so that's a problem for me.

The third issue of lowering costs for electricity consumer, SDG&E Sempra according to UCAN stands to make one million dollars in the financing alone. I'll come back. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you for understanding that.

Paul Tarr.

Do you mind, I think it's easier if she can see you, so if you wouldn't mind putting it back where it was. Just makes it easier for her to do the transcript. Thank you.

MR. TARR: My name is Paul Tarr. These folks, a lot of them probably know what I look like anyway. And I'm a property owner, I'm a real estate broker, business degree.

I have a lot of problems. I'm going to try to stick to environmental, but the primary problem I have right now with the CPUC's process is that right from the beginning they were clear that they were in the process, the steps that they were going to take, that they would approve the project prior to the actual final route selection.

When they were here the last time in their order of slides they made that clear again. If that's the case, then the environmental review is not really relevant. So I'm going to make that statement right up front, because that slide was in their presentation the last time they were here.

Private property rights, the impact environmentally. A lot of large ranches and tracts that are fairly remote have been in families for generations are going to be heavily impacted by this. And I hope that this environmental -- the scope of this is going to go into some great detail with the environmental issues of those particular pieces of property, because it's simple to run something through one piece of property that's large. It's a lot easier to do that than to run it through many smaller pieces, so I understand the route selection.

Fire considerations. I haven't heard anything on fire considerations. I haven't heard the fire department. I haven't heard the Forestry Department. I haven't heard anybody chime in on this problem of fire about the fire considerations. They're enormous out here.

Infrastructure versus commerce. My final thought -- I've got a couple of thoughts on this, infrastructure building a local facility for power. When you build power lines, it's commerce. They're a battery. You can draw up the battery at any point. What will happen is Mexico's going to realize they have a much larger market in that fuel, petroleum fuel burning plants that they have down there for power generation is going to expand. My recommendation is that a tariff be put on that power so that it's only an emergency power resource for times on the grid when the controller needs that power and to be bought at a premium to SDG&E. And that tariff be used to build infrastructure in San Diego County.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. And, again, keep in mind that there are two ways to provide comments, written and oral. And you will have a second chance to come back if you want to expand on your comments. The last speaker I have a speaker card for is Sharon Lynch.

MS. LYNCH: Good afternoon. I'm a citizen of Ramona. And I live at High Oaks Ranch, which is just off of Dye Road in Ramona. It's a community of about 100 families. And I have concerns regarding aesthetics, quality of life, and also wildlife, just like Mr. Schultz was talking about his area, which has birds and wildlife also in our area has that.

I'm concerned about quality of life, because one of the sections of this powerlink I can see right outside my kitchen window. It will be about two football fields away from me. And I'm concerned about the corona effect, the noise. And I'm retired and would like to enjoy my retirement. And most of the people in our community are also retired. These lines are going to be over two, two -- twice as long or twice as big as the original. And, as I said, I can see them right outside my kitchen window.

On the map my section that is aboveground there's actually two portions, just to the west of N27 there's a section where the lines go into a gully, which may not be so much of a problem. It may be further away. But the section directly west of N27, which is aboveground, it's a small section like Mr. Schultz was talking about of his community of homes and I would like to see an alternative of having the powerlink of underground in that particular section, because I don't think it's necessary. It's such a small area that has to be aboveground in that area.

We think that our community of 100 families is just as important as Rancho Penasquitos and Country Estates. And SDG&E gave them consideration to put their power lines underground and we would ask that they would give consideration to that in this area also.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker card that has been handed to me is Don Larson.

MR. LARSON: My name is Don Larson. I'm a resident of Ramona. The Warner Springs Airport is located approximately five miles north of the proposed 500, 250 kV substation also in the Lake Henshaw Valley. This airport is an internationally recognized glider base and destination. Glider pilots routinely fly over the area of the proposed project. Clearly the addition of 100 miles of steel cables 120 feet in the air constitutes a new and additional hazard for any glider pilot attempting an off field landing. Please explore the safety impact to the existing glider usage of this area.

Also, the visual impact of the project in the Lake Henshaw Valley will not be positive in supporting glider activity in the region. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. For those of you who would like to add to your comments, if you want to come up to the microphone here, please do.

Would you like to come up here? Sure.

MR. TRAFECANTY: I'm Dennis Trafecanty from Santa Ysabel. And I was at El Centro yesterday. I know you know that. I wanted to touch on a few things. Are we off the three-minute thing?

MR. MICHAELSON: No, because this is your first helping.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Okay. Let me just talk for three minutes about something that will be kind of fun. My little wife over there and I we've decided that we are going to counteract an SDG&E advertising campaign. Now, I don't have as much money as SDG&E, neither does my wife, but there's a lot of people here in this community that are probably going to appreciate our little campaign.

You will notice on our property a sign that's says -- and we're probably going to move that sign because it's not close enough to the highway, but it says "Blue sky or cold steel." Another one says, "Enjoy the view before it's gone." And then another one says, that was put up last weekend, I hope you see it before you go back, maybe on your way to Anza-Borrego. It's on the way, Highway 79 north. And it was more appropriately placed with a contractor who built our home who used his own employee and himself to help put it up, because I'm a finance guy and when I try to mess around with things, I lose fingers. I'm not a contractor, but he helped us. One side of the sign says, "Aren't parks forever?" And the other part of the sign says park lines -- "Park Lands or Power Lines."

And we're now contemplating our next investment, which is going to be a sign on 79, something that will say -- I don't know if some of you were here for the hearing when there was a lady out there in a wolf custom. One side of the sign will say, "Beauty or the Beast."

And my wife and I are going to go home tonight and decide what the other sign is going to say. And thank you, but I don't even need that extra minute because I'm going to come back.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. So first person, and if you would just again for the court reporter give us your name again before you start.

MS. CONKLIN: Diane Conklin. I did not mean to turn my back to you. It's terrible to sit out there and see people's backs. Could we move it there and we could see everybody?

MR. MICHAELSON: I prefer that you do it there, because I know that you're here with your community, but these people have come from a long ways away to hear you speak to them.

MS. CONKLIN: Okay.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks.

MS. CONKLIN: Diane Conklin, Mussey Grade Alliance. I wanted to go back to the one billion in profits in terms of quoting the paper on this project. And that is an estimate that UCAN has spoken about publicly. That's the interest that Californians would end up paying on this line, so it's quite a -- it's quite a money-making operation from the very get-go.

Now, I'd like to take in reverse order my own concerns regarding the overall problem with this line. This includes the real possibility, and I know you've heard this before, but that this line will carry a power generated in Mexico. And that area is not covered by the environmental review. Now, we know that there are people who are deeply engaged in that whole subject area, and I'm not going to go into it because they're the experts and I'm not. But there is the obvious concern that you can't prove a negative, so if SDG&E says we are not going to produce power in Mexico and put it on this line, it's very difficult for them to prove a negative. And then after the CPUC process is over, what will happen when they put power on this line generating from Mexico.

And, of course, the reason people are interested in that issue is because the whole environmental scoping process is jinxed. If you cross an international border with a project, you don't have any control of what happens on the other side of the border. And the reason that people are really interested in these possibilities, not because they have secret ideas about the company, but because SDG&E, Sempra SDG&E is building one of the largest liquid natural gas facilities in Baja, so -- it won't stay in Baja, I don't think. So it's going to be used. And the idea is that they will build gas lines as well as produce electricity both coming into the United States and one of them coming -- one of them -- the ways it would come in terms of electricity would be this plan for Sunrise Powerlink.

Of course, the issue of the Sunrise portion of it is in question because of the seemingly infeasibility of Sterling Engines and whether they really would work. They have six prototypes now and they want to bring them up to a thousands by 2010, so nobody knows quite how they'll do this.

This other issue is this is not an issue of roots, I would like to say that it's not an issue of roots alone, but on the issue that the line is really for other reasons. And that the line starts if you look at the map at Central Substation, ostensibly because Sterling Engines would be out in the desert, and ends essentially at the Warner Substation. It has to come back down. It goes up north and it has to come back down to go out to San Diego. It's a really strange dogleg from the new Warner Substation from the border to the coast. So it looks like the tail is wagging the dog. Is that just to make us feel that this is for San Diego County when, in fact, Warner is pointing north.

Then the line when it does cross over, and I know you're aware of this, but when it does cross over to San Diego County goes through up to five open space preserves. These preserves were established, some of them, under the Multiple Species Conservation Program, which was a pilot program here in San Diego County, which was signed off by the feds and the state and the county to preserve open space as mitigation for development. So now we have the potential of having the very land that was bought to mitigate development in other areas being developed itself as an industrial corridor.

The other issue I wanted to talk about was the development of alternatives. We hope, and I noted in your materials you are going to look at alternatives including in-base generation. And we really hope you sincerely look at that. And, of course, you're aware of the 2030 energy plan stressing

in-base generation and local support for electricity, because it makes us stronger to have our supply be local.

I ask you on behalf of the alliance to please look at the rooftop solar and the comparison of costs between rooftop solar to the suggested 1.3 billion dollar cost of this line. Now, SDG&E has come up with these figures, like 23 billion dollars to come up with the same amount of electricity that the rooftop solar would incur in terms of cost versus the line. And yet they're only talking about 300 megawatts that they need. So I don't understand that, and maybe you could help us figure that out in terms of your discussions of generation alternatives and including rooftop solar generation.

The other point is that of the 2030 energy plan, which was arrived at with the San Diego Association of Governments, does have at Point No. 5, and I'm sorry to say things you already know, but I need to do it. That Point No. 5 is for transmission. And SDG&E will often talk about transmission, as you know one of the points, one of the suggestions of the report, therefore, Sunrise Powerlink is perfectly okay. But, you know, this transmission recommendation at Point No. 5 is a recommendation that is less emphasized in the report, if you read it completely, than the other kinds of recommendations involved in in-base generation. And I understand it was a political compromise, because SDG&E sat on the committee that wrote the report. So obviously it was in their interest to have a transmission recommendation.

Finally, regarding the no conduct alternative. The alliance would expect the commission to fully develop this alternative. Based on the many problems with this potential line, not the least of which is the potential to be the source of ignition for wild fires.

Now, if you look at the Cedar Fire route, you will see that the line actually follows some of the very path of the Cedar Fire route, actually the most important portion, because the fire gathered in strength as it crossed the county. And it was -- just so I have you understand what it means to us who lived through it, and certainly Ramona lived through it, it was the largest wild fire in the history of the state, covering some 280,000 acres, over 2400 homes and structures were destroyed. Thousands of people were dislocated and to this day many of those have not been able to rebuild, so it has changed communities. My own community lost 107 homes. It destroyed in its path some 80 percent it's estimated, you can find the actual percentages, verify it, of a wild fire in the area that it -- that it ran through. And that it also burned to a crisp many of the open spaces that SDG&E would like to run through.

The issue for us -- I moved to Ramona the 1999 from overseas and I had never been in Southern California in my life. And when I went to Ramona, the Triple A people would not insure our house and they said it was too much of a risk. Then I went to National Geographic and I found a little flame on Ramona on a map which says fire. We're known for fire. Then I realized that we actually have a problem. The fire went through our area as well. We saved our house, but by very, very extensive work previously done. I'll give you that in the written comments.

The bottom line is that fire is something we live with, but we don't want to have extensive fires started in the back country that can't be handled as the Cedar Fire was unable to be contained. And then have as a point of ignition towers in the very areas where these ignitions would cause the most damage and danger.

It is extraordinary to think that SDG&E would suggest putting this line through the path of the Cedar Fire from the Mount Cuyamaca area to Sycamore Canyon Preserve and Sycamore Canyon



Substation. So I wanted you to look at that very carefully. People's lives have changed. We live with fires, but we don't want another source of ignition. And I thank you for your extra time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Who else would like to come back up?

MR. SCHULTZ: Peter Schultz for Starlight Mountain Estate Owners. The checklist that you have here -- this isn't prepared. The negative impact on the areas on your checklist are numerous for us in our community. It's actually too numerous to elaborate here in this session. But the area of quality of life is very subjective, it's very personal and difficult to define as far as impact. But to corroborate with what Ms. Conklin was just saying, our community and the community that we've described in our protest is within the Cedar Fire burn area. And even though we only lost a couple of structures in our community, the rest of it was turned into ash. And my wife and I were trapped on our property. Even though we have three CDF units stationed in our little valley, we were trapped on the property. And I watched 200 acres burn to ash, to just dust within 20 minutes because of the capacity of that fire.

Now, our primary responder, the captain of our primary response unit for fire has stated that with overhead facility in our valley, aircrafts will be literally impossible or ineffective because of the height to avoid the power lines. And that no crews are likely to be allowed in our valley because of the proximity of the power lines. So just to add that.

And, again, taking the line underground will mitigate the adverse effect in all of these different areas on your checklist.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Anyone else? Yes, sir.

MR. TARR: I think all of us appreciate the opportunity to come up and address a lot of these concerns, because they're close to us, we're watching this process, it's moving very quickly towards the side of the project.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can I just get you to state your name.

MR. TARR: Okay. It's Paul Tarr and I'm a resident in Ramona, property owner. And I see this as an opportunity to import more power. And I see this as an opportunity to move power more than to supply power for the San Diego area. And that gets away from the environmental aspect of it, but my understanding is that SDG&E -- right now the only block from the Carlsbad project, which they want to build a 640 megawatt facility next to the old fuel burning facility is SDG&E's commitment to buy power from them. And SDG&E is then withholding that. And I'm having a hard time understanding why.

I think when the whole big picture gets put together, it looks like there's a lot of business behind this power line. And a lot of environmental concerns that are going to get run over, so I would expect this environmental study that you're looking into, because you're going through enormously sensitive environmental land, a lot of it to get here.

The last point that I wanted to make was if this was about green power and solar power, and when I first moved here, I built a solar power system. We were off the grid. I understand it. I like it. And it is a renewable source. Sterling is talking about building not only I guess wind generated by a solar farm on some property that is out there and I guess it is an enormous project and something on the

scope of a square mile. But it's not there and I don't see the process with environmental review and I don't see the wheels turning for that project, yet I see infrastructure being built. Historically infrastructure never proceeds crisis. I don't see that they're getting ready to build that project. And I don't believe that project is going to get built because it's an enormous project and it would be started now.

My request would be that if this power -- because this is advertised as being Sunrise Powerlink, this is advertised as SD -- well, not SDG&E, but the CPUC's ability to transport green power to San Diego, but I don't see the project starting.

I think that my request and a reasonable request would be to require that the project be brought on line at the same time this project was being built. And without that I don't think this project has validity. And I think that the whole guise that is being represented as green power might not be as truthful a representation of it as it could be.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is there anyone who hasn't spoken yet already? We said we would save time for question and answer. If you want to make a comment, I want to finish all of those and then we'll go into Q and A. If you haven't filled out one of these already and you feel like you want to say something. Just come up here to the microphone, sir. Give us your name, give us your comments, and then I'll ask if you don't mind filling one of these out. Thank you.

MR. BREMER: My name is John Bremer. I'm a resident of Mesa Grande Road, one of Jim Davis' neighbors. I am energy independent from SDG&E, so this -- this is going to affect me, but it's not going to give me an opportunity to use some of their nice power. I -- I think -- I think this whole thing is very simple and it made a giant circus of this whole thing. If we were to allow SDG&E to count all the renewable power that is generated on individual rooftops as part of their 20 percent for their renewable mandate, that would allow them to have their renewable without this operation in the desert that doesn't even exist. If they support or if somebody supports Encina, South Bay retrofits so that they can come on line with cleaner greener power that they can make, their infrastructure already exists and there will be no more power lines. The power line that comes from the desert, 130 plus miles of lines through some of the prettiest country in Southern California. The losses in power from the source to their destination will be incredible. The amount that they're going to generate in the desert is going to just evaporate by the time it gets to the beach. And being on solar power I understand a little bit about how it works.

If they can come on line with their Stirling generators, at best their only going to work seven hours a day. How many hours are left in the day that they won't have anything generated from the power? The geothermal is not developed. It doesn't exist in a commercial amount that they haven't proven yet. They're just now starting to put wells in to see if they can use this. So the things that they want to do only work for less than a third of the day, so you're going to tell me that this line is going to just sit with no power running through it for the rest of the day, I don't think so. I think it's going to come from other sources.

The terrain that this runs through out in the desert and into the Ranchita area and over into Warner Springs and Mesa Grande Road is pretty much indefensible and inaccessible to fire trucks and whatnot when they get a fire in there because the roads will be closed off. There are only three access roads to the whole area.

The ultimate routes that they've proposed seem convoluted and don't make sense so that they will be discounted without proper consideration. It seems to me by just looking at a map if I were to follow Highway 8 all the way up to the point where it connects to the 67 and run over to their power plant, they wouldn't have to go across any virgin grounds. And that's about all I can think of.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Someone else? Sure, come on up. If I could ask you to fill out a speaker card on your way out.

I just need your name.

MS. BREMER: Phyllis Bremer, resident of Mesa Grande, also on solar power. Two things, I attended the solar conference in San Diego last week. I might just point out that the attendance has doubled from the year previous. And Commissioner Dian Grueneich was there and well received, but it just goes to show you how many people are interested in alternatives.

My second is a question to you to explain how you conduct your environmental review? Do you send biologists out to the field, do you do it via helicopter, do you take whatever we've submitted and contact the property owners? And so I'd like you to explain that, please.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Can I suggest we go to the Q and A session. Do you want to start answering questions or did you want to take a break? We're coming up so close on the 6:00 hour anyway to prepare for the 7:00.

Is there anyone here who had additional comments that they wanted to give? Let's go ahead and do those and then we'll go into the Q and A.

MS. LYNCH: Sharon Lynch from Ramona High Oaks Ranch. Diane Conklin just jogged something in my memory. My husband and I moved from Chicago in 2002 and were subjected to the Cedar Fire in 2003 and had never experienced anything like that in our lives. It was just totally horrifying to see this fire come down the power lines, the hill outside my kitchen window, just following those power lines, coming up toward our house just before we evacuated. And I hope to never see this again. And it's even more dangerous with higher lines. And the only way that they could get to these lines is by that retardant and flying the planes, so it was really rather scary and I hope never to experience this again. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. TRAFECANTY: John Bremer and Jim Davis remember those winds that we had in Santa Ysabel over 100 miles an hour and would those power lines withstand that? I was going to offer these pictures. My wife is making a picture --

MR. MICHAELSON: Can you state your name?

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty from Santa Ysabel. Common spelling for Trafecanty.

My wife is making an album, because I truly believe that the application that was submitted by SDG&E had people taking pictures from a road like this, so that you could really not see what the beauty is of this area. And I know you're driving around. I was going to offer to let you see the pictures. This is a panoramic view of Santa Ysabel Valley last Sunday. And there's information on the back or maybe at dinner time you could just take these and bring them back so we could put them in our album to send to you, give us something to look at.

And, also, an article on our Bald Eagles in Lake Henshaw. I know you heard about it, but I was going to hand these to you and give you a chance to see Santa Ysabel in the springtime. We've got the golden Santa Ysabel now. But, see, the power line would go right through these pictures, so that's what I wanted you to look at.

I know you're anxious to get this part of the meeting ended, but I want to read one section about fires because you heard it a little bit, and I did give this to the court reporter in El Centro yesterday. But the myth is the proposed Sunrise Powerlink proposes no fire hazards through San Diego back country. The facts are, according to Gary Boland, fire chief of Innermountain Volunteer Fire and Rescue Department, the proposed power lines could present adverse fire response conditions in three ways. Now this is a fire official, it's not me. A, access. If Santa Ana wind conditions along confined areas within some canyons, access to some of the residence structures would be hampered or prevented in conditions such as those we experienced in the 2003 Cedar Fire. Second item, B, defensible space. In some areas of alignment of the power lines restricts the potential to create effective fire breaks between surrounding natural brush and structures. C, attack. The height of the proposed towers would probably prevent effective operation from CDF airtakers in some areas due to the maximum altitude limits for effective retardant payload and relative close proximity of the lines to some residences.

One final thing, because I know we've got to get out of here, Santa Ysabel right at the intersection there is a heliport for emergencies. And there's two times when the Life Flight helicopters come in. Once is usually Sunday morning when they want to get some donuts at Dudley's Bakery, but the other time is to handle emergency response. And they're in and out of there especially on weekends all the time. And I fear for them if there's large power lines around Santa Ysabel Valley, which is the area where these pictures are. Thank you very much. I'll just hand these to you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Has every one spoken that wanted to speak tonight? I just wanted to make sure. If so, then let's go ahead and take some time for questions.

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. CONKLIN: Diane Conklin. Again, I just wanted to ask a couple of questions. I realize you're taking questions and then you will answer them all at once. The first question is will the transcript that she's doing be made public on your website so we can see, register what each other has said? The second one is, can we invite you to come to our area while you're in town? Mine is very steep, rugged mountains and valleys. No. 3, can we submit pictures to you? And, No. 4, could you explain to us the effect of overriding considerations on the EIR process?

MS. LEE: On the question of the transcript: We certainly could put them on the website. We will be preparing a Scoping Report that will include copies of all the comments that are submitted and it will include transcripts of the public meetings. We'll be preparing that during the month of November and we'll have the report itself on the website. These oral comments definitely will be in the report along with all the written comments.

Thank you for the invitation to see your area. We have a large team of environmental specialists that are going to be working on this project who will be all over this area.

This actually ties back to an earlier question that somebody asked about biology, it was mainly in terms of how are we gathering the data. SDG&E has had biologists out doing surveys of the route for the last several months. Our biology team has been tracking with them the areas that they have finished, the areas that they haven't yet been to because they haven't gotten access permission, and

areas that they weren't able to get to for topographical reasons. What we normally do is field-allocate what they've done to make sure that what their biologists did we think is correct. We will do our own surveys of alternatives, because unless SDG&E has done it, and they haven't done too many surveys of alternatives, and we have to start from scratch on alternatives.

Let's see, submitting pictures with comments, absolutely. It would be easiest for us if you could submit them electronically. If you have them electronically please pdf them, but you can submit photos as well and we'll scan them and make them part of this scoping report.

Overriding considerations: the Environmental Impact Report will make a statement about whether or not there are significant impacts, so if the EIR/EIS determines that there are significant and unmitigable impacts in any geographic area and the CPUC decides to approve the project regardless, they're required by CEQA to include in the approval document, as Ms. Conklin referenced, a statement of overriding considerations. This says why we are approving this project even though it has significant impacts. So it's a requirement of CEQA. It allows a lead agency to approve a project that does have significant impacts, but it basically forces them to explain why.

MR. MICHAELSON: Do you want to talk about the difference between that and the NEPA process? It's not a similar piece. Let me hand this down to you.

MR. ZALE: Well, that is correct, that there isn't a similar piece to that required by NEPA, but the BLM would be issuing a decision that will include the decision rationale.

MS. BLANCHARD: I would just like to add one more thing. As far as the transcripts, we have a website for CPUC for the project. I was talking with a consultant today as far as the need to go ahead and upload our data requests, the response to data requests, anything that we're doing, scoping reports, information that we're receiving from people in the transcript. We'll go ahead and do that.

But I also understand there's a need for people in certain communities to have hard copies of things. So we will go ahead and make available hard copies of the scoping reports and other things, because we understand that not everybody has access to computers.

MR. MICHAELSON: Would anyone else like to come up to the microphone and ask a question?

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty, Santa Ysabel. I wanted to ask Tom a question. Last time I heard Buzz from Stirling Energy speak, he said -- he made it sound like the BLM was working very closely with them in their efforts to build these 36,000 solar. I'd just like to hear whether or not that was accurate. That was before the San Diego County Board of Supervisors last week.

MR. ZALE: Well, we have had several meetings with the project proponents. At this point in time we are awaiting submittal of an application for right-of-way and plan of development that would go with that. I think at our last meeting they indicated that would be probably a time frame of January and February for submittal. We don't have any applications yet, but we have had some discussions.

MR. MICHAELSON: Tom, they were originally looking at several locations. Have you gotten to a point where a particular location at least has been narrowed down?

MR. ZALE: Yeah, the project proponents have indicated that there is about 6,000 acres, predominantly public lands, by Plaster City between Old Highway 80 and Interstate 8 that they're looking at.

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm just going to stand up here. Other questions? Just come up to the mike, that way we can get it on the record.

MR. BREMER: John Bremer from Santa Ysabel. I was wondering on the amendment to the CDCA plan, how is that process done? You say they need to amend the 1980 plan.

MR. ZALE: As part of the environmental analysis here, part of the proposed action would be to do an amendment that would designate a utility corridor along the proposed route and/or alternatives. That will be part of the analysis that is required by NEPA. That is the reason that the public comment period would be 90 days on the Draft as opposed to the normal shorter period.

MR. MICHAELSON: So BLM will be doing that as a part of this NEPA process.

Come on up.

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller, San Diego/Imperial County Sierra Club. I want to follow up on the CDCA plan amendment question. It's my understanding that Stirling Solar Plant would also require some new, and correct me if I'm wrong, some new 230 kV transmission line to get the power to whatever power line is going to be around. And I'm wondering, would that 230 kV line also require a utility corridor, and if so, would that utility corridor for the 230 kV for Stirling Solar also require an amendment for the California Desert Conservation Plan?

MR. ZALE: As we understand their proposal right now, they would use an existing corridor to the project site down to the substation paralleling the existing 500 kV line.

MS. FULLER: One more question on it. Thank you. My understanding of the 1980 California Desert Conservation Area Plan is it mentions that it is a national conservation area, and normally those are for conservations, but this one is kind of unique because it has some energy project in it and that plan states that there needs to be a balance for energy and for conservation. And I'm wondering how the BLM is going to find that balance? Do you have any ideas how you're going to do that for this utility corridor?

MR. MICHAELSON: Wow, that may be one of those questions that is not answerable at this point.

MR. ZALE: I'm not sure. Let's clarify, for which corridor, the proposal associated with this project?

MS FULLER: I think I mean for the Sunrise Powerlink, because it's my understanding it would need to go through an area of environmental concern and some things like that. So how do you balance those two things in a national conservation area?

MR. ZALE: You do an EIS. I mean, as we pointed out before, we're just at the beginning stage of this, so I mean, that is the whole purpose of going through this analysis is to identify what the impacts are and to make a decision based on that analysis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: Hi, Sharon Lynch again. I had been looking at the very detailed maps in the booklet that you provided and I have a couple of technical questions. This is Page IV dash P15, it's in the Ramona area, aboveground area. You have on a map something called "Proposed Structures." Are they just simply replacing taking out the old existing structure and putting in the proposed structure, or is this in addition to the existing structure?

MS. LEE: I believe that in the area these are in addition to the existing structures. There are many portions of this project where an existing line would be co-located on a new tower and the existing towers are taken away. I can verify this at the break if that's okay. I'm fairly certain that this is an area where the existing line would remain and the new one would be adjacent.

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm going to suggest that if we have an extremely specific location on a map, we do that at the break, if that's okay.

MS. LYNCH: This is more a general question. My neighbor has located on this map something called a pull site. What is a pull site?

MS. LEE: P-u-l-l. This is the site which after the towers are built, the conductors are pulled from one pole to another. It's a process in which they bring in a reel of the wire that actually hangs on the towers and they pull it usually over a span of several towers at a time, so they identify an area that's usually a larger distributed area right along the right-of-way and they bring in a couple of pickup trucks and pull the conductor across.

MS. LYNCH: So it's not permanent?

MS. LEE: No, it's a construction site only and would not be permanent.

MR. MICHAELSON: I fear we are near the reaches of our court reporter's fingers, so I think we've got about five more minutes she can hang in there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm with the County of San Diego. I believe we'll have an opportunity to talk with you later this week, so thank you for that.

My question is really more for my information prior to that meeting and I heard a lot of different input from the proponents and others about the project, what kinds of social impacts that would we have. My question for is what resource will you use that's not affiliated with any interested parties to determine what the actual impact would be in terms of power availability and socioeconomics impacts?

MS. LEE: Okay. That's a good question and project alternatives is often a challenging one because it requires a lot of speculation about what would happen if this project is not constructed. The team that we have includes engineering and transmission planning experts. They're on the EIR/EIS team, so we've got our own resources and we review information, including the SANDAG data, the reports that are there, the ongoing projects that are in permitting stages, including the South Bay Power Plant, the potential for Encina. It is definitely an issue we would like to have scoping comments on because it's not a simple answer to define what would happen in the absence of this project.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Any other questions?

Okay. If not, we're going to see if Billie and/or Tom have anything to say. I think what they would do is thank you very much for coming today. We may see some of you back at 7:00. If you could go out to stir up some more people and we appreciate you being here. And we're now adjourned. Thank you.

(Scoping meeting adjourned at 5:56 p.m.)