

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

Held 7:00 p.m. October 4, 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 8
Public Comments begin on page 9
Q&A begins on page 17

PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER

Kelly Fuller9
Kathleen Beck9, 14
Jim Lydick 10
David Lloyd 10
Diana Lindsay 11
Dennis Trafecanty 12

Q&A, BY SPEAKER

Elizabeth Broom..... 15, 16
Kelly Fuller..... 16
Diana Lindsay 17
Carolyn Dorroh..... 18
Dennis Trafecanty 18

STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. My name is Lewis Michaelson. Welcome to tonight's scoping meeting. I work for a firm called Katz & Associates and we've been hired to provide support to these public meetings and to provide neutral moderation services.

This meeting is being held to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act in which scoping is the beginning of the environmental review process.

Because some of you may be unfamiliar with this process, we want to be sure that we properly orient you to this meeting and what you can expect and where we are in the process. So after I finish going through the purpose of scoping, then Susan Lee, seated immediately to my right, with Aspen Environmental Group will give you a description of the proposed project. Billie Blanchard sitting next to her with the California Public Utilities Commission will talk about their process and schedule. And seated to her right are two representatives from the Bureau of Land Management, Lynda Kastoll and Tom Zale, who will talk about their aspect of this under the federal regulations and laws. And finally Susan Lee will provide a more detailed description of the EIR/EIS process. Then we will come to the most important part of the evening which will be your opportunity to provide comments to the agency officials and consultants who are here tonight.

I want to mention that we are at the scoping phase, which is the early part of the process of the EIR/EIS. The people here are not here to make decisions tonight, but they are here to listen firsthand to anything that you would like to offer.

I will mention that written comments are also extremely welcome and will provide the opportunity for much more detailed comments. They're given the same consideration as oral comments. So for those of you who are uncomfortable with public speaking, please do not feel left out by this process. We welcome any and all written comments.

The purpose of scoping, or why are we here: first, it is to inform you, the public and responsible agencies, about the upcoming project for which the EIR/EIS is being prepared. It's also an opportunity to inform you, the public, about the review process so you can understand where your opportunities lay to participate.

Then we need to solicit input regarding the potential alternatives for the proposed project and the appropriate scope of issues to be studied in the EIR/EIS. Those are most types of comments that will be appropriate to the proceeding tonight. We are also able to identify issues of concern and areas of potential controversy from your comments.

It's important to note that a Scoping Report will be prepared based upon all the written and oral comments. It will be distributed to the information repositories and placed on the project website so that you can be aware of the other comments and meetings and locations. If you didn't know already, this is one of seven meetings being held this week in a variety of locations around Imperial and San Diego County.

Of the key players in the process, you probably figured out by now, one is the California Public Utilities Commission, who we'll refer to as the CPUC. They are the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act for preparing the EIR. Also the Bureau of Land Management or BLM is the agency for the NEPA process. San Diego Gas & Electric is not an official part of these proceedings

here tonight, but obviously they are the applicant and they are the ones who initiate this process and then it goes for review by you. And then finally, from Aspen Environmental Group, Susan Lee is seated up here, but there are a number of other representatives that are here tonight. They are responsible for preparing the EIR/EIS. I know some of you got a chance to talk and meet the EIR/EIS team around the boards to get more information.

With that, I will turn it over to Susan Lee for a description of the proposed contract.

MS. LEE: Thank you. I am going to give a very brief description of the Sunrise Powerlink Project, because I know you all have copies of the Notice of Preparation. If you don't, we have additional copies at the table as you enter and there's a fairly detailed description here.

The most relevant maps for this portion of the project are included in the NOP. There are Figures 4A and 4B which show the Central Link of the project which is the area of Santa Ysabel and south of Warner Springs. And Figure 5A and 5B show the area around Ramona, heading down towards Mussey Grade Road, so those are the most relevant figures in terms of where we're located today.

The project itself, though, is about 150 miles of new transmission lines starting in Imperial County at the Imperial Valley Substation just west of El Centro. It involves a 500 kV transmission line, about 90 miles, that goes mostly through Imperial County and into San Diego County ending at a new substation which is illustrated here on Figure 4B. At that point the line will become a 230 kV transmission line continuing for about 60 miles through San Diego County to end at the coastal portion of San Diego County at the Penasquitos substation. There are a couple of portions of that route that are proposed to be underground. One of them is just south of here, in the Ramona and the San Diego County Estates area.

I'll make couple of other points related to the proposed project. As you know, San Diego Gas & Electric is the proponent and has submitted an application to the CPUC. The Imperial Irrigation District is also connected to the project. They have a Memorandum of Agreement with SDG&E under which if the project is ultimately approved, they would be the entity to actually construct and operate the transmission line starting from Imperial County at the Imperial Substation and ending at the Narrows Substation, which is actually in the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

SDG&E in its application to the CPUC has indicated the three major reasons for which this project is needed. The first one, according to SDG&E, is to maintain the reliability of the transmission system. The second one is to promote renewable energy. The project as described in the application by SDG&E describes some solar projects in the Imperial County area and also the fact that geothermal resources in Imperial County have been identified to such an extent that they believe that Sunrise would be able to bring renewable resources into San Diego. The third purpose in terms of the need for the project is to reduce energy costs. And this would allow SDG&E to reduce costs to its rate payers by changing the structure of the way electricity is provided in San Diego County.

This slide shows the objectives that are basically the more detailed reasons that define SDG&E's project and the reasons for which it would be built. They relate to the three issues that I already described and I won't go through them. The last couple, No. 7 and 8, are the ones that define SDG&E's land use principles that they've used to site transmission lines in terms of avoiding urban and suburban areas.

Now Billie will talk about the CPUC process.

MS. BLANCHARD: Again, hi, I'm Billie Blanchard, the CPUC project manager. Basically this is pretty much complete here, but the CPUC process has two parallel review processes for this application for CPCN, a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, the general proceeding and then the environmental review process, which I'm involved in with the CEQA/NEPA documentation.

The general proceeding for CPCN is going to be led by the Assigned Commissioner Dian Grueneich and Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman.

The scope of the CPCN review is defined by Public Utilities Code Section 1002. And there's a variety of things that are being looked at in the general proceeding, including the determination of need for the project, considerations of community values, recreational and park areas, and historic and aesthetic values. And also, of course, the review of the environmental impacts of CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act.

Right now as far as the schedule goes, we had a prehearing conference initially in Ramona on January 31st, 2006. There was a second prehearing conference and a public participation hearing in Ramona on September 13th of 2006. There is a scoping memo that is to come out on the general proceeding hopefully the first part of October 2006. That will be prepared by the administrative law judge and it will outline all the issues and the schedule for the proceedings. As far as the other aspects of that proceeding, including testimony and evidentiary hearings, that is yet to be determined and will be outlined in the scoping memo.

The environmental review schedule that we have thus far is that the application was filed initially in December of 2005. They filed an amended application along with a Proponent's Environmental Assessment, the PEA, on August 4th, 2006. The Notice of Intent to prepare the EIS portion of this document was published in the Federal Register on August 31st, 2006. We are now at the point of Notice of Preparation for the EIR. That was released on September 15th. And the public scoping closes on October 20th, 2006.

And as far as the dates for the release of the Draft and the Final, we haven't determined those yet because of a number of issues that we're still looking at, but when we do, hopefully soon, we will be sending out a card to the entire CEQA mailing list to indicate what those dates are.

So I will now take this over to BLM.

MR. ZALE: Thank you. My name is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are here representing BLM's field office in El Centro. The reason that BLM is involved in this process is that SDG&E's project as is currently proposed involves crossing about 32 miles of public lands primarily in Imperial County, but also involving about a mile and a third in San Diego County. Also on the slide behind me you see a listing for Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. When the patent for the Park was issued back in the 1930s it included a reservation for an existing power line right-of-way through the Park. BLM administers that right-of-way, or did in the past. At this point in time there's some assessment being made in terms of what exactly the BLM's role and responsibilities will be to the park there.

As the slide also indicates an Amendment to the land use plan for the California Desert Conservation Area will be required as part of this analysis. The reason for that is the proposed right-of-way as it's configured deviates from the established utility corridors. The fact that there's a plan amendment involved also means that the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and EIR will be 90 days as opposed to normally a shorter period of time.

In addition to participating in the NEPA and CEQA process, BLM will also be responsible for conducting government-to-government consultation with interested tribes. And we will also be the lead agency in terms of Section 7 consultation with the Fish & Wildlife Service in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

MS. LEE: In addition to the BLM and the CPUC decision process, one other really important purpose of an EIR/EIS is to get input from other agencies that also have to issue permits on this project. And this slide lists a few of them. We're also meeting with some of these folks during our scoping period and will continue to meet with them on an ongoing basis throughout the project, because getting input from these agencies is really going to be critical to getting the information we need to complete an accurate document.

Lewis alluded to this earlier, but one thing we really want to make clear tonight is the fact that we're at the very beginning of this process. We know that SDG&E has been out here a couple of times. The CPUC has been here a couple of times in its general proceeding process, but in terms of the CEQA process we're just now getting started. The yellow box on this slide shows where we are at now. The scoping period, in terms of the EIR/EIS preparation process, is pretty much square one, so we have a lot of work to do.

We'll be developing a very detailed project description. We'll be gathering information on alternatives, preparing the Draft EIR/EIS, and then we'll be back out here to hear your comments once the Draft EIR has been issued. And as Tom mentioned, there will be a 90-day public comment period so everyone will have plenty of time to let us know how we did.

I'll give you some basic information on the contents of an EIR/EIS, and the main purpose for doing this is to help you give us information that will be useful to us while we're preparing the document. We'll be preparing a very detailed description of the environmental setting, which describes what's here now: what kind of species, what kind of land uses, what are the impacts of the project within each one of the environmental areas, what kind of mitigation measures would reduce the impacts that are identified. We will gather all of this information together in a way that will be useful both to the decision-makers that ultimately have to make a decision on this project and also to the public that is affected. We expect you to help us with your scoping comments to prepare a more thorough document.

This slide shows the major elements of an EIR/EIS in terms of the major sections and the types of issues we would like to hear comments on, in terms of impacts of alternatives, mitigation measures, cumulative and indirect impacts. We're going to be looking seriously at these issues.

Here we show a list of all the environmental disciplines that are going to be included in the EIR/EIS, again to guide your thinking. It would help us to know what kinds of specific concerns this project may cause with respect to any of these issues.

I'll talk in a little bit more detail about alternatives, because we know that the alternatives identification process is probably the most important step in this EIR/EIS. Those of you who were here in Ramona on September 13th heard Commissioner Grueneich ask SDG&E to identify an alternative that avoids Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. SDG&E has submitted through the general proceeding process yesterday some information on an alternative that, in fact, would go through Cleveland National Forest. That information is coming to us as a part of our alternatives process.

We are looking at alternatives under the guidelines of NEPA and CEQA by using the three criteria on the slide to define whether or not alternatives should be analyzed in detail in the documents. Those three criteria are, No. 1 does the alternative meet most of the project objectives, not all of them but most. No. 2 does it have the ability to reduce or avoid impacts of the proposed project. And No. 3 is the alternative feasible, can it be built and can it be permitted.

Here we've listed a whole variety of types of alternatives that we'll be looking at. People mostly talk about routing alternatives in terms of different ways to connect Points A and B from the Imperial Valley into Central San Diego. There's several ways to do that, but if you're looking at ways to avoid Anza-Borrego, there aren't that many ways, because Anza-Borrego goes south almost to the border.

We're also going to be looking carefully at generation alternatives. South Bay Power Plant is being proposed to bring power to San Diego; we would examine the effects that that would have in terms of replacing the need for this project. We'll relook at all the alternatives that were proposed by SDG&E and either eliminated or carried forward in their document to see whether we agree with that. And we'll look at any alternatives that may come out of the workshop that's being held next Friday by SDG&E as part of what the Commissioner ordered, for SDG&E to gather further information on alternatives through the general proceeding process.

When the EIR/EIS is finished, both of these agencies have a process that will allow them to document their decision. The CPUC process requires a vote by the five commissioners that are appointed by the Governor. It will include as one factor of several the environmental information. It will also include their determination on project need. And if the project is approved, the decision will include a requirement that the mitigation measures that are included in the document be monitored to make sure that they're actually enforced the way they were intended.

The BLM also has a different process under NEPA. They have a 30-day comment period after the release of the Final EIR/EIS. They have a 60-day review by the Governor as a part of their state process, the Governor's Consistency Review, and then they will prepare a Record of Decision.

Let's turn this back to Lewis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Daniel, would you collect and bring me up the speaker cards. Thank you.

The final slide that you have up here shows that the most useful scoping comments at this point are the ones that address location, extent of environmental impacts or potential impacts caused by the proposed project, and that recommend alternatives that would avoid or reduce impacts. Now is the opportunity for you to provide us with comments on those. We already had two meetings earlier, one this afternoon and one in El Centro yesterday, and we've received a lot of very useful, constructive comments so far.

We have set up, for consistency's sake, throughout all the meetings, a three-minute time limit for people to speak, but we also have enough time here that once we've gone through the full list of speakers who had their three minutes, we have the opportunity to provide a second questioning. So if you'll just stay within the time limit the first time, then, if you have additional comments you want to make, I'll give you a second opportunity to come up here.

After we've taken all those comments, then there will be an opportunity for questions and answers. If you have a question later on, the panel up here will answer the types of questions that they can based upon where we are in the process. Obviously, if you say, "what will that impact affect," they can't answer that because we haven't done that part of the analysis.

As far as the three-minute time limit, I will let you know we have one minute left by putting up my index finger. And then when the three minutes are fully up, I'll put up my hand like this. I'll also run through the cards so we have a general idea of where you fall in the process so that you can come up to the microphone and be prepared.

The people I have right now who turned in their cards are Kelly Fuller, David Lloyd, Kathleen Beck — actually, what I'm going to do, I'm trying to do it in order, Kelly Fuller, Kathleen Beck, Jim Lydick, David Lloyd, and then Diana Lindsay. So if you would come up here to the microphone.

If I haven't mentioned already, there's a court reporter here who's trying to capture this verbatim and so please speak at something less than lightening speed. She can keep up pretty fast but, in particular, if you're reading from prepared remarks, please slow it down to make sure she can hear it. Again, you can come up for a second time if you don't finish those comments. Of course, if you think you have some more details in writing, again if you hand that in, those are given the same consideration as any oral comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. MICHAELSON: Ms. Fuller.

MS. FULLER: Thank you. I'm Kelly Fuller from the San Diego/Imperial County Chapter of the Sierra Club and thank you for this opportunity to speak again tonight.

I spoke to you last night about what we see as some of the alternatives to this project. I would like tonight to briefly talk about the filing that SDG&E did yesterday in response to the Commissioner's request for non-Park alternatives. We're concerned. We noticed that when we looked at them that all of those rejected alternatives of SDG&E and the current ones all go to that Central East Substation. And we're wondering is that the only place where that could go? It seems odd to us that the line would need to go so far north and then head down south again. And we think SDG&E's justification for this in its filing yesterday is weak. All they said about it was that the area was the most opportune one that would accommodate the required facility and allow the necessary 230 kV features to exit the facility. And we strongly believe that this is just the first phase of a larger project headed to Los Angeles. And we are very concerned that only this first phase, the proposed Sunrise Powerlink, is going to be analyzed and that there will be no CEQA/NEPA analysis of what we see as a future project going to Los Angeles. And we think the fact that everything is heading toward that way far north substation suggests that future project going to L.A.

Also, we noticed that one of the maps, or a couple of the new maps that came on, I believe today were posted on SDG&E's website, showed dwellings and also showed wildfire outage areas on the rejected alternatives. And none of the other maps we've ever seen showed this, so we feel that the company is — with these rejected alternatives that it doesn't want is showing dwelling data, fire data, and we request that that be provided for the other maps as well for the project as it is proposed.

Also, we noticed that with the dwellings — that they're saying that about 50 dwellings would have to be eliminated. They've got a year to tweak — they said that to the press. It's been quoted widely. They had a year to tweak those routes so that the proposed routes don't eliminate houses and they're showing you routes that they have not been tweak. If they tweak those suggested alternatives, they would not be going through a bunch of houses also.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Kathleen Beck.

MS. BECK: Hello, I'm Kathleen Beck and I'm an outdoor educator through the county schools. I work with sixth-graders. I've also been involved since December with a group we call People's Powerlink. We have the Julian area and the Santa Ysabel area through Borrego, a lot of back country. So one of the things I wanted to talk about today is ethics. Being a teacher, of course, I speak from that place, and also being a resident whose family goes back a couple of generations. There's five generations in my family in the area. I would like to speak about respect, responsibility and protection. And I'm asking today what SDG&E, BLM, any of the organizations involved might tell their children along the way, how much responsibility you might have in this process, and what you might say to them if they ask you later on how you could have allowed a company with profit as its motive to desecrate our public lands, because our public lands do belong to all of us. I'm not just talking the state

park, but the national — at the national level, at the wilderness preserve areas' level, people's back yards, all of it. It is for all of us to protect and it's our job as citizens of this county.

The beauty of San Diego is known the world over. There's more diversity in plants and birds in this county than anywhere else in the United States in this 48 states here. For that reason, I consider this area a biogem and for that reason this is a jewel and we really do need to think about that when we're making these decisions.

As far as number one and number two, what you have written up here, as far as identifying the location, I would say the rooftop is the best location for the route. And I would also say that that is the best recommended alternative that I have.

There is someone who has come up with a plan for the San Diego area, his name is Jim Bell. If you go to www.jimbell.com, he has a plan for the San Diego area. You might remember his name, he was running for mayor a few years ago, and that was what he was going to focus his time and energy on if he had become mayor was the energy policy of this area. So I would recommend that you look into that.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Jim.

MR. LYDICK: Hello. One of the things I find fascinating and kind of really an experience for the possible proposed project is that a lot of community members and the people that have never met before have come together. And it's really — it's really nice to see so much concern over our back county areas.

I also work in outdoor education at Sixth Grade Camp at Fox Outdoor School. Some of the areas that we've heard about would be going right through the areas that we take the sixth-graders. And I'm just in love with the area and watch — teach out there, watch the students learn about what their neighborhoods used to look like. And it would be a terrible shame to see 150-foot transmission towers marching through these areas especially when they're unnecessary. And when I've talked to people that really don't know much about what's going on, I try to make it as simple as possible from everything that I've learned and I'm sure a lot of people here learn. I suggest to them seeing a movie "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," see "China Town." I know that's dealing with water in the Los Angeles area, of course. I feel like the proposed Sunrise Powerlink is just the situation in the movie "China Town," but would have to deal with electricity.

And I would hope that everybody here could work to the best of their knowledge towards really doing what's best for San Diego. And everything I've heard about the original 23 plan, the in-base generated power along with rooftops sounds great to me. And I would hate to see a really good thought out premier idea be laid to waste.

Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

David Lloyd.

MR. LLOYD: My name is David Lloyd. I'm an officer for Cabrillo Power Plant in Carlsbad, California. Also unrelated to that is that I am a member of the Public Advisory Committee with the Southern California Wetlands Advisory project. I'm concerned personally about environmental issues.

MR. MICHAELSON: Sir, could pull that microphone closer so we can all hear you.

MR. LLOYD: I'm very interested in seeing transmission going to the resources that can be used over and over again. Early in my career I've helped build windmills, unfortunately they also killed birds and bats. And the solar projects that are proposed for the desert cover many, many square miles and will require lots of washing and probably Windex and other things. There's no good energy that doesn't cause some environmental concern, but if we have an opportunity out in the desert to have good generation, it needs to get to San Diego and other places. We've only been concerned, however, in looking at this line as to what its real purpose is. It goes a long ways north and there's a direct route right across following the Southwest Powerlink. So our concern is this site in case and also the environmental review is more alternatives ought to be studied carefully before we build a billion for a transmission line, which is a staggering amount of money for a transmission line.

AB 1576 encourages the Commission to consider carefully repowering existing generating sites like the big Encina Station in Carlsbad. By putting in more efficient generation we can take the same amount of gas and generate twice as much electricity.

There are also renewables proposed for the Imperial County area. This transmission line should be reserved for renewables. We shouldn't be importing a long transmission line, natural gas fire generation, whether it's from Mexico, from the Gila Bend area or anyplace else. The Commission should seriously consider reserving the entire line for renewables. And if gas power generation is transported in an operable basis, that will certainly bring to life whether or not this line is really for renewables or really for something else.

And then a need analysis has to take into account energy production modeling. The CPUC in its past has spent considerable time billing energy production lawsuits to determine whether each power plant is really needed. That same model has to be part of this environmental study. In addition, transmission modeling should be part of the studies. Those are very serious time consuming models that need to be run and analyzed by the public and by the other alternatives.

Appreciate your time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Diana Lindsay.

MS. LINDSAY: My name is the Diana Lindsay. I'm president of the Anza-Borrego Foundation and Institute. We are an association established at the request of the California State Park and Recreation Commission forty years ago this coming year. Our mission is to support the park through land acquisition, education programs and research projects. We had 1200 due-paying members and many more beyond that, members who also support the project and our activities.

In the limited time that I have, I would like to focus on three areas of major concern that have not been adequately addressed by San Diego Gas & Electric. Areas which clearly challenge the rationale of constructing massive transmission lines through the state park and wilderness areas. One, environmental review conducted under the CEQA requires that project alternatives be included within

the project review, Section 15126.6A. Specifically CEQA requires that alternatives be included. And I, quote, "would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant affects of the projects," close quote. San Diego Gas & Electric did not include an alternative route that minimizes impacts to the project in their original plan. Per the CPUC directive issued at the prehearing they have listed alternate routes that avoid the park, but the listing is structured to justify their original plan rather than following the spirit of CEQA which calls for lessening impacts to the park.

I would suggest that San Diego Gas & Electric's goal is rather to pick the route that has the least impact to the body of —

MR. MICHAELSON: Could I ask you to slow down.

MS. LINDSAY: Oh, sorry.

Two, the proposed project would likely have significant unmitigable environmental impacts. Impacts to community character. Visual and biological resources would likely be significant and unmitigable. This is probable given the input provided by Ruth Coleman, Director of California State Parks, in her prehearing statement to the CPUC. As a result, the project would not be approved without the adoption of overriding considerations by the lead agency. What overrides are possible that would be used to offset the significant, unmitigable impacts to the state park.

Three, State Wilderness Lands. The current route selection would require that the 500 kV transmission line cross state designated wilderness lands. This would require a determination from the California State Bar Commission to allow such an action when no — of no similar past actions to remove state designated wilderness lands. This is an unheard of precedent. Wilderness should not be viewed as the path of least resistance, but rather as a last resort.

San Diego Gas & Electric has not offered or made available to us alternate routes that do not intrude upon or violate the wilderness values that we hold so dear. Current plans will make the transmission lines visible for 90,000 acres. We are talking about transmission lines that are as tall as a 20-story building.

We're asking you to oppose the devastation of our wilderness legacy upon which this country was built. Let parks do their jobs. Let parks be there for future generations to enjoy. The integrity of the park must not be destroyed. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is there anyone who has not yet spoken who would like to? Just give us your name.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty, Santa Ysabel.

We really don't need this proposed Sunrise Powerlink. One of the reasons we don't need it is one of the gentleman that just came in here that is involved in the Carlsbad plant, Encina.

But I want to talk about what I think you've heard so far on the other side, the environmental side. The Farm Bureau out in El Centro, they talked about their dairies, they talked about how this alternative line is going right through their dairies, and the cattle will not even get within a mile or a half of mile of those lines. If the cattle are afraid of these lines, what do you think the Big Horn Sheep

feel about them? And I don't think there's been any studies to determine whether they're going to continue to migrate like they need to migrate in the park.

Number two, the native plants. There was a lady out in El Centro who talked about the native plants, what impacts it's going to have on the native plants.

Number three, I talked about the wind in Santa Ysabel, and I'm sure it's in a lot of other areas. And I've seen pictures in the paper of down towers in other locations in Southern California.

Number four, I talked about the remote back country. The Williamson Act. All these landowners that are in Santa Ysabel, Mesa Grande, and a lot of other areas, have designated their properties as ag preserves, which means they can't build on those properties for 10 years.

Number five, I've given you some pictures, that I'll get back from you, so that we could formally present them to you. But those are pictures of view sheds. Those are a little bit different pictures than what you see in the SDG&E applications, which were pictures that were intentionally presented to not show us as having a beautiful open space preserve area.

Number six, I talked about the military. They're not in favor of this. They've got problems, and I'm sure that an alternate line was presented to handle their concerns.

What about the cropdusters? How are they going to get up and down and around out in Imperial Valley to handle the agricultural area out there? What about the emergency response helicopters that come into Santa Ysabel? They are flying really low to save people's lives.

Number ten, what about the gentleman that was here a little earlier today talking about the gliders over at Warner Springs and the glider port? What about the Sierra Club said yesterday regarding some form of lizard, I believe, that is endangered.

So for all these reasons, I think there are so many environmental reasons that I think we need to focus on in-county generation. And if I have time, I want to talk about that a little bit later. Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Is there anyone else that wants to speak? If not, then the floor is open if you would like to add to your comments. I don't know if anyone would like to add to their comments.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty, Santa Ysabel.

MR. MICHAELSON: That's fine.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Thank you once again.

Don't believe that this proposed Sunrise Powerlink is the only source to meet the energy needs for San Diego County. We have the South Bay plant. We have the Encina plant. They both want to improve the technologies of those plants. They want to take those plants away from the ocean so they don't heat up the waters of the ocean.

And, by the way, SDG&E just demonstrated that they're doing the same thing. They just opened or started up this Escondido plant and that's part of the in-county generation. They also have permits to generate power in Otay Mesa.

SDG&E uses these three R's. Everywhere I've heard SDG&E in the last year, they've talked about reliability, renewables, and reduced costs. Don't believe that there is a more reliable energy source with the proposed Sunrise Powerlink. It's a 150-mile transmission line. If you think that that's more reliable than in-county generation, then I'm wondering what we're smoking here. Because it doesn't seem like a 150-mile line is going to reduce the amount of energy that starts at that Imperial Substation to the coast is going to reduce the amount of power. You lose at least 30 percent of it.

I know you're going to hear from Bill Powers and I know you're going to hear probably from UCAN and other places, but it just doesn't compute for me. And the Imperial Substation, the renewables go through it, the Mexican power goes through it, the Southwest Powerlink goes through it. It doesn't seem like this reliability statement that they keep saying on the radio and I'm assuming the TV, I don't watch much TV, but they constantly talk about this word reliability. It doesn't compute for me.

On the renewables you heard already a lot about — and you're going to hear more about Sterling Energy and the six prototypes they have in New Mexico. Unproven technology so far. It would be great if it could be proven, but let's say it is proven, what about the Southwest Powerlink. Even SDG&E made a statement last week before the Board of Supervisors or SANDAG, I can't remember which meeting, which stated that you can at least run 300 megawatts, or whatever they are, on the Southwest Powerlink. Bill Powers said you could run 900 or 1,000. What is the Southwest Powerlink being used for right now?

And the reduced costs really troubles me. Here's a company that back in 2000 and 2001, they just — they're in the process of settling a case for 350 million dollars to pay back to the rate payers, because they did not — they weren't honest in their assessment of how much of what the supply was and they were not honest in their assessment on pricing. They misrepresented us. They cheated us. They took our money away from us. And they're going to pay it back. I don't know what perk stands for, but I read that in the paper. It doesn't get much publicity. And then they're going to have a 5 percent increase that's going to occur January of '08. We're never going to see that hundred-million-a-year reduction in costs for our rate payers. Our rate payers pay — I think, a hundred-million-dollar reduction in cost is equivalent to somewhere between 20 and \$30 a year per rate payer. All their price increases that they're coming up with, we're never going to see that rate reduction, so that doesn't compute either.

So I believe that there's other alternatives or other ulterior motives that SDG&E has with a 500 kilowatt power station trans — whatever you call it, in Warner Springs that's going nowhere. And so I respectfully request that you consider that in your analysis.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Is there anyone else who would like to make comments? If not, you can move into — sure.

MS. BECK: Kathleen Beck from Julian. I would just like to say to add to everything that's been spoken here, we are at a tipping point. Whenever there's a change that occurs and plans start being made, we could use this time as a tipping point to push us into a more sustainable way of living. This would be a very good time now that this proposal is coming up.

But rather than going back into time and creating a energy far away and using expensive, dangerous technology to bring it to us, we could use this time to move forward with a more sustainable type of energy, both production and transmission, by generating energy closes to where we're going to be using it. It seems completely absurd to me and to most of us who have studied it that we're still using these transmission lines. And it just seems like we do have a technology and that we should use what we have that will move us into the 21st century.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. As I mentioned earlier, there's also an opportunity at this point in the meeting for some questions and answers. Again, we accept the types of questions that can be answered at the scoping stage as opposed to those whose answers will come later on when the environmental analysis has been done. So if you have a question, I'll ask that you give us your name.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. BROOM: Hi, Elizabeth Broom. And I live within the site of the proposed transmission line. And I'd like to know how written in stone is the route and what process would we go through to try to get that route slightly altered? Because actually what's also close to my house is one of the most popular hiking destination in San Diego County, the Iron Mountain hiking area. And I think it would really be a blight on the landscape for people enjoying one of the few open space areas that's close to where people live to have this huge transmission tower within their sight line while they're hiking on the mountain. So I notice that the map actually shows it following an existing utility easement. And I'm wondering if it could be altered to go a little bit further south which would bring it below the site line, because right now it's going right along a ridge line.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thanks. Let's see what we get in terms of answers.

MS. BLANCHARD: First of all, the Applicant has proposed a project and a particular route, and I would say from my standpoint as the manager of this environmental document that at this point we're just starting out. And I wouldn't say that this description is cast in stone. And as Susan had pointed out we will be doing extensive alternative analysis that would include segments or alternative segments to the proposed route, as well as all the other things that we indicated that we will be looking at. So what would be helpful from my standpoint, as I've indicated to some others, is that if you have a particular area that you would like to suggest an alternative segment, that it would be great to get that in writing just to make sure that we have it. It's great to hear it, but also in writing would be great, indicating the area and your proposed suggestion for the alternative segment.

MS. BROOM: And how will I know that has any effect?

MS. BLANCHARD: Well, how it will affect it, is that you will give it to us through the scoping process and it will go into the alternative screening analysis that we talked about here tonight. If we find that it fits the CEQA/NEPA criteria for alternatives, it gets carried forward into the EIR document and fully analyzed.

MS. BROOM: So I will hear some response or feedback?

MS. BLANCHARD: You will see our responses and analyses coming up in the Draft EIR/EIS.

MS. BROOM: And then the other — let me think about it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Sure. Are there any other questions? Yes.

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller, San Diego/Imperial County Sierra Club. I may just be kind of dense. I'm trying to understand something that's puzzled me for a while. The project has a purpose and then it has the eight objectives, and it says that the objectives will guide the development of alternatives to the Sunrise Powerlink, but because CEQA does not require that they meet all of them, the objectives do not reasonably constrain the alternatives.

I'm kind of puzzled by these, because I noticed something that is really left out of this. There is nothing in these objectives that says we will minimize environmental impacts or we will choose a project that is not going to have a large impact on the environment, so to me it seems, just as a member of the public, that these are — I don't want to say arbitrary, because arbitrary is not quite the right word, but there could have been a different set of objectives. And so the project proponent gets to choose the objectives, but then the project needs to meet most of them. What is the process by which we know these are the right objectives that a big project like this should even meet?

MR. MICHAELSON: And I would also mention that the things that you mentioned like environmental help, maybe where they're picked up is in criteria for evaluation. I'm going to let someone much more knowledgeable answer that question.

MS. LEE: You're right that the objectives are defined by the Applicant and they're defined usually in a way that fit the project that they're presenting. The way we look at them in an environmental document like this is to look at the ones that most guide where the project is coming from, but still leave the flexibility to come up with alternatives that are reasonable in a sort of big picture way. We haven't had a project before that had eight objectives. It makes it a little more complicated when you have lots and lots of objectives.

As I mentioned earlier, those last two are really land use concerns. We like to minimize impacts to highly populated areas. The way to get the environmental consideration into the objectives the whole purpose of the EIR. The purpose of an EIR is to identify where the impacts are and to find alternatives that minimize the impacts of the proposed project, so it's kind of a different level from the objectives. But it is always a challenge. You have to look at objectives that are presented by the Applicant in a way that defines their own project but that doesn't unreasonably constrict alternatives. And that's I guess all we can say.

MS. BLANCHARD: That's about it, yes.

MR. MICHAELSON: Did you remember your other question?

MS. BROOM: Elizabeth Broom. And I'm very interested in trails in the region. And it seems that building a larger transmission line across the county might be an opportunity to improve trail access to some areas. And I'm wondering if there's any plan to include that aspect or that possibility in the project plan?

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

MS. LEE: That's a good scoping comment as a suggestion that might be considered. Just so you know, we hear the opposite comment from many of the public agencies who are concerned that the access roads create an opportunity for the public to get to places where they previously wouldn't have been, so there is certainly a trade off, but maybe it's a regional issue. Much of these transmission lines

do require access roads. If the terrain is such that an access road can be built parallel to it, then it is certainly an opportunity. But in the case where they're built across private land, that may not be something that landowners would want to see.

I would suggest that you put that in a scoping comment and maybe try and identify the particular areas in which you're interested in that being presented as an opportunity and we'll look at it from a land use and recreational point of view.

MS. BROOM: Well, specifically are you working with any trails organization, like the San Diego County Trails Association?

MS. LEE: We're meeting with the County actually the day after tomorrow.

MS. BROOM: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Any other questions? Yes. All we need is your name.

MS. LINDSAY: Diana Lindsay. I just have a question. San Diego Gas & Electric has had a representative come to our board meeting to answer some questions and we were asking about the possibility of burying the line through sections of the park. And Jim Avery had stated that where they could bury in areas outside the park, that they could not do that within the desert because of the heat element. And I'm wondering about this plan, that when I was looking at the map it shows that sections of it in the proposed plan is to bury it along the right-of-way for the road along Highway 78, but that doesn't make sense to me when Jim Avery specifically said that is not possible within the desert. And I don't understand the technology involved in it, but, you know, he's said that we had too much heat in the desert.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

MS. LEE: I can explain the difference and actually part of this you'll see. As some of you know that the CPUC and the EIR/EIS team have submitted a data request to SDG&E. In particular, one of the questions that was asked is to look at the feasibility of undergrounding a 230 kV route through Anza-Borrego and Highway 78 as opposed to the alternative.

The difference in what I think Mr. Avery was addressing, is that a 500 kV underground, while possible, has pretty severe feasibility constraints. It's possible in shorter segments. You wouldn't underground the 500 kV line in a desert situation because the extent of disturbance in a non-paved area would be huge. It would be equivalent with a very wide dirt road huge with amount of trenching. So not only is the heat as an engineering issue, but environmentally the impacts would be very much greater than an overhead line. But 230 kV lines can be undergrounded and are commonly, in fact, even by SDG&E undergrounded generally below paved roads. That is one of the things that we'll be looking at.

MS. LINDSAY: And could they be side by side?

MS. LEE: It would be two circuits of the 230 kV line, a double circuit line which is what is proposed per this project from the Central East substation, so what it would be is basically two parallel trenches. There's a picture of it we can show you afterwards, because it's the same configuration that is proposed, in fact, through this area south of Ramona, an underground 230 kV.

MR. MICHAELSON: Anybody else have a question? If you come up here, please, to the microphone. Tell us your name, please.

MS. DORROH: I'm Carolyn Dorroh, member of the Ramona Community Planning Group. Last year my employer had sent me to Alaska. While there I read a newspaper article that I found very interesting, because there's an abundance of wildlife up there. And what it discovered was that pathways created into previously inaccessible areas, pathways were created with the transmission line clearings and also highways, and what they saw was a decrease in population of the animals. Even though the habitat was still there, they couldn't figure out why the animals would not stay, mainly Caribou and some of the smaller species as well. But what they realized was that the predators could easily enter into the inaccessible areas, where they could not do that before, and so they take the path of least resistance, go into these areas, hunt and come right back out. And so I would like for SDG&E to address the impact of creating these accessible pathways into previously inaccessible areas by the predator species.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Dennis Trafecanty, San Ysabel. I was wondering if somebody could help me a little bit with this group called CAISO, California Independent System Operators. I think it's a group — I went to the San Diego Regional Energy Office back, oh, a couple of months ago, and there must have been 150 people there on a very hot night. And they came up — we went there with the thought we were going to have some voice in a matter that related to the proposed Sunrise Powerlink, and when we got there we — I understand now that the rate payers pay for their fees through — like a company like SDG&E would collect fees from us, they go to the CPUC somehow, and then this CAISO group starts making decisions about things. And, of course, SDG&E made a big bally-hoo about it, the fact that CAISO suggested that the proposed Sunrise Powerlink was something that we needed to have. It had a cost benefit that we needed to consider. But when we asked them, they said, well, we only looked at three things, we looked at the proposed Sunrise Powerlink, we looked at some Tehachapi thing, and some other thing that was out of the county, I thought. And those were the only three things they were evaluating. They weren't looking at in-county generation. And then this big thing, bally-hoo by SDG&E about CAISO, you know, this big outfit is proposing — is approving this. And I mean, what is that? Tell me how — that doesn't seem like a fair analysis. I mean, I'm a financial officer and I like to consider all the alternatives at once, but this group considered just three.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Maybe there's someone here who could address a little bit about it.

MS. LEE: What I won't do is get into their decision-making process. What you may want to do is look at their website. They have a fairly good website. I think it's www.CAISO.com that describes what their purpose is and they have some nice graphics.

What the independent system operator does is to operate the transmission infrastructure the State of California on behalf of the members of the ISO, which is the independent — the IOU's, the SDG&E, and other utilities that have opted to be a part of ISO system. So they operate the grid basically on our behalf and they were established by law. So they're funded through all of our transmission rates. But as far as their process goes, it is entirely separate from what we're doing.

MR. MICHAELSON: So no one here represents them or is going to try to explain to you why they made the decision they did. So do you have another question?

MR. TRAFECANTY: I just want to make a comment that what I really believe — I think I'm pretty good at judging character of people or groups. And when I think CAISO, I think SDG&E. They seem like they're talking the same language wherever I go. And I've been following this for several months now. I just wanted to make that comment.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Let me suggest we take a little break for the court reporter's fingers and we'll also see if anyone new maybe comes in the intervening minutes. So we can always go back on the record, but we're going to go into recess now for about 10 minutes. Thank you.

(Off the record.)

MR. MICHAELSON: Going back on the record temporarily. Since we have such a small impact group here anyway, we thought what would work best is if you have any additional questions, we're going to leave the posters up and all of the staffers will be back there to answer your questions.

With that, we will adjourn. Thank you.

(The scoping meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.)

* * *