

SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT

**Reporter's Transcript of the CPUC/BLM Scoping Meeting
for Preparation of a Draft EIR/EIS**

Held 2:00 p.m. October 5, 2006
At Mission Valley (San Diego), 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 10
Public Comments begin on page 10
Q&A begins on page 25

PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER

Marty Allenby.....	10
Pam Albers.....	11
Karen Mills.....	11
John Peterson.....	12
Brian Jennings.....	13
Sara Feldman.....	14
Nick Ervin.....	14
Bob Barelmann.....	16
Janis Shackelford.....	16
Jim Bell.....	17
Donna Tisdale.....	18
Bill Hoffman.....	19
Marsha Johnston.....	20
Kelly Fuller.....	20
John Raifsaider.....	21
Dennis Trafecanty.....	21
Bruce MacRobbie.....	22
Gary Hughes.....	23
Joe Raffetto.....	23
Marvin Patche.....	24
Pat Bianez.....	24

Q&A, BY SPEAKER

Donna Tisdale.....	25, 28, 36
Jim Bell.....	26
Marty Allenby.....	27
Rita Deutch.....	27
Merna Watts.....	28
Kelly Fuller.....	29, 35
Janis Shackelford.....	29
Pam Albers.....	29, 34
Harvey Payne.....	30
Paul Blackman.....	31
Sara Feldman.....	32
Ellen Shivley.....	33
Dennis Trafecanty.....	34, 36
Bob Barelmann.....	35

MR. MICHAELSON: Good afternoon. We're very glad you could join us today. My name is Lewis Michaelson. I work for a firm named Katz & Associates and we've been hired by the California Public Utilities Commission to support these meetings and for me to serve as a neutral moderator. This is the sixth of seven meetings that are being held this week. We were in Borrego Springs last night. We were in El Centro and we were in Ramona. Today we'll be here in Mission Valley and later this evening in Rancho Penasquitos.

This particular meeting is an essential spot in the rotation. It was advertised in the Notice of Preparation as specifically designated for people to provide input on routing alternatives avoiding Anza-Borrego Desert State Park; however, attendees at this meeting are also welcome to comment on any other topic related to the EIR/EIS. It should be noted that comments on alternatives were welcome at all the other meeting locations. This has been a tremendously, I would say, successful scoping process already so far in terms of the number of really useful, constructive, relevant comments that can be used in the process. We've already had a wealth of really good participation at this point, so we're looking forward to continuing that here this afternoon.

This meeting is being held, in case you're not aware, to satisfy both the State of California Environmental Quality Act requirements and the Federal National Environmental Policy Act. In a moment it will be clear why we're doing both.

Because some of you may be unfamiliar with that process, I'm going to go briefly through the purpose of scoping. Then Susan Lee, who is seated immediately to my left, with Aspen Environmental Group, a consulting group that's taking the lead in the preparation of this EIR/EIS, will talk about the proposed project. Billie Blanchard, seated next to her, is with the California Public Utilities Commission. She'll be talking about their process and schedule. Then seated next to her are Tom Zale and Lynda Kastoll with the Bureau of Land Management. They have a related and concurrent process, but with some differences that they need to speak about. Finally, we'll go back with Susan Lee for a few slides to describe in a little bit more detail what an EIR/EIS is, what it consists of and how it's prepared. Then we will reach the time for what is the really most important part of this meeting, an opportunity for public comment. I already have quite a few speaker registration cards, and that will be the time for your input.

We do know through survey after survey that one of Americans' greatest fears is public speaking. We'll be kind and gentle and we'll make this as easy and user-friendly for you as we can. But if you don't want to speak today and you do want to make comments, there are ample ways of making written comments. Written comments are also on the record and they have the same weight and consideration as oral comments. So don't feel like if you don't speak today, that you're left out of the process. Please feel free and please do think about submitting written comments as well.

You will not have to pay for parking if there was any confusion about that. If you will tell them on your way out, the person at the gate, that you are here for this meeting, you might want to mention Aspen Environmental and the EIS, and they should let you pass through. We didn't want to have anyone to have to pay for public comments.

So the purpose of scoping is to inform you and public agencies about an upcoming project for which an EIR/EIS is being prepared. It's to inform you about the review process, so that you can understand how to participate in it. It's to solicit your input, and I want to put a focus here regarding two primary things. We're at the very beginning of the EIR/EIS process. The analysis and evaluation

haven't been done, the surveys haven't been done, the documents haven't been prepared. This is the part where you get to help them identify potential alternatives to the proposed project and the appropriate scope of the environmental issues to be studied in the EIR/EIS. So those are the types of comments that are going to be most useful.

Of course, also through this process we identify issues of concern, areas for controversy. You should also know that a Scoping Report will be prepared after the scoping time period is over, which is October 20th. The Scoping Report will summarize both oral and written comments. So if you're not able to go to all the meetings, there will be transcripts. You'll be able to see what other people had to say at other meetings and then their written comments. Those will be placed in the information repositories in which there are 18, as well as on the project website.

I might mention that the website address is available on the slide and handouts. There has been some confusion at a couple of the meetings where people have actually been going on the SDG&E website, I guess, thinking that they're on the CPUC web site. Apparently when you Google it, that's what you're most likely to come up with. So we encourage you from this point forward as far as these deliberations and proceedings to consult the CPUC website for the schedule and proceeding.

Next one. Thank you. A couple of key players that you should know about, most of them are here today, the CPUC, that's the California Public Utilities Commission agency. They are the lead agency for the Environmental Impact Report that's being prepared under state law. And then the Bureau of Land Management is the lead agency for an Environmental Impact Statement which is being prepared under NEPA. San Diego Gas & Electric obviously is a key player in this in that they are the Applicant, but they are not a part of this proceeding. The people you see in front of you are the people that are being asked to review and evaluate that application, so that's helpful for you to know that. Not only is Susan Lee here, but several people on the EIR/EIS team from Aspen are here today. Some of them were answering your questions at the poster station.

So with that I'm going to turn it over to Susan Lee to give a brief description of the proposed project.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Lewis. I wanted to point you to the Notice of Preparation that I know a lot of you received in the mail, and also we were handing out at the entrance station. This document includes a somewhat description of the project itself. I'm not going to spend a lot of time describing all the ins and outs, but if you'll just note for your reference that starting on Page 4 and continuing for five or six pages after that is a Link-by-Link description of the project that describes the types of towers in each segment, the general land use within each segment. Accompanying each of those descriptions is a series of maps in the back. And the maps, again, are by each Link starting at El Centro and moving all the way to the west to Penasquitos.

I'll talk just briefly about the project. Figure 1 is the overview of the project itself. The transmission line that San Diego Gas & Electric is proposing is 150 miles long. It is about 57 miles in Imperial County and about 93 miles in San Diego County. It includes a 500 kilo volt transmission line, which is a high voltage line. That line would start at the Imperial Valley Substation, which is just southwest of El Centro and continue up through the desert primarily on BLM land. It would enter the Anza-Borrego National Park just west of the San Diego County line, pass through Anza-Borrego, through Grapevine Canyon, up to a major new substation that would be constructed by SDG&E as part of this project. That's identified on the map as the Central Link Substation, just southeast of Warner Springs. At that point the transmission line would convert to a 230 kilo volt line. That's the red line to

the southwest. That line continues through two substations where the power would be delivered first to the Sycamore Canyon Substation, which is just on the north end of Miramar, and second to the Penasquitos Substation almost at the coast, near I-5.

While the project itself is being proposed by SDG&E, there is another future owner of this project, which is the Imperial Irrigation District. The portion of the project between the Imperial Valley Substation and the Narrows Substation, which is actually within Anna-Borrego, would ultimately be owned, constructed and operated by the Imperial Irrigation District. This would occur under a Memorandum of Agreement that's already been signed by the IID and San Diego Gas and Electric; however, the environmental review of the entire project is being done through this EIR/EIS.

The goals that San Diego Gas & Electric has defined as the reasons that it's building this project are shown here in three main categories. The first one is to maintain and improve reliability to the San Diego area. Currently San Diego is served by one high-voltage power line, the Southwest Powerlink that runs right across the very southern part of the state near the border. The goal is to bring in another high voltage line from the east. The second purpose is to import renewable energy from Imperial County. SDG&E has identified a couple sources of renewable energy that it's targeted for this project. One of them is the Stirling Energy project that is proposed. There isn't a final application in yet, but it will be addressed by BLM. The area just west of the Imperial Valley Substation is the site of a potential 900 megawatt solar facility. There's also the potential to bring in power generated from geothermal resources on the south end of the Salton Sea. So that's the second goal. The third one is to reduce energy costs by providing more efficient sources of power to the San Diego region and allowing a restructuring of the electric system.

SDG&E had identified eight separate objectives. Except for the last two, these objectives repeat, in a little more detail, the three goals that I just described. The objectives seven and eight are focused on their goal to minimize land use disturbance and stay away from high density residential areas.

Now I turn this over to Billie Blanchard.

MS. BLANCHARD: Hello, I'm Billie Blanchard. I'm the CPUC project manager for the environmental document. And I just want to go over a little bit the review process that we will be doing and including the schedule as the CPUC knows it at this point.

The CPUC review process: essentially, the CPUC has two parallel review processes for the SDG&E application for the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, known as the CPCN. There is the general proceeding process for the application and then the environmental review process for the CEQA/NEPA document, which I'm mainly involved in.

The general proceeding will be led by the assigned Commissioner Dian Grueneich and the Administrative Law Judge Steve Weissman. The scope of the CPCN proceeding is defined by the Public Utilities Code Section 1002, where we will be looking at the determination of need for the project and also consider other things such as community values, aesthetic, historic, recreational, park, and other resources, and also the review of the environmental impacts of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA.

The schedule for the general proceeding: there was a first prehearing conference in January of 2006 in Ramona. And then there was a second prehearing conference and public participation hearing

that was held also in Ramona on September 13th, 2006. The administrative law judge will be preparing the scoping memo for the general proceeding. That is supposed to be done sometime in the first part of October. In that scoping memo the judge will outline the issues to be addressed in the proceeding and will also have the detail schedule for the proceeding aspects as well as our final schedule for the CEQA/NEPA process. Right now I cannot tell you any of the dates for testimony, hearings, and all of that, but that will be coming out through the scoping memo soon.

As far as the Environmental Review Schedule that we have, again SDG&E filed an application originally in December of 2005. Then in August of 2006 they filed an amended application and the Proponent's Environmental Assessment, the PEA. In late August the Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register. The Notice of Preparation, which you have now, was released on September 15th. And the scoping period will go until October 20th, 2006. Right now we do not have the schedule for the release of the Draft EIR/EIS, which will begin a 90-day comment period for the CEQA/NEPA document. There are still some issues that we needed to address. As soon as we get that schedule finalized, we will send out a card to everyone on the CEQA/NEPA mailing list to show the dates for the release of the Draft and the Final EIR process.

So now I'll turn it over to BLM.

MR. ZALE: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are both here representing BLM's El Centro field office. BLM is involved in the proposed project, because the right-of-way that San Diego Gas & Electric applied for would cross about 33 miles of public land primarily in Imperial County, but also a 1.3 mile stretch in San Diego County.

In addition to that, we're working to determine what role BLM would play in administering a reservation through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. When the patent for the park was issued back in the '30s, there was a reservation for the existing power line right-of-way through the Park. We're working to determine what role BLM would have in continuing to administer that reservation.

BLM will also be considering the proposed amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, the land use plan for this area. A plan amendment would be required because the proposed right-of-way would deviate from designated utility corridors within the California Desert Conservation Area.

In addition to those roles, BLM will also play a lead role in conducting government-to-government consultation with interested tribes. We will also be the lead agency working with the Fish & Wildlife Service to conduct Section 7 consultation in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

The last thing I should mention is the comment period for the Draft EIS/EIR will be 90 days as opposed to the formerly shorter period of time, because there is a planned amendment as part of this process being considered. Thank you.

MS. LEE: In addition to the CPUC and BLM, which are the lead agencies under CEQA and NEPA for this project, there are many, many other agencies, federal, state, local, county, that will be involved in this project because they have the responsibility to review the project and to issue permits over many parts of it. We've listed on this slide a number of them, certainly not all of them, but we just want you to be aware that part of our scoping process envelopes consultation with a large number of other agencies. We've met with many of them this week. We'll continue to meet with them and we also expect to get comment letters from many of these agencies.

These next few slides I'm going to describe is the EIR/EIS process and what the contents of an EIR/EIS are, because we're hoping that this will help you define the kinds of comments, the kinds of things we like to hear from you, and how they will fit into the documents that we will be preparing over the next many months.

Here we show the flow chart basically for preparation of an EIR/EIS. What you can see in the yellow square over to the left is where we are now. The process starts at the far left which is where the two lead agencies have made a decision to prepare an EIR and a EIS. The first step after that decision is to come to the public and look for comments on the project, comments on alternatives. That's the scoping process. So we're just barely getting started.

Everything that's been done in the past up to this point was completed by San Diego Gas & Electric. It was not done by us. We're taking all that and reviewing it independently and starting our process essentially just this week. We'll move on through this process over much of the next year. As Billie said, the schedule remains to be defined, but we will be preparing a draft EIR/EIS and coming back here to meet with people and get comments on the Draft. We'll have public meetings at that point as well. We will then incorporate responses to comments. We'll prepare a Final EIS and the agencies will make a decision at that point.

In a very broad way we define here the contents of an EIR/EIS. Initially it includes a very detailed description environmental setting, and you can imagine for a project like this there will be a lot of information in there, because this project covers two counties and a huge range of types of terrains and land use and biological habitats.

We will discuss the project as impacts of proposed components and the impacts of alternatives. I'll talk in more detail about alternatives in just a minute. The document will include mitigation measures. The purpose of all of this is to allow the two lead agencies and the other agencies, who will use these documents, to make a decision on the project based on a complete disclosure of all the potential environmental impacts. And at the same time it allows the public to be involved and understand what information is being prepared and to give us your input so we can be sure that we've got the best possible information included.

Here we've listed, again, just another breakdown of the types of sections that are included in the EIR/EIS, so you can get a feel for the way they will be divided. We'll address separately the impacts of the project, the impacts of alternatives. We will have a discussion of cumulative impacts, indirect impacts and the potential for the project to induce growth. Cumulative impacts are other projects that are in the area that might also affect the environment along with this one. The project will also include mitigation monitoring. If it's approved, there will be monitors who will be in the field to ensure that the mitigation measures are accurately implemented.

Here we've listed the long list of environmental disciplines that are included in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report, so you have a feel for the types of issues we would like to hear about. If any of these topics raise a concern in your mind or if there's something in here that you would like to comment on, these are all the issues we will be addressing in the document.

Okay. Now we go to alternatives, and even though we're not restricted to alternatives today, we know that that's the reason that many of you may have come. Let me just point out two of the maps that are included in your NOP in case you haven't noticed them. They are the very last ones in this

handout, the first one is Figure 7 and the title of this one is "SDG&E Alternatives Fully Evaluated and Carried Forward." These are the alternatives that after evaluation SDG&E decided were worth analyzing in detail in its application to the CPUC and the BLM. That doesn't mean that those are the alternatives that the EIR/EIS will consider. We will look at the alternatives that SDG&E has provided and evaluate them as to whether they should stay in our system, which I'll describe in a minute, further consideration. If you'll look at the next map, which is Figure 8, these are the alternatives that San Diego Gas & Electric considered in its application. And the yellow lines on here are the alternatives that SDG&E decided not to pursue in any detail. So we are looking equally at these alternatives, along with the ones that they did carry forward, to make a decision as to whether or not these alternatives should be evaluated in the EIR/EIS.

What we list on this slide here is the process that we use to evaluate alternatives. Every alternative that's considered in our document has to pass these three tests. The first is that it must be consistent with the project objectives. Those are the objectives defined by SDG&E, but CEQA does not require that it meet all the objectives, so we have some flexibility in looking at alternatives as far as meeting most of the project objectives. The alternative must have fewer impacts than the proposed project or avoid the impacts by moving to a different route. The third requirement is that the alternative must be feasible. You have to be able to build it with today's technology and you have to be able to get it permitted.

Here we've listed the range of alternatives that we will be considering just in terms of broad categories of alternatives, so we would love to hear from you about any of these sorts of things. Obviously there's a lot of focus on routing alternatives. And as Lewis mentioned, the meeting that we have here today is one of the opportunities that you have to discuss possibilities for routes for the transmission line that would avoid Anza-Borrego.

To jump down to that last bullet. In the prehearing conference that was held in Ramona a couple of weeks ago, the commissioner for the CPUC, Dian Grueneich, ordered San Diego Gas & Electric to identify an alternative that did not go through the park. Of all the alternatives that were out there this was the one that was meeting their objectives as the best non-park alternative.

The alternative that they identified, if you look at this Figure 8, is the one that's identified as the D Alternative. It would follow the Southwest Powerlink west out of Imperial Valley to a point that is just east of Otay Mountain. And then it goes north through the Cleveland National Forest and on and off forest land. The forest land is green. The white is private land. D goes to the Boulder Creek Area, if you know the area, and then would rejoin the proposed route in the area of Santa Ysabel. So that's an alternative that's on the table and, again, one that we will be looking at.

The other types of alternatives we will consider are, for example, generation here in the basin, either renewable or using gas fire generation. We know that the South Bay Power Plant repower application is in now with the Energy Commission, so that's clearly an alternative that needs to be looked at. We'll look at non wires alternatives as in demand reduction.

As I mentioned, we will reconsider the alternatives that SDG&E looked at and the ones that they decided to eliminate. So we're wide open at this point. We've made no decisions and we're really looking forward to input from all of you on those topics.

Just briefly, so you know what the process is, at the very end after the EIR/EIS is finished, the CPUC and BLM have very different steps to wrap up their processes. The CPUC, which is a five-

member board appointed by the Governor will vote on the project. They will reference the EIR. They have to make a decision that the EIR is adequate, called certifying the EIR. And if the project is approved or an alternative is approved, they will require mitigation monitoring and the adoption of mitigation measures.

BLM's process is very different. They have a 30-day comment period following the release of the Final EIR/EIS. They have a 60-day Governor's Consistency Review. Then they prepare their document called a Record of Decision in the El Centro field office.

I hand this back to Lewis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for your kind attention to that. Hopefully that's given you, if you were not already aware, a good orientation of what this process is about, where we're headed, and what's going to be involved.

The one piece that you're going to have to stay tuned for obviously is the precise schedule for some of the future dates. Billie Blanchard mentioned that if you're on the NEPA/CEQA mailing list, you will receive notice of that. Basically if you signed in today or filled out one of these cards, you're on the NEPA/CEQA mailing list. It's not a special list. You've satisfied that by signing in today, so you would get that notification.

I have a number of cards that have already been turned in to me. What we've been doing at all the other meetings, it's worked really well, we have a three-minute time limit for you, but because we haven't had an inundation of speakers, what we've been able to do is go back after everyone has had their first chance for people who want to make additional comments. We have what I call second helpings. So there will be that opportunity to do that. But that way we can give everyone their first chance equally in the order in which they signed in to speak. I know that at least one person had a time that they needed to leave by, so it will help us to get to that person by the time they need to leave.

I have a very sophisticated way of indicating the three-minute time limit. When you have one minute left, I'll put up my index finger like this, so occasionally you might want to look at me. And then when your three minutes are up, I'll put up my closed hand like that. That means it's time to wrap up your comment.

Again, what you may not have seen or noticed, there is a woman seated to my right. She is a court reporter and she is making a verbatim transcript of everything that's said into a microphone. And we're about to move one out there actually, if you could help me do that, for those of you to come up and speak. So I just need you to not talk way too fast. She's really fast, but she can't keep up if you really get going on a roll, so I may ask you to slow down if that's an issue. Usually it happens when somebody is reading from a prepared remark without taking a breath. So if you will work with me on that again, I will appreciate it, again because you will have the second helping. Everyone has been able to finish in that second helping if they didn't in the first.

Let's just put it right there close to Mr. Bell. And with that, I just want to again remind people that this is one way of getting your comments into the record. Written comments are given the same weight and consideration, so if you have a really detailed comment, that's usually the best way to do that in addition.

So I'm going to call the first several names. We're a little tight in the seating here, so that way it will give you a chance to start working your way forward so I don't catch you off guard, the first several speakers that I have listed in order are Marty Allenby, Pam Albers, Karen Norene Mills, John Peterson and Brian Jennings.

Marty Allenby, if you would come up, all we need is your name and we can go from there.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MS. ALLENBY: I am Marty Allenby.

MR. MICHAELSON: Adjust the mike.

MS. ALLENBY: And I'm one of those millions of Americans who fears public speaking.

I do need to comment, Susan, that it's not an national park, Anza-Borrego is a state park.

MS. LEE: I'm sorry if I said that.

MS. ALLENBY: My name is Marty Allenby and I'm a trustee on the Anza-Borrego Foundation and Institute. And I serve as treasurer of the organization.

I am opposed to the route proposed by San Diego Gas & Electric through Anza-Borrego State Park, the largest state park in the United States, encompassing about 90 percent of California's state wilderness system, for the following reasons: The proposal would encroach and intrude on designated wilderness areas, which has never been allowed. San Diego Gas & Electric's plan does not outline the impact on habitat or wildlife, in fact, it seems to dismiss some species with an inadequate analysis and lack of mitigation proposals.

The increased height and extended footprint of the new poles would invade wilderness and sorely intrude on the natural beauty and view sheds of the park's approximately 90,000 acres, as well as pollute with the buzz of transmissions.

San Diego Gas & Electric concedes significant impact on known and unknown cultural, archeological, paleontological, and other resources. There is no study that can give evidentiary support to the extent of damage to these assets.

Further, and perhaps most damning, San Diego Gas & Electric failed to adequately pursue and thoroughly document alternative routes, other than through Anza-Borrego State Park. The offer seems to take the least expensive route for San Diego Gas & Electric, though the most expensive for the park and for the future of state parks and designated wilderness.

To quote Ruth Coleman, Director of California State Parks and Recreation, in her statement for the prehearing conference before the California Public Utility Commission, "Our purpose is to conserve and manage the resources on the lands we oversee, not accommodate development projects that do not benefit state parks and its mission."

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Pam Albers.

MS. ALBERS: Good afternoon. My name is Pam Albers. I live at 4547 Shirley Ann Place in San Diego. I'm here today to express my opposition to routing Sunrise Powerlink through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park. Sacrificing our natural resources for the sake of corporate profits does not constitute progress. Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is one of the crown jewels of our state park system and we are fortunate to have it in San Diego County.

My husband and I have been camping and exploring in Anza-Borrego for almost 25 years. The park's beauty and unspoiled vistas hold great personal means for us, as they do for a myriad of our friends and acquaintances who also enjoy the park on a regular basis.

Most importantly, as a society it is vital to our physical and spiritual health to have plains of natural beauty that are protected against man's need to develop. It is the responsibility of major corporations, such as SDG&E, to be good neighbors and consider the value of preserving our environment. It is unconscionable that routing power lines through the protected wilderness area, Anza-Borrego State Park, could even be proposed, let alone seriously considered. This construction is an unfortunate and tragic presence for the future of not only Anza-Borrego, but for other states and national parks.

Pursuing other routing options for powerlinks such as a parallel line along the existing route that runs up from Ocotillo and through Jacumba will preserve the beauty and uniqueness of Anza-Borrego. SDG&E can and should be good stewards of our public spaces and a model for other corporations.

In closing, I would like to quote Ralph Waldo Emerson from his essay entitled "Nature." "Man's intercourse with heaven and earth, becomes part of his daily food. In the presence of nature, a wild delight runs through the man, in spite of real sorrows. Nature says, he is my creature, and meagre all of his impertinent griefs, he shall be glad with me."

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you guys.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Karen Norene Mills.

MS. MILLS: Hi, I'm Karen Mills here today on behalf of California Farm Bureau Federation. We represent farmers and ranchers in California throughout the state. More specifically, of course, this will impact land owners in Imperial and San Diego Counties. I feel like a bit of a party crasher because I'm not here specifically to address Anza-Borrego State Park. But I have a couple of specific things to call out about the PEA, and it certainly is an amazing document, it's very extensive, but even with my limited time to review the document, I wanted to highlight some of the things that I'm heartened to hear that you will be taking a look at as you review it for furthered documentation, because some of it invites further analysis. For example, in the Central Link area, the tables that are used to compare the impacts of the proposed project with alternate projects, some cases look like they're comparing apples and oranges, so it would certainly be helpful to the public and those that are trying to analyze the impacts of this project to truly understand how those things compare in land use and acres impacted.

And, also, it's sort of a nitpicking thing, if you will, in certain segments in that link, and perhaps other links as well, you categorize the land use impacts by types of land uses. And one of the categories used is vacant land and it doesn't appear that, in fact, it's really vacant, because my memories tell me in many aspects many areas are grazing land. It should properly be categorized as

agricultural land. I'm not quite sure what vacant land in California means anymore. But, finally, a couple of more things. The impacts of the line will —

MR. MICHAELSON: Can you speak a little bit more into the microphone.

MS. MILLS: I'm sorry. The impact of the line both have permanent and, of course, construction impacts during the course of preparing the line. The agricultural operations, the land disturbed during construction may take years to recover. Thank you. And, of course, with the line's permanent places, you know, those changes are irretrievable.

Finally, the recent submission by SDG&E about the alternative that they've been requested to assess by Commissioner Grueneich reminds us that it's state policy to use existing easements that are feasible for obvious reasons. Impacts can be far less significant because the use is already in place, but we are also concerned about the fact that SDG&E's reluctant to consider existing easements, for example, on forest service land, because it might take longer to get through the review process. This is a long-lasting project that will be around for decades and we certainly don't want there to be short-sided planning for a long-term project.

MR. MICHAELSON: That's it. You can come back.

MS. MILLS: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Perfect timing. Thank you.

It's really as important that as much as possible that you try to speak directly into the mike so that everyone can hear you and so that the court reporter can hear you.

MR. PETERSON: I'm John Peterson. I'm also a trustee of the Anza-Borrego Foundation Institute. I commend Commissioner Grueneich for requesting the additional analysis in regard to the alternative routes for the power line. The project that is proposed originally had all power lines, all alternatives, going through the park, the Anza-Borrego State Park. CEQA certainly does require a range of alternatives capable of avoiding and substantially lessening all significant impacts of the project even if those alternatives may impede to some degree the —

MR. MICHAELSON: You need to slow down.

MR. PETERSON: — obtainment of project objectives were maybe more costly. I don't believe the project as originally proposed complied with that direction, and certainly, the direction as provided by the commissioner was very good to explore the range of alternatives.

Now, we do have a brief that was filed by SDG&E that you have, the October 2nd of 2006 brief. It did talk about the additional routes. And the main question in my mind is, well, does that then meet with the direction as provided by the Commissioner and also CEQA and NEPA. I don't think it does because of some facts. The original project approved all or placed all the routes through the middle of the park. Now the response places all the alternatives through one site, that being Santa Ysabel. That does not fully examine the full range of alternatives. What about the sudden route into the Miguel Substation? Also, therefore, the routes proposed within that brief, B, C and D, go to the heart of the national forest and other park lands within the central part of San Diego County. They appear to take the longest and most environmentally impacted routes possible.

Page 8 of that brief also concludes that alternative routes are bad because they have impact to sensitive plants and animals species. Well, dah, any of the particular routes in San Diego County is going to have those impacts.

The reports appear to you to be obvious as evidence against those routes. Also, the table within the report appears not to be objective or truthful. As, an example, on Page 11, it states that the proposed route through Anza-Borrego State Park would have no impact to regional or designated open space, while impacts to the state park would be mitigated. Not according to the state, wherever possible it probably would have significant unmitigable impacts.

In summary, CEQA requires an open process with an objective, unbiased analysis to provide information within the brief. I don't think — it does not do that and does not comply with the direction provided by the Commissioner.

MR. MICHAELSON: Let me read ahead again the next several speakers. After Brian Jennings will be Sara Feldman, followed by Nick Ervin, Chris Peregrin and Bob Barelmann.

MR. JENNINGS: My name is Brian Jennings. I'm not affiliated with any group. I read in the newspaper that this was about Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and so that's why I'm here. I don't have any alternatives, although it does seem to me like solar is really kind of exploding these days with new technology and rooftop solar. I've got several houses around me that — I would really love to have the solar rays that they have so that my energy could go back to San Diego Gas & Electric instead of the other way around.

First thing I would like to do is just express my disgust with the fact that anybody would propose a project like this through a state park like Anza-Borrego State Park. The fact that there are a few crooked wooden poles there today, that fails in comparison to what is being proposed. My — I'm really committed to this park. An indication of that is the fact that my eight-year-old son is in a play right now and it's only the second time that I've ever missed one of his plays. I represent myself and my children and many of my friends that couldn't be here today. You know, this doesn't just affect people in Borrego Springs, there are hundreds and thousands of us here in the city as well. If you talk to people you meet out there on the trails, other cities, other states, other countries for that matter, that will be affected by this.

While I can't address any specific physical impacts there might be, I'm really just here to defend my favorite place on the planet. My parents have been taking me out there since before I could walk and I started taking my two sons out there since before they could walk. And I really wanted to take my grandchildren out there and let them see the same unspoiled beauty that I've enjoyed with my children. We go out there probably more than 10 times a year, several times, three generations, my parents and my children.

My concern is the reason that I go there, one of main reasons is for the vast views of just miles and miles and miles. And I talk to people from Europe and that's one of things that they're impressed with. My favor site overlooks where this powerlink will be and it will pretty much ruin what I go there for. I'm not going to tell you where that site is, I'm sorry. And there are many other of my favorite sites that are virtually under the route and there are many Native Americans sites with them.

I just would like to say we established these parks to give us a place to go to get away from development. And I just hope that we can maintain this park as such a place so future generations can enjoy it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Sara Feldman.

MS. FELDMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Sara Feldman and I'm the Southern California Director for the California State Parks Foundation. We're an active party in the CPUC proceeding. And I'm going to reserve specific comments for written materials later as we complete this scoping process, but I just wanted to make a few comments on behalf of our 75,000 members throughout California, that we oppose the routing of this line through the park.

I think that the speaker who immediately proceeded me, as well as practically everybody else who has spoken thus far today, has already expressed very eloquently and I'm sure many more will as the day goes on what their concerns are. And I think what it really boils down to is that our state parks are held in sacred trust, in sacred trust for our children and our grandchildren and all the generations to come. And to allow development through state parks such as this project is not tolerable, not permissible for the citizens of the State of California.

And there are viable alternatives. We'll be commenting in a much more specific way on those in the future as well as the impacts, but I just wanted to go on record about what the Foundation's position is on this. Our main concern is, in fact, the park. But inasmuch as alternatives will go through other wilderness areas and affect other private residences, we think that there are adequate mitigation measures. And we really want to see alternatives fully explored in an unbiased, fair and open way. So that's the Foundation's position and we will elaborate on that more in written materials.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Nick Ervin.

MR. ERVIN: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Nick Ervin. I'm the volunteer president of the Desert Protective Council, which for about 50 years or so has been an advocate for desert conservation and education.

Our primary focus is more recently, in recent years, eastern San Diego and Imperial County desert areas. For about 30 years myself I've been exploring, studying and advocating for California desert landscapes. I spent about six years in the BLM's California Desert District Advisory Council. It seems like a previous lifetime now. I've walked or driven most of this proposed route, not just through Anza-Borrego Park, but through the lesser known portions of western Imperial County which affects at least two federally designated wilderness areas, which were created under the California Desert Protection Act of 1994.

I think it's fair to say Desert Protective Council has grave concerns about this project as currently constructed. For me I have to say that this poses one of the biggest threats to the integrity to the desert landscapes in the 30 years that I've been involved. At a bare minimum we want to see that the environmental review of this project encompasses at least the following, which would be, No. 1, the impact on scenic view sheds. I mean, state park is the highest designation possible to protect things like scenic views, as well as the fact that it will affect views from at least, again, two federally designated wilderness areas. The noise impact on park visitors and wildlife, the noise study that's done so far is clearly inadequate. The impact on camping areas in the park, the fact that this park unlike most has open camping, so these enormous towers with the electric fields cracking and humming all day have an

enormous impact on camping. The impacts on endangered species particularly the California Desert Big Horn. The park is privileged to be a critical habitat area for this endangered species and I'm lucky enough to have seen some of these over the years. They are extraordinarily rare and majestic.

We're also concerned by the impact potentially on scientific research within the park boundaries particularly by Anza-Borrego Institute and others. The degradation is bound to sort of impact the undeveloped areas that are necessary for legitimate scientific research. And ultimately also we're concerned with the economic impact on communities like Borrego Springs and maybe the income on the state park itself, because it depends on tourism for most of its income. And the inevitable degradation that would go with this project is almost incalculable at this point.

Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Next speaker is Chris Peregrin.

MR. PEREGRIN: My name is Chris Peregrin.

MR. MICHAELSON: You're going to have to speak into the mike.

MR. PEREGRIN: My name is Chris Peregrin. I'm here to comment on the Sunrise Powerlink as defined in the Notice of Preparation. And, specifically, my concern is with the regions that go through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and other public lands. I've lived in San Diego for about seven years. I have a degree, a bachelor's of science, in Wildlife, Fish and Conservation Biology from UC Davis. And I've worked professionally as an ecologist for 10 years.

I think this project will be a disaster for the ecology of the region. That we will incur significant, negative ecological effects from this project is a given. We can throw mitigations at it, but mitigations rarely make up for the loss. This project will have a huge and ongoing ecological cost, that's a given. Please consider that.

I'd like you to consider something else. We have a unique opportunity in this process. We need to use this opportunity to distinguish San Diego as a conservation forerunner. We've done the boomtown, now we need to make sure that we savior the resources that make this place so special. San Diego can be a truly great center for ecotourism in America. It has all the elements, but we need to make a commitment to those elements. Creating a swath through pristine landscapes and habitats is not taking advantage of our opportunity. It's destroying the long-term sustainability of this region. Please do not support this project. There are better options. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Read ahead, after Bob Barelmann, we have Janis Shackelford, Jim Bell, Donna Tisdale and Jill Hoffman.

MR. BARELMANN: Hello, my name is Bob Barelmann. This past summer we went camping and traveling throughout the Cascades, Sierra Nevada and Rocky Mountains. Nearly half of those evenings were spent in the state parks, national parks, and national forest. All of us are so fortunate that our forefather's had the vision to set aside for future generations to breathe the desert and mountain air in a natural environment. These parks and campsites, hiking and biking trails, belong to all citizens of this wonderful country. And each and everyone of us on both sides of the table have a responsibility to our children and grandchildren to enhance, maintain, preserve the parks and national forest.

It is our opinion that the alternative showing the Sunrise Powerlink crossing the Anza-Borrego State Park wilderness areas should be illegal and unacceptable. Those lands were set aside for the wildlife and the use and benefit for people to enjoy nature forever. All of us in this country share those benefits. We should be responsible for protecting it.

Sort of comparing it to a baseball game, you have to hit the ball inbounds to score a run. It is our opinion that SDG&E already has struck out. Crossing the wilderness areas of state parks and national forests are foul balls and out of play. SDG&E has been hitting foul balls for all of its alternatives.

I have spoken at length with the right-of-way department at SDG&E. They are buying land and surveying as if the game is already over and already won. The umpires, that's the CPUC, as I see it, and the judges, are letting the game get out of hand. In my opinion the solution is simple. It is time for CPUC and the judge to dictate that the only project that gets on base is one that does not cross Anza-Borrego State Park, the Cleveland National Forest, designated open space, or other public areas for enjoyment and the use of our children. If SDG&E can find no other options, then the game is over, no project, and SDG&E would have to prepare for the next game.

Frankly, is there anyone who would be proud to show their grandchildren the location of those city-size transmission lines running in those wilderness areas? Would you take a hike with your grandchildren to admire those city-size steel structures in that project?

I need to shorten this, I think. Okay, in our case there is also human drama, too. My wife and I purchased acreage in Ranchita 20 years ago. The land offers exclusion and privacy and dramatic views of the surrounding valleys. In addition, it is surrounded on three sides by the Anza-Borrego State Park. It's our feeling that the park would protect those three boundaries better than any other neighbors and any other location. And to this date the Anza-Borrego State Park has protected those areas and continues to be a good neighbor.

My wife and I want to go on record in extreme opposition to this project due to the impacts of the Anza-Borrego State Park wild wilderness areas. Is the CPUC willing to bankrupt our protected wilderness to the benefits of profits for SDG&E and Sempra Energy? Where is the corporate conscience? No project is an option and a valuable lesson.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, sir.

MS. SHACKELFORD: Janis Shackelford. First I do not support the current route of the Sunrise Powerlink, but I'm speaking here today on alternatives. The Alternative D that was published in this morning's paper is not an alternative. It takes the power line through the worst of our fire-prone back country. San Diego generally burns every 30 years, our county, in the back country. And even the route of the current Sunrise Powerlink is not assured in a fire event.

I question the validity of the Sunrise Powerlink in general. Initially they're proposing that this powerlink will bring alternative energy sources from Imperial Valley; however, those alternative sources are not even submitted to the CPUC yet. The geothermal plant was already planned to be accessed — transmission was already planned to be accessed by IID through their agreement, I believe it's called. So I would like to see an alternative where SDG&E is in partners with IID to find a way to transmit the power from the new sources through the IID system and then down to San Diego County from the north.

Regarding the alternatives listed on Page 12 of the NOP, left-hand column, Bullets 2 and 3. I would like to see SDG&E be required to evaluate improvements to the existing power plants in our county and not write that off as not reasonable. I would like to see expansion of rooftop solar in conjunction with the state program. My husband and I do have a solar system. We sell our excess power, or give, excuse me, our excess power to SDG&E for free. We would love to expand the system, but we would also need some financial incentive to do so, if SDG&E would pay us for our excess power. So I would like to see rooftop solar expanded.

Also on Page 12, the last bullet in the right-hand column, the LEAPS project is proposed, it is under review, yet SDG&E is writing it off as not to be evaluated as an alternative route for a 500 kV line. At the same time they're using the speculative project in Imperial Valley to justify the Sunrise Powerlink. So I would like those alternatives considered. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: I'm Jim Bell. This is about alternatives, and I think the only alternative should be not to build the powerlink no matter where it's routed. And why do I say this, because investing actually less money and efficiency improvements and renewable energy development could make this actually completely electricity metered out. And this would cost a lot less money than building a powerlink which will produce no power at all.

Also, with regard to the solar that SDG&E is always talking about, the further east the solar is set, the less it helps us meet our peak demand, because the sun is further east the sooner the sun sets. So I think this whole thing is just a smoke screen.

Okay. Then, okay, how does this work? Okay, first of all, if you're going to do this, you want to tie solar with efficiency. Efficiency pays back quickly, so initially you invest almost all your money into efficiency. That gets you out of debt. Then you shift the income from that efficiency to renewable energy development. And through that process it will cost much less than a powerlink.

Then there is — and this is how it works for the consumer. Let's say you have a house or business, a crew would come out and they would retrofit your house or business. And if you had a good roof, they would put solar on, but there would be some solar to represent your need either on a parking lot down the street or on somebody else's rooftop in any case. Your bill if it was \$100 a month before, would go down to \$90 a month, but after the retrofit you're probably only going to be using \$50 a month worth of electricity. So what you're actually doing is you're using less power, but you're paying for power you're not actually using, but you don't care because you're getting a ten percent positive cash flow. That \$40 is used to not only eventually pay off your installation and efficiency improvement, but it also rolls over to help everybody else become renewable energy self-sufficient as well.

Finally, there's the issue of trust. According to energy business, Sempra and Company are on the hook for 586 million dollars in fines and a reported 1.9 billion dollars in total costs because they've been stealing from rent payers. They don't admit guilt, but it appears that Sempra and SDG&E has decided that it is more profitable to steal from us whenever they think they can get away with it and pay the fines when they get caught and to charge us a fair cost. The strategy seems to be working even with fines and other costs, Sempra's profits in 2005 were a reported \$895 million dollars. Now Sempra, SDG&E comes to us to build a powerlink proposal and tell us we need it and it would be good for us. Given their past performance, why should we trust them about anything.

Then, finally, I brought copies of this book, if anybody wants one, and basically Pages 9 through 18 lay out the whole plan to make our county completely renewable energy self-sufficient. And I also have an opinion piece that basically shows that even if none of these environmental issues were involved and could all be solved, that the SDG&E plan still does not make economic sense.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, Jim.

MR. BELL: Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Donna.

MS. TISDALE: I'm Donna Tisdale. I chair the Boulevard Sponsor Group, but I am speaking today as an individual. People in our area of the back country just found out that the alternative routes that were previously eliminated are back.

MR. MICHAELSON: It's difficult to hear you. Could you just get a little closer to the mike.

MS. TISDALE: This issue is on our agenda tonight for our Boulevard Planning Group. And I have done my homework. I've been to the meetings. I've been getting information. I've met with SDG&E and I've met with the opponents. I've been to hearings. I'm also a 30-year resident of Boulevard, which is targeted for wind energy, 500 kV lines, 230 kV lines. I'm also a native of Imperial Valley where numerous blighting energy projects are proposed in sensitive areas but few have been approved. I vigorously question and dispute the stated need for this invasive obnoxious project at all.

When people blithely express support for Sunrise and its alleged sources of renewable energy, and I wonder if they really know the tens of thousands of acres of our treasured public open spaces and scenic vistas will be sacrificed with thousands of towering windmills, over 30,000 massive solar generators, and over 100 plus miles of huge transmission lines. Are they aware that it could all be a ruse for future, undisclosed, transmission of Mexican or other sources of power to serve the L.A. basin ultimately.

In talking to my farming family in Imperial Valley, it is clear that their community has not been fully informed of the planned sacrifice of their low-income rural neighborhoods to benefit the more affluent and politically influential coastal urban areas. How can this be right?

Also, maybe we're not fond of off-roaders, but I wonder if they are aware of the potential impacts on their activities. I was informed that over 5,000 acres near Ocotillo and Plaster City HOV areas is the new potential site for a massive solar field. How will Santa Ana forced sandstorms, which can strip the paint off cars and pit your windshields, impact those solar generators?

Regarding the alternate routes, the reasons stated in SDG&E's NOP and PEA for eliminating the routes B, C and D are all valid. And I will wait for my second round to finish.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Bill Hoffman is our next speaker. He will be followed by Marsha Johnston, Kelly Fuller, John Raifsaidar, and Joshua Feathers if that person has arrived. And then, yes, thank you.

MR. HOFFMAN: Hello, I'm Bill Hoffman. I'm a lifetime resident of San Diego County. I've been going to the park for about 50 years camping there and spent a lot of time in the Cleveland National Forest as well. I have a strong concern for the environment. And I also own an in holding in

the desert about 100 feet away from the power line that is going to be taking place in between the Narrows and Ocotillo Wells, so that's where I come from.

I'm feeling like we've gotten on a train that's going in the wrong direction here. And the only question is how quickly can we get off and on to the right direction? And there's a couple of things I want to talk about. One is an assumption on the demand. The other is alternatives. And then the players in the process, because if we are going to go through this, I think we all need to understand some of those things.

On the assumptions of the demands, some of the other speakers have talked about the alternatives, and I think that's being downplayed a little bit. I think there needs to be more focus on do we really need this line at all? For example, there's a number of little substations that can be put in. I know in Escondido there's a place up there I don't think they're using all their power. I think those issues should be examined as well as reducing the demand, which is, I think, key to everything.

The next thing was the alternatives, because I think the perspective, again back to that analogy of getting on the wrong train, the perspective ought to be let's assume, because the overwhelming opposition I think is that we're not going to build this line through Anza-Borrego State Park. So let's put the focus on the alternatives and not the strongman alternative that San Diego Gas & Electric came up with that moves the line up through the Cleveland National Forest past Green Valley Falls and Paso Pacacho. I mean, that's just — that's something that's just, look, here's something even worse, so therefore, you out to go with our bad idea.

The other is I think we need to look at from — if we are going to go down this process, I think — I know I would like, and I think others would like, an understanding of all the players throughout the process. I know you put it on some of the slides, but email addresses, because if we're going to be an effective part of this process, we need to be able to contact the right people at the right time. So if it's possible somehow to put it on your website or something, the players and the process and the time limit, I think that would be helpful.

And then the last is the critical issue. What is it going to take as we're going along, and I know, Bill, you were talking about the various steps, what is it going to take from what agency and do they all have sign-off approval or veto power to get this thing derailed away from the park? And I think that's a critical issue, because everybody that is opposed to it needs to focus on those issues.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Marsha Johnston.

MS. JOHNSTON: Hi, Marsha Johnston. I'm a writer and researcher. And, first of all, I was going to be — this being an environmental impact assessment meeting, because my argument's primarily economic at the moment. And what I would like to say, and a lot of other people have already touched on it, and in addition to the environmental impact, which I believe would be a terrible thing, but basically this project from some of the research I've been doing lately on co-generation and local on-site generation, that is to say, distributed energy generation, is that the weakest link in the project is that it has so much remote transmission. I was going to give you some figures from some of the research, is that power plant utilities like SDG&E probably would tell you that central power generation is the most cost effective, okay, that there's cost savings. Well, yes, that's true if they count only the cost of generating. And according to the World Energy Outlook from the International Energy Agency,

that's generation. In 2000 two dollars was 890 per kilowatt of capacity, which is 25 percent less than distributed generation, let's say, on site. But when you add the cost of transmission and distribution, which is the weak link and which causes all the brownouts and everything and the biggest problems around the world, not just in the United States, it shoots to \$1380 per kilowatt. So it adds an enormous cost to generation, the transmission. And so that's why putting this so remote from San Diego, what they're doing is they're jacking up the cost. And, in fact, a study by the Regulatory Assistance Project shows they studied 124 U.S. utilities from 1995 to '99, and they found that the cost for those utilities of setting up new distribution was \$50 billion dollars a year per all of them, it's like six billion per. And so what you got is that those — that investment that they have to have they say raises rates by six billion dollars a year. So essentially — and other people have touched on the idea that there are alternatives that are cheaper. And one of them is in this paper I'm going to leave for you. It talks a lot about recycled energy, which can be from industrial processes and also from electrical generation that already exist. It can be recuperated and the payoff is enormous, so I'll leave this for you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Kelly Fuller.

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller, San Diego Imperial County Sierra Club. And I've got a copy for you.

Thank you for this opportunity to inform you more about our concerns and our suggestions about the Sunrise Powerlink. Today's comments focus on the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park section. We will be providing yet more additional comments at a later date.

In regard to the alternative routes around the park that SDG&E presented earlier this week, the San Diego Sierra Club has not had sufficient time yet to examine them and consider whether they would present greater or fewer environmental impacts in the current proposed routes through Anza-Borrego. We would like an opportunity to explore the impacts of these potential new alternative routes in greater detail; however, we do not believe we can complete this exploration by the current end of scoping on October 20th, much less present coherent scoping comments on these new alternatives by that date.

Like many of the other groups who are concerned about this project, we are a grass-roots volunteer organization, not a powerful corporation with vast financial resources. It is very difficult for us to evaluate entirely new routes in less than three weeks, especially because these new routes were added while we were still compiling our comments on SDG&E's previously proposed routes.

We believe that others will also need additional time past October 20th. For example, it is our understanding that land owners in the potentially affected areas have not yet been notified that their properties could be impacted.

We also would like to note that no preliminary environmental analysis, much less a full EIR/EIS, has been completed for these new potential routes, yet SDG&E asserts that their previously proposed project through Anza-Borrego has significantly fewer environmental impacts than the new alternatives. Full surveys of biological, cultural, and other resources have not yet been conducted for the new routes. Thus, it is premature to draw any conclusion about the comparative merits of the new alternative and the proposed project.

I think with your permission, I'm about to hit another major section, I'll come back if there's time.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. John Raifsaider.

MR. RAIFSAIDER: Hello. Yes, John Raifsaider. I recently moved from the City of San Diego to Julian about a year now. And I've become associated with a group called People's Powerlink up in that area. Can you hear me? Great.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. RAIFSAIDER: I on behalf of being aware of environmental truth, since I also have been working on behalf of Global Peace, and I want to link this issue to that, because I think the project proposed by the big corporation is an act of violence, doing violence to nature, disrupting the order of beauty that exist in nature, not just for us, but for itself. It's doing violence to humanity by the way it tramples upon the people's will and solicits a violent reaction from the people as you hear.

The world is changing and it's changing with a new awareness that the people, humanity understand that the big corporations haven't quite gotten yet, they have to catch up with us. So there's a wisdom in the human voice here and I want to speak on behalf of that, because this violence that's being done to both nature and human nature, I think many are waking up to the fact that it must end. This idea of perpetual war which is being promoted by the people, the top growing strings, I think it's due to end and we're here to end it. And I think that the irony of — the argument of transmission lines to bring solar power across a great distance to the desert is rather like we were — if you live next to a river, pristine river and someone said, well, I'm going to sell you water from hundreds and hundreds of miles away because you need this water, that's as if you're ignoring the river. The river is the sun which shines every where. Everyone has access.

And so everyone has access. And to the new vision I think that to support a project like Jim Bell's, which is solar rooftop to bring — let the sun come to where we are and let that be our source and let us go wireless.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is Joseph Feathers here? All right. Then is there anyone else who has not turned in a speaker card? Why don't you come forward, please. Good to see you again.

MR. TRAFECANTY: I don't understand it —

MR. MICHAELSON: Just give us your name.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Name is Dennis Trafecanty. I don't get it. It was an application that was 2,000 pages long by a multi-national corporation who when they talk about Anza-Borrego Desert they said regarding the view shed, "no significant impact." When they talk about my Santa Ysabel Valley — I don't know if you've ever been to Santa Ysabel, but if you go out of Ramona and you go east, you finally come to the last hill and you look down and there's that cute little town and on the left is where I live. And they said, "no significant impact," but that's where the power line, those towers are going to go through. So I'm not sure I understand what's going on here.

I thought, you know, state parks were land banks for future development. The note — you know, we're talking a lot about the desert, but what about all that land around the Anza-Borrego Park. It's so beautiful. It's — there's no growth. That's the way the county designed it for no growth. All those farmers and ranchers that have those cows that are munching the grass out there, they signed a

statement that they wouldn't grow — they wouldn't develop their property for 10 years under the Williamson Act. That's a state mandated property tax relief act. They don't want to grow it. They don't want to develop it.

I'm also a co-owner of a business in Poway with about 20 employees. I'm not worried about a shortage of power in 2010, but I am worried. What I'm worried about is the so-called energy crisis of 2000 and 2001 where, as some of you gentlemen and ladies said, SDG&E manipulated the price of natural gas. They also misrepresented the quantities. You know, it's like the old Enron days, remember when the guy was quoted on a voice mail when he was talking about California rate payers, said "Burn baby burn." Remember that, don't forget it.

Let me tell you how this works, SDG&E doesn't make money if the Carlsbad Encina plant gets developed with new technology or the Chula Vista Plant or the South Bay gets developed. They don't get any money on that because those are other owners. The way they make money if there's a two-and-a-half-billion-dollar project, which this is an excess 1.3 billion for just straight costs, that project — contractors usually get 10 to 12 percent. That's two and a half billion, that's 250 million, 10 percent. I've been a financial officer for 25 years, 10 percent of what investors earn from those numbers that they're earning go to management in the form of stock options and bonuses. That's 25, 30, 40 million dollars that you're going to line the pockets of people that run this company. That's what's going on.

Okay, there's strength in numbers. Peoplespowerlink.org is something that a lot of you ought to look into that website. As the sign says in Santa Ysabel, the sign that was just put up, one of them says "Aren't parks forever," and the other sign says, "A blue sky or cold steel." Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: If you fill out a card and you want to add your name to the list, just come on up to the mike. Thank you.

MR. MacROBBIE: My name is Bruce MacRobbie. I live in Descanso. I suddenly got a fright attack, I'm sorry.

First of all, I question whether or not this powerlink needs to be installed at all. And the more I've heard here today, the greater my doubts. I came here because I read in the paper that this power line was going to go through one of my favorite places in Anza-Borrego — excuse me, damn — Grapevine Canyon. Anza-Borrego Desert State Park has a flaw in that it has the word desert in its name. And a lot of people they speak of desert, they think of the road from Yuma east, you know, out to Texas someplace and it's just desert, it's not attractive. But Anza-Borrego is more than that. Grapevine Canyon is more than that. You talk about a spiritual place, I just drove down through there to take some pictures. I don't know if you guys have a format that I can —

MR. MICHAELSON: Well, that's okay.

MR. MacROBBIE: I took most of them, including the existing power line that goes down through there and it's almost — it's almost easy to look past even in the photographs. Whereas, you know, your guys slides here show this monster, this thing that looks like it could walk around at night. And I read that SDG&E said it won't be so bad because for every pole that goes through Grapevine Canyon now, there will only be — well, for every two that's in the canyon now, there will only be one of those things. I can't imagine. I tried to imagine it in these pictures.

And then here today my other favorite place is violated. As you leave Julian and you come around past the Firemen's Memorial Point and you look out over Santa Ysabel Valley. You see, the seasons change there, spring, summer, winter. You don't see that here in the city so much, but up there it's magnificent. And to think that monster, a whole row of those monsters down through that valley, it's more than I can take.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. After the meeting stops, we'll get those photos from you.

MR. MacROBBIE: Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: I thought I saw a hand of someone else.

MR. HUGHES: Good afternoon. My name is Gary Hughes. I'm a private citizen. And I understand that one of the main reasons for construction of the powerlink is to have green sources of power generation. I also understand that SDG&E does not have any guarantees that especially geothermal energy will ever be available from the Imperial Valley. That said, if or when SDG&E goes to Arizona or Mexico for power, would other sources be guaranteed green by SDG&E? If not, why spend the 1.3 billion dollars on dirty power? When upgrades and modern expansion to current generating facilities in San Diego can be utilized.

Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who hasn't spoken who would like to for the first time? We have a number of people who have been coming to more than one meeting. I feel like we're becoming friends.

MR. RAFFETTO: Thank you very much for the opportunity. I appreciate it. I wasn't going to, but my name is Joe Raffetto. I'm a licensed concessioner in Anza-Borrego State Park. We take people out in the desert on excursions and try to get them away from this area.

I spoke enough yesterday I thought, but until today I've always thought that the answer is to reroute the line, just keep it out of the sensitive areas, but as I look at all these map, even up the I-8 corridor, I'm thinking like the transmission line itself, the whole project and the bogus reasons that we're being told it's being made. It's just not — it's tearing the heart out of this county. And whether it's people that are having their ranches infringed upon or their view sheds when they take their families to Anza-Borrego or just riding the highway and being subjected to all of that. It's something that's uniquely archaic and they may have gotten away with it 50 years ago, but everything is set in those maps. There's boundaries that aren't supposed to be crossed and something like a transmission line is ridiculous. And someone earlier mentioned a train going the other way and other people have mentioned, like Jim Bell, rooftop solar. I hope that this is an impudence to get us to do things, because it's always occurred to me when I was a kid, and probably you guys too, do you remember watching 2001 Space Odyssey. I mean that was like 1968. And I remember thinking like, wow, I'm going go to be in my forties then and I'm going to be able to see that future and that's going to be amazing. And then I realized that something happened in the 20th century. Like if you took somebody from 1900 and brought them to 1950, it would blow their mind. They would see aviation and elementary rocketry and skyscrapers and super highways, horseless carriages, it's amazing. And then take somebody from 1950 and bring them even to today, they would be like scratching their heads going, hey, what the heck, this is all you guys have? Well, we've got the internet. I mean, it's really ridiculous. And why is that? I

always thought it's because of the 800-pound guerillas like Sempra that are basically — this plays right into their hands. They want commodities. They want something that they can control. Rooftop solar, especially if you cut yourself off the grid, is just something horrifying to them.

And I just hope that this will be impudence to get people to do — at least have rooftop solar and other sources that are real, not out in the middle of the desert, like someone said drawing water in a pristine stream. I really hope that all the forces that would be would put a stop to this so all of us, all the people in this county don't have to suffer because we're all in this together.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Anyone else who would like to speak? Sure come forward, please.

MR. PATCHE: I'm Marvin Patche. I live about a block and a half from Anza-Borrego State Park. And I've asked in several meetings I attended what about the existing power line that you have for years? Why don't you just put a larger format and not disturb everybody with the plans there are now. And they say, well, it's dangerous for having a fire. Well, much of that link is in the flat desert where there is little chance for a fire and it doesn't take too many brains to figure out that you can provide a concurrent line with a fire proof bottom just like they used to have. It was the fire separations in the mountains. And it doesn't take too much of an engineer brain to figure out that they could produce the same line without disturbing the landscape and people by conducting if they must go on the same line that they have now and just improve it and make it fire proof. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. By the way, Daniel will approach each of you and try to get you to fill one of these out. I thought I saw a hand somewhere else. Yes.

MS. BIANEZ: My name is Pat Biane. And I may not have all the statistics exactly right, but I was reading an article where Walmart — a person that works for Walmart came up with this idea that if they bought energy efficient light bulbs and replaced just the display light bulbs in the fans in all of the Walmarts in the United States, that they would save enough electricity to be able to power Rhode Island, Connecticut and one other small state. And they have done this. They went to GE and they said, "We don't want to buy your other kind of light bulbs, we only want to buy energy efficient ones." And GE has decided to work with them. And that's now going to be standard for all Walmarts, because obviously Walmart is a very big, powerful corporation. They can do a lot of things. The bottom line is they figured out how to save a lot of electricity by just having these small light bulbs being changed in every one of their stores.

They also in the same article said that if everyone just changed one light bulb in their house, that it could — I don't remember the statistic, but it was just an incredible amount. And I remember San Diego Gas & Electric used to have programs where they really did encourage people to conserve. And they had programs where they tried to give people rebates if they bought certain kinds of appliances and they just don't seem to do that anymore. It's not part of the agenda. They may have small programs. It's not at all what you see that they seem to be pushing. And I just think that that's an alternative that should be really — I think we need to know why they're not doing that.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else before we go for second helpings?

Okay. I should mention that if there's enough time at the end, we also at the other sessions had some Q and A where people can also ask questions about some of the aspects that they didn't

understand, like the proposed action, or the alternatives, or things like that. So just keep that in mind, we can do that if we have enough time. It doesn't matter what order we do the second helping. If you're ready to go, all I need is your name.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MS. TISDALE: Donna Tisdale from the Boulevard area. I'm kind of disappointed in some people pointing to other neighbors, you know, saying it's better to put it there than over here. I grew up visiting the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and all the other desert areas, just like Boulevard, it's a spiritual place that gets into your system and you want to protect it no matter what.

So I was there when the existing power lines came through Boulevard. I'm still there. I had horses that would not — could not make them go under that line, so when people talk about expansion —

MR. MICHAELSON: We can't hear you, I'm sorry.

MS. TISDALE: When people talk about expansion, there are other neighborhoods that are equally impacted. So I wanted to go on where I left off before.

Negative impacts on the Cleveland National Forest, Cuyamaca State Park, sensitive species, habitat, panoramic view sheds and private residential properties along the alternate routes are all as real as those along the proposed route. There are also problematic Tribal lands.

Putting two 500 kV lines side by side through wildlands in the eastern San Diego County, it's not flat desert. Next to the U.S./Mexican Border would put all that power at risk due to the extreme fire danger. We also have an out-of-control border. I live there. Mexican cartels have come in. We live in a lawless state much of the time. Smugglers and others breach our border frequently undetected and pursued. I have family and friends that work in federal law enforcement, including my own son. We have some very scary types roaming our border areas on this side and sabotage is not out of the question.

Boulevard right now is carrying a heavy burden by hosting the 500 kV transmission line and one tribal wind farm and more to come. With the turbines they also have blinking lights and strobe lights that go on all night in these previously dark areas.

Blazing new corridors will only encourage and promote the industrialization of the back country, which does not comply with the community character or plans, and will pave the way for future expansion. Just look at the 395 corridor by Victorville where there's multiple sets of power lines.

Power should be generated as close to core urban basins as possible, such as the proposed rebuild of the South Bay and Encina Power Plants. Intensive conservation efforts and other forms of local generation should also be pursued along with replacing old lines with newer lines which can move more energy over existing transmission grids.

Just say no to Sunrise. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MR. BELL: Jim Bell. I just want to speak a little bit more about the economic implications of going with renewables and efficiency. I mean right now the county exports about two billion dollars a

year to pay for the imported electricity that we bring from someplace else. That's a huge cash flow drain out of San Diego's economy.

The other side, if we're investing it in efficiency and renewables in the county, we're employing literally thousands of people that will be installing these devices, so basically taking money that we're already spending and exporting. And once we export it, we get no jobs, no business opportunities, no tax revenue from it. Keeping that money in the local economy and for every dollar you keep in the local economy, it basically — it at least decreases by another dollar. So if we're talking about two billion dollars being exported, bringing that money back in the economy would mean four billion dollars of actual local economic activity. And some people say the economic multiplier is much higher than two.

Even after all the solar is installed and all the efficiency is installed, whenever we pay for energy, all the money stays in the local economy because it would be going to some local entity that would be managing it. So it continues feeding cash into our economy, you know, indefinitely.

And plus in terms of just a minute ago the issue of terrorism was mentioned. If you have a system on roofs and over parking lots throughout the county, it would be very difficult for any kind of terrorist activity to make any significant dent in our power supply. If we locate it to one location or have power lines crossing great distances, anybody who just got, you know, went nuts or whatever, could knock down that line at any time. You shoot it down with hunting rifles, simple explosives could knock down towers. So it's not secure at all.

Then, finally, why should we be basing our energy security on a non-renewable dirty resource like natural gas or any other non-renewable energy resource. It just does not make sense. Even if we produce the power locally with natural gas power plants, we have to — we have to import the natural gas, so that is not energy security at all. Those pipe lines are still going to be subject to terrorism, earthquakes, and other disasters.

And the price of a kilowatt hour in terms of the price of natural gas. At 10 cents a kilowatt hour, the price of natural gas represents almost 90 percent of the cost of kilowatt hour. So even if we're producing it locally, we're still producing the money to the natural gas suppliers.

Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Kelly, are you going to come up?

MS. FULLER: Thank you. Kelly Fuller, San Diego Imperial County Sierra Club.

It's our understanding that the environmental review documents the CPUC and BLM are preparing will address the responsibilities of the government agencies associated with this project. The section on California Department of Parks and Recreation should state that the Anza-Borrego General Plan would have to be amended before the Sunrise Powerlink could be approved through the park. In addition, the California State Parks Commission would have to approve the de-designation of state wilderness through some sort of public process that has yet to be created. And I don't think anybody knows what it would be.

SDG&E has incorrectly asserted in its alternative route filing that under Anza-Borrego's General Plan the powerlink is a permitted use and, therefore, SDG&E believes the general plan does not need to be amended, but the general plan recognizes only SDG&E's existing easement. The

easement would have to be widened into designated wilderness before the company could build the powerlink. The widening changes everything.

We would like to remind everyone that there are alternatives that can provide San Diego's electrical needs without having to build the Sunrise Powerlink at all. We provided a list of them at the El Centro scoping meeting.

Today we would like to ask that the environmental review documents address the implications to this proposed project of SDG&E's request to the CPUC for authority to add 250 megawatts of new peaking units to come on line in 2007 and 2008. And this request is contained in SDG&E's response to rulemakings, and I'll give this to the court reporter because I know this numbers are hard, 05-12-013 and 06-12-013.

Thanks for this opportunity to share our concerns and suggestions.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to add to their original comments? If not, good, we have time for the Q and A. What we did is — again, just to emphasize where we are, the analysis hasn't been done, documents haven't been prepared, so there are a lot of questions that can't be answered at this point obviously, but if you have questions about the process or the project, the panel here will do its best. And if we can't, we may have to get an answer for you at a later time. Because this is a hearing and there is a transcript, I need you to come up and ask your question at the microphone and just state your name.

MS. ALLENBY: My name is Marty Allenby. This may be an unanswerable question. But, Susan, you got a mitigation monitor. Who do you envision being the monitors, from where?

MS. LEE: I can't answer geographically from where, but I can tell you how the contract process works. The contract that Aspen has with the CPUC and the BLM includes mitigation monitoring. So we would propose to the CPUC and BLM a series of resumes of folks who are considered qualified. They review them and decide if they're acceptable to them based on local knowledge and monitoring experience.

MR. MICHAELSON: It would depend entirely on what's being monitored. It could be for biology, it could be a variety of things. Good question.

Other questions? Please come up to the microphone if you have one.

MS. DEUTCH: Rita Deutch. I have two questions. One is, I haven't read the material that I got today, I was wondering if any alternative considered increasing the power coming out of our existing San Onofre Nuclear Power Plant?

MR. MICHAELSON: The short answer I think is no.

MS. DEUTCH: Okay, thank you. And another is, I'm not familiar with the technical engineering of these towers, but will they have some sort of light or blinking light up on top or near the top as it goes through our very beautiful widely known dark sky Anza-Borrego State Park?

MS. LEE: That's a good question, and actually the question has been raised several times this week. We need to research it. We believe that the lights are only required for towers that are very tall, something like 160 feet. And these towers for the most part are less than that, but we actually need to

research the requirements. We've worked on other projects through the desert including lines through the Mohave Desert along the I-10 and those towers do not have blinking lights.

MR. MICHAELSON: But if they were to have those, we've received several comments at other meetings about the the concern related to that in other areas.

Just come up to the microphone if you're going to ask a question.

MS. WATTS: My name is Merna Watts. I have seen a map introduced by SDG&E which shows transmission lines running from the Imperial Valley Substation, or whatever it's called, I'm sorry, into Mexicali and south of the border, and I want to know what kind of guarantee SDG&E has made to you people that under no circumstances are they going to get power from Mexico? That's it.

MS. BLANCHARD: I know of no guarantees at this point.

MS. WATTS: Thank you.

MS. TISDALE: My question is for Ms. Kastoll from the BLM. How many of the windmill proposals are actually in the Anza-Borrego State Park or in the Ocotillo area?

MS. KASTOLL: I have no wind proposals for Anza-Borrego.

MS. TISDALE: For the southern area down by S2 and down by the Jacumba wilderness?

MS. KASTOLL: No. Well, okay, I have three pending applications for towers in the Ocotillo area, but mostly north of the highway, north of Interstate 8.

MS. TISDALE: I thought there was one south of the highway, too?

MS. KASTOLL: I don't recall, but I don't think so. If there is one, there's one small piece that relates to the application, north of the interstate.

MS. TISDALE: I spoke to someone and she was concerned about one that was in the pristine area of the desert, and I was pretty sure it was south of Interstate 8, but I could be wrong.

MS. KASTOLL: I can check it for you. But if there is one, I think it's a very small application that no environmental assessment has been done, no work has been done towards it. And I will be sending out the environmental assessments as they are completed.

MS. TISDALE: And my other question is on the information I got on the location, potential location of the solar facility, was from Mr. Abers himself, and he said it was in a triangle area between Ocotillo and Plaster City. At another hearing I heard it was from the Sterling Company that they need 5,000 acres and from a third party they said it was 32,000 units. So how far has this gotten? Is there an actual application? Is there an actual site picked or is this still up for grabs total?

MS. KASTOLL: Stirling has submitted an imperfect application. Their plan of development is expected to be filed with us probably in February of '07. Their proposal is 300 megawatts in the first stage with 600 more added if that's successful, which would ultimately take 5,000 to 6,000 acres. Their current site is between Interstate 8 and Evan Hewes Highway south of Plaster City.

MR. MICHAELSON: Kelly, did you have something you wanted to add? Come up to the mike. I think it had to do with the wind energy.

MS. FULLER: Yeah, I think someone may have been asking about the Wind Hunter proposal for wind testing. I saw a map that they provided, I don't know, almost a year ago, and at that time it appeared to be adjacent to one of the southern borders, south eastern border of Anza-Borrego and kind of northwest of Ocotillo.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. I think, yes, why don't you come up.

MS. SHACKELFORD: Janis Shackelford. A 2004 document entitled, "The Energy Supply and Demand Assessment for the Border Region," that was submitted to the California Energy Commission. It described the Imperial Water Irrigation District's plans for improving their system. Do you know if any of those plans have occurred? Because they were going to expand their lines and substations to provide transmission capability for the geothermal plant at Salton Sea.

MS. LEE: I believe that for the most part those plans are related to the Green Path Project, which is the IID portion of which Sunrise Powerlink is a piece, but in addition to that there are a number of upgrades to the IID lines within Imperial County. I don't think they've been done. There has not been an environmental document published on it yet.

MS. SHACKELFORD: Okay. Because I was wondering, are they eliminating what was discussed in 2004 to replace it with their proposed MOU with SDG&E to provide that interconnect to the substation?

MS. LEE: I don't know for sure. But the MOA with San Diego Gas & Electric addresses only the 500 kV portion, from Imperial Valley to Narrows Substation. It doesn't address the IID upgrades which are a separate component and not part of this project.

MS. SHACKELFORD: If I may, a second question. On the LEAPS project proposal, SDG&E is saying it's not approved and faces regulatory hurdles. Is that project still in process?

MS. LEE: The LEAPS project has published a Draft EIS in, I think, March of this year. And they're planning on having their Final by the end of October. But the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission would have to approve it at some point after the Final, so its process is moving.

MR. MICHAELSON: Do you have a question?

MS. ALBERS: I wondered if these kind of towers —

MR. MICHAELSON: Your name?

MS. ALBERS: I'm sorry, Pam Albers. I was wondering if these were the kind of towers that pose electrocution risks to birds and raptors, and if so, what kind of measures are going to be taken to avoid that?

MS. LEE: Almost any kind of tower poses some risk to birds if the conductors are close enough that a bird can contact two conductors at one time, because that's what you have to do in order to create an electrocution hazard. The 500 kV towers in general are less of a risk, because the conductors are farther apart. But for very large birds, like Golden Eagles, you really have to check wing span. We have in previous documents had mitigation measures to reduce electrocution risks. For the most part you try to make the conductors more visible, which has obvious other concerns.

MR. MICHAELSON: Any other questions? Yes, sir.

MR. PAYNE: Good afternoon. Harvey Payne, Rancho Penasquitos Concerned Citizens. I will be making some additional comments tonight in Rancho Penasquitos.

My question for the energy division of the CPUC is whether you have retained any consultants to study the non-wires alternative?

MS. BLANCHARD: I have retained the Aspen Environmental Group to do the CEQA/NEPA work, and as part of that team we have people that can look at various aspects of this project including non wires.

MR. PAYNE: Such as comparing in-basin generation?

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes. Plus there are parties in the proceeding who also are going to be providing a lot of information into the whole process. We will review all of that as well for the purposes of our document.

MR. PAYNE: I understand that the benefit of the CPUC doing it is you perhaps get a more independent analysis of the two non-wires versus wires alternatives?

MS. BLANCHARD: That is our objective: to do an independent review and analysis of this project through a CEQA/NEPA document. The ALJ, Commissioner Dian Grueneich have the general proceeding and they have their roles to play as well.

MR. PAYNE: This is the part I've been struggling to understand all the way through, which is there seems to be somewhat of a crossover at least on that aspect between the CPCN part of it and the what we'll call at the CEQA part of it. And can you explain or tell us how do you see that crossover and what the focus is on one side versus the other?

MS. BLANCHARD: Well, for NEPA/CEQA our task is looking at all the impacts on this proposed project and identifying a reasonable range of alternatives to that project that would lessen the impacts, take care of some project objectives, and would be feasible. Some of those reasonable alternatives could be a non-wires type of alternative like in-basin generation, use South Bay or that type of thing. We will be looking at all of that. And as Susan had indicated in the slide earlier is is our task to look at a reasonable range of alternatives for this project. There's a lot of issues and there's a lot of alternative analyses that we have to do. It's not a small project.

MR. PAYNE: If you wouldn't mind, I would like to ask you another question on a completely separate topic. The question is, and I almost hate to ask the question, but I don't know much about mitigation. Can you explain what mitigation is all about within the CEQA process once a certain alternative is selected? Let's presume that some part of this project does move forward and then a transmission line is going to be built, how does mitigation come into play? What does that mean? What is done? Those types of things.

MS. BLANCHARD: I'll let Susan speak to this also, but generally speaking under CEQA we have this requirement to do mitigation monitoring implementation plan, and so on any of our contracts where we have a Draft EIR or the final, we go in, and let's say the Commission approves some physical type of line project, we would go ahead and develop a mitigation measure compliance plan. We would lay out all the adopted mitigation measures that deal with reducing a significant impact identified. We have to come up with a mitigation measure that has to actually take care of that significant impact. We will go through all of that process, identify all those significant impacts and

identify mitigation measures. And if there are some impacts that cannot be mitigated, then they will become what we call a Class I significant impact, and we will probably have a few of those. So if they approve it, we have a mitigation measure in plan. Then at the Aspen Environmental Group we will have a number of people who will be out there monitoring the whole process of the construction on this project. And then if there's something that needs to be monitored after it's actually constructed such as restoration of a particular area, then we would do that as well.

Susan, do you want to comment?

MS. LEE: I don't know if it would help to give just a couple of examples of types of mitigation that would normally be recommended in a document like this. An example for air quality possibly is dust control, certainly in the desert and any area that's dry. This is usually done in accordance with the regional APCD, looking at what their requirements are to water roads, to keep speed limits during construction that reduces dust. Usually we have specific requirements even on the types of engines that are used during construction, because they have different levels of emissions. We have requirements for biological surveys immediately prior to construction and also sooner, so that you make sure if there are, for example, burrowing owls within the right-of-way. There are procedures for relocating them before you go and dig up habitat. Requirements to revegetate an area that has been disturbed for construction, but is not required later on. And we get even into design issues. If there's an area where SDG&E has proposed the towers that look like that and our visual expert believes that the singular tubular pole tower would look better, we would recommend that as mitigation measure in order to improve visual impacts.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else have any questions? Come on up.

MR. BLACKMAN: Hi, my name is Paul Blackman. I'm with the San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club. And following up on a comment Harvey Payne asked. Just an initial comment, if the CEQA process is somewhat parallel with the CPUC's process, the problem we have is that we'll have some alternatives analyzed through environmental process, that there isn't any technical impact analysis by CPUC. And it would seem pretty much impossible for the CPUC to adequately evaluate a project that had all the economical environmental analyses, but none of the economical technical analyses. So I think there needs to be some parallelism between the CEQA process and the CPUC.

Now, getting to the question, for example, on Monday SDG&E filed their southern routes document and the question is, well, now what do we do with it? I don't know.

MS. BLANCHARD: I won't tell you what we're going to do with it. First of all, what they talked about is their alternative, not a partial alternative. It is essentially right out of the PEA that was done, and so it's not really anything new. I mean, I think if anybody was looking at the PEA and saw the final. I think you'll see that it's pretty similar to what's in the PEA. Now, for us it's nothing new than what we already know about. We have to embark upon this whole alternative screening analysis in terms of what we decide should be carried forward or not under CEQA/NEPA and in the light of our discussions with BLM. We will go through a long process of alternative screening analysis as Susan indicated in the slide. So we're at the beginning of all of that really. And we will relook at some of what SDG&E did, but probably we may not agree with it or we may come up with something new. And there's a lot of information coming in through the prehearing conference statements and through other people, that we're going to utilize all of that information and get out there. We've already been talking with a number of agencies down here and we'll have more of that. All of their great input is

coming into this process as well. So we have a lot of work to do, but we understand the need to have a very extensive analysis of alternatives in this case.

MR. MICHAELSON: And eventually that's going to be in a Draft document and that's all going to be there for review.

MR. BLACKMAN: Right. The concern is — I understand the CEQA and NEPA process pretty well. The question is, is how does the CPUC evidentiary hearing process where they're going to analyze all the models, you know, the models, figure out, well, whether — all the environmental issues aside, whether it means technical, economical, these are two distinct analytic processes.

The question is, on the CPCU side how is that going to be made parallel to the CEQA side so they're analyzing the same sorts of alternatives?

MS. BLANCHARD: Well, we haven't worked all of that out yet actually because we haven't done the scoping memo, which we will hopefully attempt to resolve our two processes so that they're sort of working together with each other. So I'm not sure I could really say anything definitive about that right now. But obviously we want to make sure that information out of the ALJ proceeding is put to use into our document, that the timing is correct on that. And we haven't really finished the discussions on all of that in terms of those responses, but we understand the need to do that.

MR. BLACKMAN: Well, I just want to make sure that the process is metrosexual.

MS. BLANCHARD: Right.

MR. MICHAELSON: Did you have a question?

MS. FELDMAN: Yes. I had a prior question on what was just brought up which was, you know, the —

MR. MICHAELSON: What's your name?

MS. FELDMAN: Sara Feldman, California State Parks Foundation. The Foundation is concerned primarily with the park. Of course, we are also very concerned with surrounding areas and impact of alternatives on the view shed and other national forests, et cetera. So what I want to know is that — the alternatives that SDG&E put forth, they put forth three alternatives, which as has been pointed out are nothing new here, they're the same, but they did. And all of those run through national forest and scenic areas, even if they do avoid the park. So what I want to know is specifically can SDG&E be ordered — can they be told none of these alternatives are sufficient and you have to come up with some different ones, some completely different new routes or new alternatives? I mean, is that possible or does SDG&E — are they the ones who determine the alternatives? And if none of them are good, there's no power to order them to do something different?

MS. BLANCHARD: I don't want to speak for the ALJ.

MS. FELDMAN: I just can't figure out. Is it possible?

MS. BLANCHARD: I know from our standpoint what we will do is to look at alternatives. They all have issues. Our role will be to present reasonable alternatives and try to find something which has less impact, including non-wires alternatives as well, which may be the ones that have the least impact, right? So that's what our role will be. I've been down here all week, I'm not sure how the

Commissioner's office and the ALJ are responding to this recent filing. I haven't talked with anyone up there. I've been busy down here, so I'm not sure what is going to happen from their standpoint. But I know we have to proceed ahead and we have to evaluate and look at alternatives and do the best we can to be objective, try to find some alternatives that we feel have less impact than the proposed project.

MS. FELDMAN: So you're not bound by the alternatives that SDG&E has put forth?

MS. BLANCHARD: No. No. I'm sorry, I may have misunderstood. I mean, no, we look at the PEA, we look at the alternatives, we look at what they've said. And then our environmental team will go about the process of verification, of discovering more information, of deciding whether what they've said is correct or not correct. We may look at new alternatives, we've may decide to take some of their alternatives and carry them forward, or we may decide that most of them are not worthy of being carried forward and that we have to develop new alternatives, and we go along in the process. So we're not bound by any of their alternatives and we're not bound with the proposed project in that if we find something that is a better project, less impact, we will make those statements in the environmental document.

Susan, do you want to say anything else?

MR. MICHAELSON: That's it.

MS. FELDMAN: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: She's coming up with a question.

MS. SHIVLEY: Good afternoon. Ellen Shivley (phonetic) from the San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club. I know you are not talking technicalities here, but looking at these towers, I'm very impressed with the size of them and the weight of them and my frightened concern is that weight will grossly impact the groundwater. And, as you know, the desert is so precious that it seems to me like 100 or so towers of this nature may permanently impact the ground water, so I hope you have in place a hydrologist, a geologist who will very seriously consider these impacts.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. ABLERS: Pam Albers. This question might have been answered earlier, but there were a lot of acronyms being thrown around and I didn't quite understand. So when you consider all these alternatives, do you also consider cost as a factor or is that beside the point and you just make your recommendation, and how does that fit into the process?

MS. BLANCHARD: As far as under CEQA and NEPA, you can carry an alternative forward that may be more costly. Costs and various options or alternatives are a factor in the general proceeding.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. Dennis, do you have a question?

MR. TRAFECANTY: One of the things I wanted to ask is I know you've been down here all week and I know you've met certain agencies or groups, and I was wondering if — I don't know if you're willing to disclose who you've met to try to help you evaluate the decision that you're going to recommend, but have you done any investigating with the Encina people to see what it would take to get that on line, moved away from the ocean and put inland, and also the one in South Bay, which are

two of the critical in-county generation sources of power? And — well, that's one question I have, maybe if you could answer that. I'm Dennis Trafecanty.

MS. LEE: Our meetings this week have focused on public agencies, the counties of Imperial and San Diego, Anza-Borrego State Park and the Cleveland National Forest, so those have been our focus. But we had a speaker actually at a previous hearing from Cabrillo Power Encina. He gave us some comments. I'm not sure if you were at that meeting. We definitely are looking at an in-basin generation alternative in which we will gather information from all the proponents of in-basin generation. There's no lack of information regarding South Bay. They have an application on file with the Energy Commission that's multi-volumes and we have copies of that.

MR. TRAFECANTY: And then my other question, at the prehearing conference one of the things that I heard loud and clear was, it was kind of like a threat to those several of the 500 people that were there by the SDG&E attorney, when he said, "We got to move this thing along because the lights might go off," or something to that. And I was just wondering what kind of pressure do you have? What is the timetable for what you have to do? And if all these new alternatives are coming up, is there the ability for you to increase the amount of time you have to make your decisions?

MS. BLANCHARD: We're still trying to determine the time frame for getting the draft EIR/EIS out, as I indicated earlier. And there's a number of issues related around that. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and Fish & Game are requesting we do protocol surveys before we release the draft. I think we — we have a lot of information and we can go ahead and we'll do the alternatives as necessary. But, again, we have to work with the scoping memo and the ALJ to figure out the whole process on how we all dovetail with each other and get everything done.

MS. LEE: One more thing, as you know, the SDG&E application states that the project has to be on line by 2010 in order for the lights not to go off. However, in response to some questions that we had asked in the pre-application process, SDG&E did add a fair amount of information in its application in light of the South Bay application. And, in fact, they state in the application that they did provide to the CPUC, that if South Bay is repowered and goes on line, as it's expected, and I think it's 2010 or 2009, that, in fact, the need for this project could be extended to as much as 2016.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, sir.

MR. BARELMANN: I have two questions.

MR. MICHAELSON: Your name?

MR. BARELMANN: Bob Barelmann. The project at Otay Mesa that's been delayed for years and no one seems to want to pay for it or wants to start it and it's got permits and it's ready to go, why haven't they taken that into consideration? The first question. And my second question is, how can SDG&E's necessity be complete when they bring a 500 kV link through the desert, through everything, and they dead end it into Central Link Substation in the middle of nowhere and from there they can go with a 230 kV link, I mean, where does the other 270 go?

MS. LEE: That's an interesting question and that's been raised before. One of the issues we will be looking at in terms of looking at alternatives is the configuration of the project and to what extent the 500/230 substation can be located in different places. I think that the application actually

states that there's the potential for a future expansion of lines out of the Central Link Substation, but it's not expressed very clearly and it's an issue that we need to look at in terms of potential future impacts.

The first question was about Otay Mesa. I know there's an ongoing proceeding for Sempra to purchase the Otay Project from the approved developer. And, honestly, I'm not sure of the status of that. I don't know if anyone else knows about it. So we don't know whether it will be built, but part of our research related to in-basin generation will be to research that whole situation.

MR. MICHAELSON: Kelly.

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller. Getting back to what you said earlier about there's a possibility that you might come up with a completely different alternative, say a completely alternate route, nothing that we have seen before, what would be the process for that so that the people living in that area would be notified? Would they get scoping meetings like this? Would there be other kinds of meetings? How would that proceed?

MS. BLANCHARD: I think that's something that you mentioned before. And basically we've been talking amongst ourselves about it and, quite frankly, we have to go back and talk up in San Francisco as far as how we would review that process. We had some talks about it, but I understand what you and I think the rest of the people are saying, but I just need discuss it with others. So that's all I could say right now, but we have received your comment and we are going to look into it and figure out how to do that, because I understand.

MS. FULLER: Thanks. I was just hoping maybe it had magically been figured out the last couple of days.

MS. BLANCHARD: We have been talking and talking to people, so quite frankly, we haven't had time to think about anything.

MR. MICHAELSON: I just want to wrap this up to one more question.

MR. TRAFECANTY: In July I think in most of California there was quite a heatwave and, of course, SDG&E took advantage of that, made a big announcement in Horton Center here in San Diego about we got to get this thing going. My question relates to Encina, I understand that that plant, even though it's a dirty plant, and we all know that they want to improve it technologically and make it clean using natural gas and take it inland, but my understanding is it's there in reserve right now. But my thought is that during this terrible July heatwave when SDG&E was starting to talk about blackouts, wasn't it still not being used or maybe minimally used, in other words, it wasn't used on an emergency basis to get us through that July heatwave for about two weeks?

MS. LEE: I don't know. I don't know if anyone else knows. But what we will be looking at in this application is the Cabrillo folks have issued a press release stating their intent to repower Cabrillo which would allow it to essentially be rebuilt with the new style of power plant and many, many fewer air emissions. So part of that I think we will be looking at the historic generation and in-basis generation, so we will have a lot more information as we move through this process, but at this point I don't know what its operation has been.

MR. TRAFECANTY: My concern is that there's a trust issue here, a couple of people brought it up, with SDG&E and I was one of them obviously. But the issue is they've got a lot more money than a few of us in Santa Ysabel putting up a few signs, you know, to try to counteract some of their

advertising. But, you know, there's — I think that, you know, we got burned once by SDG&E back in 2000, and I think people ought to be educated, that the rate payers as to, you know, should we let them burn us again. You know, my dad told me, "Someone wrongs you, shame on them, but if they wrong you twice, shame on you." And so I'm really worried about all this — I don't know who pays for all this advertising. I can't imagine. I'm sure it comes out of our pockets somehow, but I hear it every morning and it just drives me nuts, so thanks.

My question is is basically how do we — how do we establish trust? Maybe that's not your function, but I have a real concern about that.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yeah, I think that's in a category of rhetorical question. I'm not going to ask them —

MR. TRAFECANTY: Another question similar to that is, are you still beating your wife?

MR. MICHAELSON: Yeah, exactly.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Try to answer that one.

MR. MICHAELSON: Do you want to come up?

MS. TISDALE: Well, it's more of a comment that's informational. When the Kumeyaay wind farm went up on the Campo Reservation with SDG&E, the location of the wind farm was redacted from the public documents. And also they failed — SDG&E failed to tell us that our community was going to be taken off the grid, or anybody, for 12 weeks and put on emergency generators. So this is who we're dealing with. And we also have a trust issue. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Well, as you probably know, we have another meeting to go to up in Rancho Penasquitos. Given the unpredictability of freeways this time of day, we're going to thank you very much again for coming and participating. This particular scoping process has been extremely useful to the CPUC and the BLM. We've received very constructive and informed comments. We appreciate your participation, and with that we're adjourned.

(The scoping meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.)