

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

Held 6:30 p.m. October 5, 2006
At Rancho Peñasquitos (San Diego), California

Reported by:
Claire A. Wanner, CSR No. 12965

STAFF PRESENTATION

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER

Martha Sullivan.....	9, 12
Marijo Vandyke.....	10, 23
David Regendardt.....	11
Mike Vildibill.....	11, 23
Keith Ritchey.....	13
John Callahan.....	14
Grazyna Krajewska.....	14, 21
Robert Reich.....	15
Laura Copic.....	15, 21
Tom Kluczynsia.....	16
Harvey Payne.....	16, 20
Helen Dominguez.....	17, 22
Michelle Ritchey.....	17
Mark Schmidt.....	17
Weixing Chen.....	18
Aurele Gilleran.....	18
Demian Dorrance.....	18, 22
Glenn Halchadorian.....	19
Tad Braun.....	19

STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good evening. My name is Lewis Michaelson, and I work for a firm called Katz & Associates. We have been hired to help support these meetings, and I've been hired specifically to serve as neutral meeting moderator at all of the meetings that are being held. As you may know, this is the seventh and last of a series of meetings that have been held throughout Imperial and San Diego Counties. We've been to El Centro, Borrego Springs. We've been to Ramona. We were down in Mission Valley earlier today. And, actually, we're in my neighborhood today. I live in Rancho Peñasquitos, so it's good to be here close to home finally.

In any case, this meeting is being held to satisfy two environmental laws. One is the California Environmental Quality Act for the state of California, and the other is the National Environmental Policy Act known as NEPA. That's because there are two different agencies, one state and one federal, that are involved in the eventual decision that will be made.

Some of you may be unfamiliar with an EIR or EIS process or the Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement. So I just want to familiarize you with the process so you know what to expect this evening and how you can participate. If you will go to the agenda, I'm just going to go over the purpose of scoping, and then Susan Lee with Aspen Environmental, seated to my right, will give a description of the proposed project. Billie Blanchard next to her, will be talking about the California Public Utilities Commission process's schedule. Then we have Lynda Kastoll and Tom Zale from the Bureau of Land Management. Tom will speak to their process and schedule in relationship to the national schedule. And then we'll go back to Susan Lee briefly for a few slides so she can give you more detail on exactly what's contained in the documents, how the analysis is done, and what types of comments are helpful at this point.

So let's go to the purpose of scoping. It's important to understand that we really have at the front end of what can be a very lengthy process. No decision has been made or will be made tonight. The document has not been prepared. The analysis has not begun. And the purpose of scoping is so that you, the public, and public agencies at the front end can help them with the preparation of that document. For our part what we try to do early on in scoping, and part of that will be tonight, is to inform you and agencies about the upcoming project for which the EIR/EIS will be prepared, to inform you about the environmental review process. After that, what we would like to do is solicit input. And those are the two most important things of scoping.

At this stage if you can give us comments regarding potential alternatives to the proposed project or which types of environmental issues you think are appropriate to be studied for this proposed project, that's the type of comments that are most helpful. As I said, we've had six meetings already. They've been extremely fruitful and productive. People have been providing cogent, focused, and relevant questions. So this has been a great scoping so far, and we're looking forward to continuing that this evening in Rancho Peñasquitos. We also expect to identify — we certainly have already — certain issue areas and issues of potential controversy.

And then, importantly, the scoping process ends October 20th. That's the deadline for all comments. The Scoping Report will then be prepared. That will summarize all of the comments received, both written and oral, at all of the meetings. And that will then be available on the project web site as well as 18 information repositories where hard copies are available of much of the background information.

I do want to mention that at a couple meetings there was a confusion about the web site. There is, of course a web site that's run by SDG&E about this project. But for the purposes of the environmental impact review process and the proceedings that are being handled by these two agencies, it's important to know that there is an additional web site of the California Public Utilities Commission which is really the one from this point forward would be the best one to pay attention to if you're going to pay attention to this process. That's something in handouts and also will be on a later slide.

It's important to know who the key players are again in this process. The California Public Utilities Commission is the lead agency, as I said, under the California Environmental Policy Act for which the EIR is being prepared. The Bureau of Land Management is the lead agency under NEPA. There also is a another very key actor, and that's the applicant, San Diego Gas and Electric. They are not part of this proceeding, obviously. This is the part where they've made their application and these agencies are now asked to independently review and go through and do the analysis of potential environmental impacts. And then Aspen Environmental Group, not only Susan but several of her team, are here tonight listening to your comments. And they've been hired by the CPUC and BLM to be the people who help do the analysis and provide the subject matter experts.

So, anyway, with that, I think I'll turn it over to Susan to go over the proposed action.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Lewis. We've included in the Notice of Preparation — and I think you all have copies from the mail or received a copy at the door as you came in — a fairly detailed description of this project as it's been proposed. So I'm going to give just an overview today, and I'll let you look through the description here. The project is large. It's 150-mile transmission line. I know because we're at the western end today I'll focus a little more on the Coastal Link as it's called. If you want to look at the verbal description in here in the text, it's on pages 4 through 8. But just for the overview, if you want to turn to Figure 1 of the Notice of Preparation, it's called Proposed Project Overview.

What you'll see on here is a transmission line that starts at the far eastern side at the Imperial Valley Substation at the southwestern edge of El Centro. You can follow the blue line up to the north and then to the west end through Anza-Borrego State Park. The blue line represents the 500 kilovolt portion. That's the highest voltage of the project. That part is over 90 miles long and extends into San Diego County to a large substation where the blue and red lines meet, called the Proposed Central East Substation. That's in the area of Warner Springs. At that point the project becomes a 230 kilovolt transmission line which is similar in voltage to the larger lines that you have through here. And that portion of the project continues down through the area of Santa Ysabel, south of Ramona, through part of Poway, Peñasquitos, ending at the Peñasquitos Substation just out west of us here.

As you know, the project is proposed by San Diego Gas & Electric. There's another component that you should know about. While they're not a proponent of the this project at this point, the Imperial Irrigation District has a memorandum of agreement with San Diego Gas & Electric under which ultimately IID would own and operate and, in fact, construct the first portion of line between the Imperial Valley Substation and the Narrows Substation which is actually in the center of Anza-Borrego State Park.

One other map you may want to take a look at — I think most of you saw this in the lobby out there — is Figure 6A. That's the one that zooms into the area where we are today. It's called the Coastal Link. It shows the route from the Sycamore Canyon Substation which is within Miramar, continuing to the west from Miramar past the Chicarita Substation which is not part of this project — the project actually goes past that substation without connecting to it — through Peñasquitos in an

underground segment. And that's what you'll see in this map in those dashed lines. The overhead segments are the solid blue and the underground with the dashed lines. And then overhead again down into the Peñasquitos Substation.

Here are the three goals that SDG&E has presented in its application for why this project is needed. No. 1 they're saying that it's needed to enhance reliability for the San Diego system in terms of being able to provide electric power in the future as need grows. The second one is to access proposed renewable energy. You saw on Figure 1 the project starts in Imperial County. SDG&E has identified a couple renewable resources out there where they would import solar power from a project that's being proposed from Stirling Energy, which would be built down near the Imperial Substation and also possibly geothermal power for which there's quite a few resources identified along the south edge of the Salton Sea. The third goal that SDG&E has identified is to reduce energy costs in general for SDG&E rate payers.

This next slide is SDG&E's objectives. And they presented quite a few objectives. They again follow these same three goals, but they're much more specific. The reliability, renewables and cost is the basic theme here. The last two objectives really are land use principles that relate to how they decide to site transmission lines.

I'll hand this to Billie, and she'll talk about the CPUC.

MS. BLANCHARD: Good evening. I'm Billie Blanchard, CPUC Project Manager for this environmental document. And I just want to go over real quickly the CPUC review process and the schedule for the general proceeding and the EIR/EIS. Basically, the CPUC has two review processes for the application. One is this for the general proceeding, and the other is for the environmental review for the EIR/EIS which I am mostly involved in.

The general proceeding for the CPCN is being led by assigned commissioner Dian Grueneich and administrative law judge Steve Weissman. The scope of the CPCN is determined by the Public Utilities Code Section 1002. And in that proceeding, the determination of need for the projection would be assessed. Also, we look at community values, issues, aesthetics, parks, various other aspects of the project including and also the review of the environmental impacts of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA.

As far as the schedule for the general proceeding, so far there was a prehearing conference held in January in Ramona, and then there was a second prehearing conference in a public participation hearing that just happened in Ramona on September 13, 2006. There is a scoping memo that will be prepared for the general proceeding by the ALJ Steve Weissman. That has not been prepared yet. I understand that he will be working on that in the first half of October. That scoping memo will lay out the issues that will be addressed in this proceeding and also will address the schedule for the proceeding and then will also include our EIR/EIS schedule as well. So right now I can't give you any dates on the hearings or briefings or any of that at this point, because we don't have the scoping memo done.

The environmental review schedule: SDG&E had originally filed an application in December of 2005. And then in August they filed an amended application and also filed the Proponents Environmental Assessment known as the PEA. There was a Notice of Intent published for the EIS in the Federal Register and that occurred in August 31st of 2006. The Notice of Preparation — which we have sent out copies to everyone — for the EIR was published on September 15, 2006, and the scoping period will end on October 20, 2006. At this point in time the dates for the release of the Draft EIR/EIS

have not yet been determined as we are still trying to assess some issues. Although when it does happen, we will go ahead and send out a card to everybody on the CEQA mailing list so that you will know the date of the Draft release and the date of the Final and that would be a 90-day comment period when the Draft EIR/EIS is released.

I'm going to hand this over to BLM so they can talk about their side.

MR. ZALE: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Tom Zale. Lynda Kastoll and I are here tonight representing the Bureau of Land Management, El Centro field office. The Bureau of Land Management is involved in this process because San Diego Gas & Electric has filed a Right of Way Application that would involve, as it's currently proposed, about 33 miles of right of way on BLM-administered lands. Those lands are primarily in Imperial County, although there is a 1.3-mile stretch in San Diego County that the BLM is responsible for.

In addition to that, BLM is currently working to determine what role we would play in the administration of a reservation that was attached to the patent for the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park back in the 1930s. It is the reservation for the existing power line that crosses the park. And the staff at the BLM is working to determine what role BLM would play in continuing to use that reservation at part of this process.

In addition to that, BLM will work on an amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan. That's the land use plan that BLM uses to govern how we manage the public lands in this area. An amendment to the plan would be required because the project as it's currently proposed would deviate from BLM-designated utility corridors in the California preservation area.

In addition to that, BLM will also be responsible for conducting government to government consultation with interested tribes and will also have to lead in completing Section 7 consultation with Fish & Wildlife Service in accordance with the Endangered Species Act.

Because there's a plan amendment involved in the process, the public review period will be 90 days as opposed to the normally shorter period that's associated with EIS/EIRs. I think that's it.

MS. LEE: One of the other things we do during our scoping period is, in addition to consulting with the public directly, we also talk with the key agencies that have responsibilities for issuing permits or providing input to the decision that needs to be made by the CPUC and the BLM. So we've listed here for you just a few of the many, many agencies along this 150-mile route that have some jurisdiction over the project. We've met with several of them this week, and we will be meeting with others as the process moves along. It's just for your information to know that there's an agency scoping process as well as the public — a question I guess?

MR. MICHAELSON: You know, we'll have time for Q&A later on. One thing I didn't mention — because usually public comment hasn't started yet — there's a court reporter over here. We have to make a verbatim transcript. So unless things are on the mic, it doesn't get picked up. So if you could hold onto that question, I'd appreciate it.

MS. LEE: Okay. And to reiterate what a couple people have described already, this time a little more visually, this is a flow chart that illustrates the NEPA/CEQA process under which we're preparing an EIR and EIS. And just to show you where we are, the decision has been made to prepare these two documents. And we are now in that yellow box where we are out here for scoping, looking for input from the public and these agencies. We are then going to move into actual preparation of the

document, identification of alternatives, and I'll talk more about that in a minute. After we publish the Draft, we'll be back here to talk to the public and hear what your comments are on the Draft EIR during the 90-day comment period that Tom mentioned.

I'm going to show just a couple slides that summarize the types of things that are included in an EIR/EIS, because we're hoping that this will give you a feel for the types of issues we'd like to hear about today. In general, an EIR includes a very descriptive and detailed environmental setting which is a description of what is in the area now, what are the land uses, what are the biological resources, cultural resources. We'll describe the environmental impacts of the project that is proposed and also for the alternatives. And for each of those, the project and the alternative will have mitigation measures that are feasible to reduce impacts.

And the purpose to all this is to provide information to the decision makers that ultimately need to decide whether the project should be approved and if the project or an alternative should be approved.

Here we list just some of the major components of an EIR/EIS and, again, so you can get a feel for the types of issues that are covered and the way a document is normally broken down. In addition to the proposed project and alternatives, we'll look at cumulative impacts based on an assessment and a list of other projects that could also affect the environment along with this project, either geographically or regionally depending on the types of impacts they may have. And we'll look at growth inducing impacts as well. EIR/EIS also addresses mitigation monitoring. This comes into action if the project is approved. There's a process by which the mitigation measures that are adopted by these agencies are monitored in the field to make sure that they're actually implemented.

Here we list all of the environmental disciplines that an EIR/EIS would cover so you have a feel for the range of issues we'd like to hear about today. If any of these are issues that you know about or impacts you're aware for the project, then that would be great comment.

I'll talk in a little more detail about alternatives because there's been a huge focus on alternatives as you may have read in the paper or heard at the prehearing conference. Commissioner Dian Grueneich asked SDG&E to submit an alternative that would avoid Anza-Borrego Desert State Park so that would be on the record as their stated preference for a nonpark alternative. SDG&E did submit that just a couple days ago. Then I'll just show you which one that is although, it doesn't affect the western end of the route. The route that SDG&E identified in their filing if you look at the map called Figure 8, which is the very last one in the set of maps attached to this Notice of Preparation, what SDG&E identified was an alternative that would begin also at the Imperial Valley Substation, follow the gold line which is the existing Southwest Powerlink with another transmission line, and then would turn north along this line that's labeled D. That's a route that actually goes into the Cleveland National Forest. It would pass through both private lands and national forest land and would rejoin the proposed route in the vicinity of Santa Ysabel. So everything west of there would be unchanged by that proposal, just so you know.

What we're showing here is the process by which we evaluate every alternative. And this applies to both regional alternatives as well as to an alternative that may avoid a couple blocks of a city street. In any case, we look first to see whether the alternative meets the project objectives that have been identified by SDG&E. They don't need to meet all of the objectives. CEQA specifically allows that most of the project objectives be met but not all. The alternative must have fewer impacts or avoid impacts of the proposal project. And, thirdly, the alternative must be feasible, which means you have to

be able to build it in a technical way and you have to be able to permit it based on existing laws and regulations.

The types of alternatives we're looking at are very broad in this case. We're looking at everything from routing alternatives which, again, are different ways to get either from the Imperial Valley to western San Diego County, or different ways to get from one intersection to the next. The scale of a routing alternative can be large scale or small scale. We're looking at generation as an alternative. As you probably know, there's an application in for the South Bay Power Plant to be repowered, which would change the inbasin situation pretty dramatically within San Diego. And there are other power plants that are expected to be repowered or constructed within the basin in the next few years.

And we're looking at nonwires alternatives which are methods to reduce demand, efficiency measures, new metering possibilities that would allow a reduction in demand. The last two maps, one of which I referred to a second ago, Figure 7, shows the alternatives that SDG&E has proposed in its PEA, its Proponents Environmental Assessment. Those alternatives we will take another look at and decide independently of them whether or not we believe those should be carried forward and whether they meet our criteria. And, separately, we will look at the alternatives that SDG&E considered and did not pursue and those are the ones shown on Figure 8. We will reconsider all of those and see when we believe some of those should be pursued and, separately from that, we look at all other alternatives we come up with. We're not bound by what SDG&E has done up to this point, but we will look at what they've done.

One other point. There's a workshop you may have heard about a week from Friday, tomorrow, that will be held by SDG&E. It's for the formal parties in this proceeding that Billie mentioned earlier. It's a workshop the public can listen to but not participate in. People who are parties to the proceeding will be discussing alternatives. The feedback from that meeting also comes to us. So if you have alternative suggestions you're absolutely free to give them to us here. There's no reason that you would also have to go to the other workshop.

Just quickly, I want to show you what happens at the end of this process so you have a feel for what you may expect. After the Final EIR/EIS is published, the process for the two lead agencies are very different. At the Public Utilities Commission, a commission of five members that are appointed by the governor, will vote on the project. They'll include the environmental effects in this decision as well whether the project is needed. If the project is approved, they will require mitigation monitoring, and they'll identify which mitigation measures should be implemented.

The BLM has a 30-day comment period of the Final EIS, which is different than the CPUC. They have a governor's consistency review period of 60 days and they prepare a Record of Decision, which is a different sort of document than is prepared out of the El Centro office.

We will now give it back to Lewis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. This is the part that is really the most important of this meeting. This is an opportunity for you to provide oral input. I do want to make it clear, though, study after study shows that one of the greatest fears Americans have is public speaking. So we understand that. And if for whatever reason you're not comfortable in public speaking, we don't want you to think you've been left out, because written comments can be submitted or provided in a variety of ways. And written comments are given the same weight as oral comments. They are just as much a part of the

record. So if you decide not to speak tonight, please make sure if you do have thoughts on this, that you provide them to us in writing. And if you want to make oral comments, you can still provide the written comments as well. Again, very detailed comments is a good way to do it and make sure you get the point across.

I just want to reiterate this is a scoping process. And, therefore, the two types of comments that have the greatest relevance and impacts at this point are ones that either identify the location and extent of environmental impacts that you think the proposed project might have, and the second is recommendations on any alternatives that would avoid or reduce those. If you can address those in your comments, that's what will have the greatest impact at this point in the process.

I'm going to read the first several names so you know who's coming up. We've used a three-minute time limit. But because we've had sufficient time, what we've been able to do is after everyone as has their first chance at three minutes, we'll go back and have what I like to call a second helping if you can't fit your first comments. So don't worry about it. Don't try and speed through them so my court reporter can't get it. Know that you'll have a chance to come up. It happens particularly if you are reading from prepared comments: you have a tendency to get on a roll and go too fast. It's just because I want to make sure we get it on the transcript.

And then after we finish the comments, we do have a Q&A. We've been spending anywhere from either 20 to 30 minutes doing that as well where you can ask any kind of question. Of course, certain questions can't be answered at this point. For example, they haven't done any analysis so they can't tell you what the impacts are going to be. That is something that still has to be prepared. You say it's important for you make your comment, so you can come up to the microphone and quickly state your full name and ask your question. I'll make a small exception here.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MS. SULLIVAN: I'm Martha Sullivan, and I'm from Poway. And what I want to understand — and I may have missed it in your description, and I apologize if I did — but I want to mention, I want to be clear about what the BLM jurisdiction in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is.

MR. ZALE: Well, we're not really clear what our jurisdiction is.

MS. SULLIVAN: I sort of got that.

MR. ZALE: We're continuing to administer that reservation that is attached to the patent when the patents was issued for the Park back in the 1930s.

MS. SULLIVAN: So you don't yet know exactly what --

MR. MICHAELSON: Their jurisdiction will be.

MS. SULLIVAN: — permitting associated with that patent.

MR. ZALE: Correct.

MS. SULLIVAN: And when is that going to be resolved?

MR. MICHAELSON: That's three questions now.

MR. ZALE: I hope very soon.

MR. MICHAELSON: They'll let us know when they have an answer. They're not there yet, okay?

MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: That's one of those ones that we're not there yet. I'm going to list the first several speakers so you have an idea of when you're coming up. And I apologize in advance for mispronouncing anyone's name. I got three choices on this one. Marijo, Marijo, or Marijo Vandyke. Or not even that. Maybe I'm totally off. Maybe it's Marijo. David Regendardt, Mike Vildibill, Martha Sullivan, and Keith Ritchey.

One more thing. In a very sophisticated way of indicating time, when you have one minute left, I'll put up my index finger like this. And when your three minutes are up, I'll put up my closed hand like this. But remember, you're going to get a second helping.

I'm going with Marijo Vandyke.

MR. VANDYKE: Very good. Thank you. Good evening.

MR. MICHAELSON: You need to start with your name.

MR. VANDYKE: My name is Marijo Vandyke, and I live in Poway. And I'm here to ask some questions and make some observation about the NOP that I reviewed. The purpose of the Sunrise Powerlink project is threefold. It's to ensure reliability of services, utilize renewable resources, and reduce energy costs. In speaking about reliability, I'd like to look at the possibilities for service interruptions. The draft EIR/EIS should examine in particular I feel that a potential for wildfires and also earthquakes.

Wildfires are frequent in the back country of San Diego and Imperial counties. The proposed new line, in particular this one segment, I'll just call out for an example. The line that extends from San Vicente Road to Sycamore Canyon Substation is following the route of the Cedar fire. The possibility of severe damage to transmission lines and equipment above ground are very high. And, therefore, that's just one area that could be affected and cut the link that San Diego County will grow to rely on for its energy.

The other natural disaster that's very frequent in southern California and in the Imperial County specifically is earthquake. From El Centro, Calexico, to Mexicali that area — the Imperial Valley and the Vallecitos Mountains are the most active seismic fault area in California today. If you open the newspaper on any given day and look to see where the seismic events of any consequence are, they're always in those areas. The potential of a magnitude 7 or greater event or multiple events is also very high. Service interruptions should be anticipated and should be planned for.

When addressing renewable energy sources, I question when the use of geothermal sources will cause subsidence in the Imperial Valley. I also question whether any sources of power will be located in Mexico. Specifically, I'm referring to page 17 of the NOP under Potential Impact for Air Quality. "What is meant by "power plants provided imported power"? Is the purpose of this project not to utilize renewable energy resources primarily?

Generated capacity for San Diego region is being hotly debated. We know the South Bay power plant is due to come back online. And it is right now characterized in the NOP as outdated and

ineffective. It is, however, undergoing a complete overhaul, so it should be included in the calculation for power generation in the area.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, Marijo.

MR. VANDYKE: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: David Regendardt.

MR. REGENDARDT: Hi. My name is David Regendardt, and I live in Rancho Peñasquitos. And I'm here for two reasons. One, I live in Rancho Peñasquitos and I live across the street from the current power lines. There are three reason 13 years ago my wife and I decided to move across the street from the power lines. And every time during the summertime we go to the neighbors pool and we understand why we didn't live on the canyon. It's because of the buzz. It's because of the only thing you can see from your backyards are these lines that are there. That's what it is. The concept of burying cables coming through and adding underground appeals to me, you know, personally. So that's my PQ part of this.

Next, you all heard from my cousin out in Borrego. We have land that you all want to cross. We're surrounded by state park, and the concept of bringing new wires and new towers through the state park across our land and up and above just frightens me. First of all, the ability to be able to build within the state park is something new, you know. What's next? Is Old Faithful going to have towers over top? There should be a line drawn. Our state parks are for everyone to enjoy.

We are the keepers of our property. We have 800 acres over there. Through the years we've opened up our property to universities, to various groups to come and study the Native American artifacts that we have. We have kitchens, bones, burial sites. We have actual marked trails where they walked hundreds of years ago. It's an incredible thing. And in my family's opinion, we take better care of our property than the park would. And we have talked through the years about someday when we can't afford to pay the property tax or something happens, the first thing we would do is either donate it into the park or to a conservatory to maintain what it is.

We have no intention of building. Dropping in those towers through our canyon would have such an incredible impact between the workers, the helicopters, the steel, all the things that go with it. The impact on the animals. We have mountain lions. We have endangered long horn sheep. And I bet you a dollar, if I look carefully I could find a small tsetse fly that exists on our land.

Again, my thing is I really really oppose going through the state park for everyone's sake. And, of course, personally, I really don't want you coming through our land. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: It probably was just a misspeak, but I do want to be clear that SDG&E is not sitting up in front of you. So when you say "you all want to cross" and "you want to do this," I want to be clear that this is CPUC and the BLM, and it's not their proposed project.

Mr. Vildibill.

MR. VILDIBILL: My name is Mike Vildibill and now that I pronounce my last name I used my three minutes.

MR. MICHAELSON: I don't count that.

MR. VILDIBILL: Okay. Thank you. I live at the southern edge of the city of Poway and I currently have 437 kilovolt lines going adjacent to our community. This is the Rolling Hills community in Poway. And the Sunrise Powerlink project proposed to increase that the 667 kilovolts directly adjacent to these homes. And when you compare the 667 total kilovolts that this community would have compared to the 200 kilovolts that are being proposed to some new communities there's is a stark contrast between the impact of the community that's sharing the burden or carrying the burden of a large set of wires going through their neighborhood as opposed to a neighborhood that's dealing with a mere 230 kilovolts.

So I ask that the environmental impact study include recommendation to install incremental lines under the ground for those communities that are already shouldering the burden of having overhead lines already in their backyards. By not considering the undergrounding of these incremental lines, the CUPC — the CPUC is really telling every citizen in San Diego that's impacted by Sunrise Powerlink that once you get a transmission line installed, that there's no end to what will come in next. And that there should be, I think, serious consideration taken to undergrounding incremental power lines even through communities that currently are shouldering the burden of having overhead lines.

Which, finally, I wanted to pointed out that some communities — and Rolling Hills in Poway is one such community — had a very difficult time engaging SDG&E during the planning process through unreturned phone calls, broken promises of returning phone calls, and whatnot. And we look at the SDG&E proposal that does have undergrounding through some communities and not ours, and I ask that you and your planning take into consideration that that wasn't our intent. And it wasn't a result of our lack of interest or attempt but some communities simply were unable to engage and to influence those — that proposal as it went in. So don't take the proposal that SDG&E put in as a reflection of what the community's input into the process.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Next speaker is Martha Sullivan.

MS. SULLIVAN: Hi. I'm Martha Sullivan, and again, I live in Poway. Just a brief interruption, I did work for the day Public Utilities Commission for almost 20 years, and I was at that table for a number of years managing so I know how you feel when they talk about "you all."

With that, briefly a few things I wanted to mention. One, it seems like to me that there is basically going to be surplus capacity at the north ends of this 500 kV lineup in Warner Springs or wherever it ends up ending. So I would assume a cumulative impact or some kind of analysis of growth including impacts whatever that surplus provides the pathway for.

And we all know that there's been a number of proposals to build similar lines northward, so things like the Rainbow transmission line, there's definitely examples out there, proposals to do just that. So I would say that this EIR/EIS is going to have to consider that their real prospect by bumping this much capacity at the north end of that 500 kVL line.

You've probably heard this already, but there's been a lot of questions about feasibility of Sterling, or the technology out in Imperial Valley the feasibility of it when it's going to be available, whether this line would be built and what by holding that out as the, you know, source of renewable power, we actually one are starring San Diego County for the media pipe dream; and two, are we redirecting, you know, limited resources of energy and time to that project that really ought to be going to ones that are more feasible and more short-term.

And that leads me to my last point, which — it strikes me that the No Project Alternative is going to have to include all the recent legislation that's been enacted. That calls for the global warming solutions that was just signed, the global emission standards for electricity emission, sellable energy standard, then the California Solar Initiative that was signed last year. We can't — in the past we might have said there's nothing concrete we don't think it's feasible so we're not going to study that as an alternative. Just now it is required by law. It is feasible. There's technology in place to do it. It will meet many of the objectives of the project. So I would argue that this has to be part of the No Project — not a separate alternative?

MR. MICHAELSON: I'm not sure the court reporter got the last Cal what? The Cal --

MS. SULLIVAN: California Solar Initiative.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. The next speakers coming up are Keith Ritchey, John Callahan, Grazyna Krajewska, Robert Reich, and I believe that's Laura Copic.

MR. RITCHEY: I have copy of my notes, if I can provide it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Sure.

MR. RITCHEY: Hi. I'm Keith Ritchey. I'm a Peñasquitos resident, west Chase Homeowners Association. And I'm representing West Chase Homeowners Association here today. When I look at this project, the overall project, I don't know whether it's needed. I have my suspicions about the need for the project. I don't know whether the coastal link is needed in entirety, but I'm very concerned about the way they route the coastal link to Peñasquitos, specifically addressing the link from the Chicarita Substation area over to the end of Park Village Road area. And the look of alternatives that SDG&E even studies to see what could be done there. I have proposed that analyze three different routes through the area.

The first one would continue at Chicarita and run up to Carmel Valley Road where it would go underground under that roadway. SDG&E has franchise right of way to run under the roadway. It would run about 3 miles underground and then transition near the Evergreen Nursery back to the overhead lines and would impact far fewer homes than — SDG&E's proposed route.

Another one that they didn't study is running under or in the median of State Route 56, which runs from the Chicarita Substation over about three miles to where the overhead lines again could be joined and that would impact no homeowners and would also be underlying, less expensive. Both of those alternatives would be less expensive than the proposed route.

The third route that we had looked at was running through a little more of the park or the preserve, as we call it, an area that is an abandoned sewage area and along some lines up to the park where the ball parks are. And then it would turn and run up Mercy Road into the existing area in Scripps Ranch where there are overhead lines. That alternative impacts far fewer homes. Again, it is a much better alternative than SDG&E's proposal. The reason West Chase is so concerned is, we have a park for 1500 feet along this easement. It's a landscaped private park where our children play. And this line either overhead initially as proposed or underground would run right through the middle of that park, 3 feet underground where kids are playing. We're going to have a 230 kilovolt line. It's just not an acceptable alternative. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. And can you — are you going to keep that, or is that in the materials you gave us?

MR. RITCHEY: The final map is on the back as a copy of this and has a copy on it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very very much. Next speaker, John Callahan.

MR. CALLAHAN: My name is John Callahan. Although I do not live in Poway or the directly affected areas, I live in Escondido. I'm an electrical engineer. When I read about this project — which I probably haven't read as much as a lot of you folks — I kind of understand the concerns that have been mentioned up to now about the lines go over personal property. I kind of sympathize with the concerns that having power over one's property can induce. EMI, take that concern to heart.

Even though I'm not directly affected, I thought I would like to make sure that existing rights of way that exist between the east and the west of this link, that whether SDG&E has power rights-of-way as well as natural gas pipelines, rail lines, oil or diesel pipelines, all of these rights-of-way highways that was mentioned earlier that exist that impact, I think, a minimum number of people in terms of their property, their houses, their children. If one could take a look at those rights-of-way and see if any of those links or segments could be incorporated into the powerlink.

I kind of agree that the powerlink is necessary. I agree that we need more power. San Diego has shown that they need more power by their growth. So, in summary, I would like to recommend that this report, this EIR/EIS report, entail and encompass the possibility of using highways, rail lines, natural gas lines, water sewer lines, run these utilities in common as much as possible so we don't affect our residences, our children with the EMF and EMI that is generated by power. Thank you very much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you it. Grazyna Krajewska.

MS. KRAJEWSKA: I'm Grazyna Krajewska. I see the power lines from my windows although I'm not very close to them. But there are other things that I will — very close to them, and here I found the chart that you have of electromagnetic field that goes up quite a lot with the number of kilowatts? So I think that whatever it was acceptable when the houses were built possibly was fine. Maybe it was already too much. But quite likely, I think, more power lines would increase electromagnetic fields. And I also have the progress, and it's really time to understand ground or power lines period. They should not be hanging there anyway.

Now, another issue is, we saw that energy in general — we like solar energy. I like energy system project. So far the contract is signed for 300 megawatts. That part of the contract would be fulfilled without, I think, an extra power line. Existing power lines are good enough. The project can go to 900 megawatts, the standing energy system. They don't necessarily want one giant project. What they want — they want to be able to have access. Oh, they want to be able to produce big vat of energy collectors. So my concern is okay. When you want these 300 megawatts, don't build any more power lines. Look for a space. Standard energy collectors will use a little bit of efficiency. That is not optimal, but they would work just fine with power anywhere. So there could be some other ideas that are close to existing power lines that are underutilized where these smaller collector lines could be put in, and then no power lines would be needed. What I think you should look at where the probably applies — it applies to us and SDG&E and quite likely for the brand there the collectors closer to San Diego are more expensive. Then you would save on the power lines, so the cost of the project could be less.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you very much. Robert Reich.

MR. REICH: My name is Bob Reich, and I'm in Peñasquitos. I concur with the earlier speaker which suggested that this powerlink is debatable. From an implementation point of view, it hasn't been considered with the whole issue of energy for the city of San Diego considering sources that are nonsolar which will provide for the next 20, 30 years — according to the most educated studies, 90 percent of the power for us in the U.S. — and so the forthcoming Rosarito plant, energy from the north are going to be the principal appliers of energy.

And I've worked a little bit on solar and I've done quite a bit of reading. And the assumption that we're going to have in the near future huge solar farms in Imperial County is ridiculous. And so this should be considered a cost benefit. There may be some politicians who think we've got to get solar energy going in Imperial County now torpedo the cost but we who are going to be affected by immature technology crossing the lines should be in the loop, as I assume we are. Also, the cost benefits are important because most of us want underground power lines which involve cooling at quite an expense which involves liquid nitrogen being pumped through, and the estimated cost versus open is 2 to 500 to 1. Why are we being subjected to this burden? Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Laura Copic.

MS. COPIC: My name is Laura Copic from the Poway-Carmel Valley Community Board and Carmel Valley Concerned Citizens. I think it's clear that nobody wants the power lines in their backyard. Nobody wants transmission lines. That's pretty obvious. So in light of that, I don't want them in my backyard. I don't want them in anybody's backyard. We feel strongly that nonwire alternatives for this transmission line should be consciously pursued. The transmission first strategy proposed by SDG&E appears to be in conflict with the Energy Action Plan and the San Diego Regional Energy Strategy, which maximizes demand reduction distribution rates and others in county generation and renewables before transmission is preferred strategy to attaining our future energy needs.

In addition, this transmission line would be a visible, audible relied upon our state park --

MR. MICHAELSON: You're going to get one more chance. You have to slow down.

MS. COPIC: — and as well as fire and health hazard to nearby residents.

I want to specifically address the area in Carmel Valley. The line travels — the proposed line travels underground in Rancho Peñasquitos and then comes up above ground right before it hits a neighborhood in Carmel Valley or Carmel Country Highlands where there is an existing overhead transmission line. There's actually a large what we call "the lattice structure" with 230 kilovolts, and then there's 138 kilovolts circuit on a lower profile wooden structure, which is not very visible. SDG&E proposes to add an additional 230 kilovolts on another tall tower. I did want to point out the NOP indirectly identifies the towers that we currently have as — I think they call them monopole or whatever the single pole structure is — when they're actually the lattice structure poles.

We obviously would love to see all of the lines go underground. We feel that our community is being essentially wired off from the Peñasquitos Preserve. It is along the border of the Preserve that these lines are located. And we do feel — and I want to say I agree with Mike Vildibill that we feel like those communities that already have power lines are not being considered by SDG&E at all in spite of the fact that we've approached them several times about this.

We feel only by limiting our underground preferred route in dissection can be impacted and be meaningfully mitigated. If underground is not feasible, we would also like to evaluate the slower stack cables and further consolidation of the line. We feel like newer technology definitely exists, and we certainly agree that prudent avoidance is applicable even in those communities where the lines currently exist.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Tom Kluczynsia.

MR. KLUCZYNSIA: My name is Tom Kluczynsia, and I'm in Rancho Bernardo. But I also have property out in Borrego, and I didn't get to speak out there or make it out there yesterday.

I'm kind of curious. Have you ever had anybody come up and say "Go ahead. Put it in my backyard?" I'm just curious. The alternate route I saw in the paper but by the canyon — that as to an aesthetics value, that would ruin a lot of aesthetics of when you come into Borrego down Montezuma Grade because you peak the mountain top there and it's just the prettiest — at least in my opinion and a lot of other people's opinion — just wide open vast wilderness. And to have a power line run up there would ruin that whole thing.

And I know you guys got a tough job. SDG&E has a tough job too. It doesn't seem like — no matter where you go, you're going to run into problems. But the southern route I've heard that want to keep out of the fire threat areas, and the southern route where they already have one seems like it east fire threat area to do the if you run another line parallel to that. And, like you say, you haven't knocked off any of previous alternatives.

I was looking at Figure 8, Item D, that seemed to be a second one that I thought would be better than taking any of them through Borrego. I have to admit, I've been up by the canyon and if it has to run it comes on to it, then so be it. But not Uptopp Canyon. That would ruin a lot of Borrego's appeal. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. That was all the speaker cards that I have so far, but I do want to ask if there is anybody else who would like to speak. Did we miss you on the way in? So what I see is somebody actually has a card filled out. If we could have somebody on the staff bring these cards, and I'll call you and have you come up.

But, Mr. Payne, do you have one already?

MR. PAYNE: Good evening. I thank you for coming out to Rancho Peñasquitos. My name is Harvey Payne, and I am the chair of Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens. I believe this panel is already aware that Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens is an intervener within the proceeding.

I would like to respectfully note that the rate payers not only here in San Diego county but, frankly, all over the state are counting on the PUC to fully develop an unbiased record of alternatives. Specifically it is extremely important the it energy division and its consultants provide a thorough nonwires alternative or alternatives. While parties such as ERPA have accepted the study of nonwires alternatives, the weight given to a thorough study by nonaliant consultants will probably be given greater weight. RPCC believes that are for a number of nonwire alternatives to this proposed project including additional inbasin generation, distributed generation demand reduction, conservation efficiency measures, and AMI to name a majority of the option and combination of these options. Or perhaps even one specifically inbasin generation would make up for the significant gap that SDG&E claims is going to exist in the future.

We also encourage the PUC to look closely at the projected numbers that SDG&E has put forward. Some say it's almost impossible to build new inbasin generation. That's just not the case here in San Diego. Within the last five years, we've built one power plant and permitted another power plant. In addition, our two old plants are right for repowering. One, as the commission is well aware, has already submitted an application to repower to the ECC. Therefore, the inbasin generation option clearly is a viable option.

In addition, a piece of property on the southwestern edge of MCAS Miramar was specifically set aside by the federal government a few years ago for the sighting of a new power plant to San Diego's future needs. It's just isn't true that transmission is our only option. We can get this done with inbasin generation alone. Yet I would submit that there are a variety of other alternatives that in combination with each other probably provides the best mix. I know that I'm coming to the end of my time, so I will allow a few other people to use their time, and I will come back and finish my comments.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. I have more speaker cards filled out. Michelle Ritchey, Mark Schmidt, Weixing Chen, and Aurele Gilleran.

Again, I apologize if I mispronounced them. So, Helen Dominguez.

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Hi. My name is Helen Dominguez. I live in Park Village. My concern is specifically with EMF transmission. Even though I'm of the option that the SDG&E is look at putting the lines underground, I still have concerns with EMFs because from things that, well, that I've read and — there's even a report that I've seen on CPUC web site that states that there's contradictions with increased amounts of brain tumors in children, essentially in young children. And there are a lot of young children in the Park Village community. The lines are also pretty close to Park Village Elementary which, if you look on the map, it's just behind a park also, a public park where a lot of children play. So my concerns are with these issues and it's in the first line of the scope — that is, it's to promote the safety, health, et cetera. So I don't believe that that's being looked at too well if the line is running too close to an elementary school, too close to a park, and too close to houses.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Michelle Ritchey.

MS. RITCHEY: My name is Michelle Ritchey. I'm on the West Chase Homeowners' Association board. And I'd just like to reiterate we live in a very dense community of attached homes and there is a about 150 foot easement. And we all knew at the time that, yes, it was an SDG&E easement. But it's also a planned community with no overhead lines, no visible lines. We have a lot of homes that are adjacent to the park, actually have gates that go into the park. The closest homes sit only 5 feet from the that fence. And it would be devastating for those lines to go through the park.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. RITCHEY: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Mark Schmidt.

MR. SCHMIDT: My name is Mark Schmidt. I'm a resident of Scripps Ranch. Like other speakers, I'm also concerned about the aesthetics, noise, public safety, impact of additional power lines. I'm particularly concerned about the Chicarita Substation including Scripps Ranch and Poway. To

mitigate these concerns where we want to reiterate the option of using more underground routing. I'd also like to see an easy way to understand a quantifiable analysis of these impacts.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Weixing Chen.

MR. CHEN: Hi. My name is Weixing Chen. I'm a resident in the West Chase — West Chase Community. I just want to let you know that, based on my reading, that the power line is going to — we have a community park across the whole community greenbelt. It's very beautiful, kids and children, paradise. And the — on both sides of the park it's the house. And the proposed line is going to go through the middle of the park, and distance between the lines to house, it's about — based on my variation, it's about 23 to maybe 40 feet. And although they propose under the ground, it's going to be under the ground.

But I read one article at your published, world famous journal called Nature couple months ago, talked about the potential big earthquake in southern California, and San Diego is one of the areas that can be affected by this big disaster. And I'm wondering if you put the power — if SDG&E put the power line under the ground just like 20 feet from the house, what about the earthquake cause a big fire there? And this going to really devastate to life and the public. I just wondering whether or not it's a standard if SDG&E put this power underground, what's the distance it should be from the house? 20 feet is just too close. So that's all I want to say.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

MS. GILLERAN: My name is Aurele Gilleran, and I'm in the Rolling Hills Estates in Poway.

I have two concerns: EMF and property values. Ours is a community where the power lines will be overhead, basically in the backyards of our neighbors. And as I look through the scoping process and everything that was presented tonight, I don't see any agency that represents our health. We're concerned about fish and game, other speakers talked about the beauty of Borrego desert and all that. But my question is, Who represents the health of the residents in the community through which the power lines pass? Is there anybody that represents our health?

And the second is, there's also no one apparently that is concerned or represents the property values of the homeowners that could tell us what the potential impacts would be on our property values of a second huge power line going through the backyard of our community.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Next speaker is Demian Dorrance.

MR. DORRANCE: Good evening. I'm a resident in the Carmel Valley community.

MR. MICHAELSON: We just need your name. Thank you.

MR. DORRANCE: Demian Dorrance, resident of Carmel Valley.

I wanted to make a couple comments just very briefly about what it's been like as a homeowner and someone in the community trying to learn about the CPUC process and become involved at the same time working under a community that's rather a major marketing campaign, really is. What I'm thinking of is SDG&E is spending I don't know how much money, but I know a lot of their staff — some of them very nice, some not so nice. We can't listen to Padre games, you know, during the baseball playoffs without hearing all of these commercials that tell us how great Sunrise Powerlink is going to be, solving all the power needs of our community.

Well, there are alternative viewpoints on that and it's tough to cut through that message as individuals. I hope that you'll listen to the comments of the people here who live in this region. We do have a regional energy strategy that spells out what is favored over transmission for power generation, and that's in-basin generation and repowering of our power plants. The alternatives to go around Anza-Borrego, which I personally support, I think Anza-Borrego is deserving of protection and preserving, of maintaining its wilderness designation. The alternatives they have just recently presented are not real alternatives. They look to me much like a poison pill. They're things that SDG&E knows will be completely unacceptable when looked at from a variety of angles. There hasn't been a no-wires alternative presented. And I believe that there should be and that the commission should seek that from SDG&E, whoever the involved parties are.

Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve is a very special preserve. It's about 7 miles long. It's the largest coastal preserve in the city of San Diego. One half of it is in the coastal zone. It certainly took a lot of people many decades of work to make sure that that was there, and I believe that land and open space is deserving of the same protections as Anza-Borrego.

Currently as has been proposed, lines would be undergrounded in Peñasquitos if this project were to proceed. I certainly feel strongly — and I know many members of my community feel strongly — that the lines should be continued underground through the second half of the Preserve that they would traverse if the coastal link was approved. That's all my comments for today.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

MS. DORRANCE: Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Next speaker is Glenn Halchadorian.

MR. HALCHADORIAN: Hi. My name is Glenn Halchadorian, a Peñasquitos resident. And my primary concern is the stated goals of the power line to increase reliability, lower cost, et cetera. I cannot find anywhere on the CPUC web site or anywhere in the documentation to what degree those goals will be met. And so I believe that the public at large is at a disadvantage to evaluate the proposal because there's no hard numbers as to what is going to be met in terms of goals. And so I would strongly encourage the CPUC to request SDG&E provide those numbers. To what degree will reliability be enhanced? To what degree will renewable energy resources be used? And to what degree will energy costs be reduced as to rate payers for what benefit it is to us. Because we all know there's a cost. There's a cost to the public at large. And so what will be saved going forward?

And then my second point is specifically on the coastal link. I reiterate and encourage the previous speaker's point that that most — Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve is a special canyon, is a special asset to the San Diego city and county. And I would encourage that the entire coastal link were buried if it would be approved. Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much.

Do you have any other cards turned in? Anyone else who would like to speak who has not already before we go back for seconds? Yes, sir. Come forward.

MR. BRAUN: My name is Tad Braun. I'm a resident in the West Chase Homeowners over there in Peñasquitos. I just have a couple quick questions. Couple niggling thoughts actually.

I'm concerned that this new Sterling solar farm is this new technology that's — it's in infancy. And it's supposed to go to full blown major proportions that provide all of the alternative energy over this 500 kilovolt line. What happens if it doesn't fill out? What will fill the line? Where will that power come from? I'm very afraid they will take it from Mexicali plant. And then there's this whole Imperial Valley pollution plant with the Mexicali plant. I'm very concerned where the power is going to come from if Sterling doesn't pan out.

One thought I had. There exists — I believe it's a 230 kilovolt power line already along the border all the way over to south San Diego. What would stop SDG&E from perhaps swapping the line, put the 500 kilovolt along the border and run the 230 along the existing route that they're proposing for Powerlink? The benefit I see there is it might take away SDG&E's — what I consider their sneaky proposal to sell power to L.A. which is the only reason I think they're going forward with this line, is to someday connect to sell to L.A. once the ISO contracts sell out. I'm proposing they swap the lines, run the 500 south, run the 230 north and they go ahead and underground in Peñasquitos, and all those other places as well, and come cross I believe in Anza-Borrego Park, there's already shorter poles. They could just put the 230 on that pole, I believe. They would haven't to raise it as high. So, then, there goes the visual across the end of Borrego Park. Just a couple thoughts.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Those are good scoping comments that what we're looking for. Thank you.

Anyone else who wants to speak before we give those who couldn't finish in their first allowed amount of time?

At this point anybody who's ready to come up and take a second helping, please feel to do so. All we need is for you to give us your name again.

MR. PAYNE: Harvey Payne. I'd like to turn to the issue of one of SDG&E's stated goals for the project, which is to get access to renewables. A new transmission line is not needed to get access to the foreseeable economical, realistic renewable resources that exist out in the Imperial Valley. We have a 1900 megawatt 500 kilovolt line called the Southwest Powerlink. If the State of California desires to have our future energy resources come from renewables and to the extent that those are located out in the desert, why don't we load up that Southwest Powerlink with every single renewable megawatt we can possibly put on it? We have a line that goes to the exact same place where this new line is scheduled to begin.

In addition, there are existing paths coming north out of the Imperial Valley in the SE, territory that could be used to transport renewables as well both existing proposed future upgrades and more specifically, the proposed LADWP green path — traditional real green path project.

I'm sure the PUC and the BLM and its consultants are painfully aware of the difficulty of selling a new transmission line from the Imperial Valley here to San Diego. It's significant.

In summary, there are no good options. The cost of putting in this line is simply too high from an economic standpoint, from an environmental standpoint, not to mention the human impact of this line all the way from the Imperial Valley through our state park, through our beautiful back country, through our preserves — as close as the Los Peñasquitos Preserve here in San Diego, ending up just a mile from the coast. Ranch Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens looks forward to providing detailed written comment to the PUC concerning alternatives to being developed by RPPC within the coastal link which will include both nonwires and alternative route analysis. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. COPIC: Hi. Laura Copic again. I want to reiterate everything Harvey said. And our desire to see nonwired alternatives fully vetted.

I also wanted to get very specific as I see that's what kind of input you're looking for with regard to the coastal link in Carmel Valley. There is a substantial adverse effect of the Scenic Vistas neighborhood enjoyed with the Los Peñasquitos Preserve, and more prevalent towers and wires would increase the wiring-off effect of the public from the preserve and further reduce the public access. These wires and towers along the Preserve's edge is also notable for those in the Preserve on both sides of the Preserve. And it is visible from the school and public places, from everywhere in our community. There they are biological effects there already its orientation caused by new home and road construction near the Preserve's edge and wildlife corridor, and it's already causing the deer population to wander up onto the road. And there's been several deer mortalities. And I suspect that the significant construction impact of adding more towers in this area will cause more disorientation and the displacement of other wildlife population as well.

There's a concern as to hazardous materials. The existing towers appear to be one quarter mile of Sage Canyon Elementary School. They are certainly visible from the school and close to children's homes. The school and homes could easily be impacted by any hazardous materials released during the construction operation of the circuits. There is a hydrology concern. Existing habitat trails have already been adversely impacted by shifting drainage patterns caused by new home construction, which we expect the construction of these additional towers to do the same. And we feel that that definitely needs to be avoided.

In terms of land use planning, there is the site of the Torrey Hills Peñasquitos — well, the Peñasquitos Substation. But that actually has a fuel pipeline beneath it as well, and it is the site of community park in Torrey Hills. There's many cumulative effects in the area, the increased wildfire risk in community and we do have density of vegetation because of the preserve, and we also have an inadequate response time because of the lack of a fire station in our area. And more wires would increase that risk. There's some concerns.

There's also the interstatewide and other construction projects that continue to impact our community. So, cumulatively, this is really much — a lot for our community to bear.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. KRAJEWSKA: Grazyna Krajewska. One further is the need for the power line. Like according to SDG&E, this 1.2 million electric meters in San Diego and thousand in the county. That's what SDG&E said. Now Sunrise Powerlink is going to be for 600,000 homes. San Diego route predicted by 2010 is hundred thousand homes. So definitely by 2010 we don't need the power for 650,000 homes. And the number of homes cannot be definitively. So there's some number of homes by 2030 but quite likely it's not 650,000. That's one thing.

Other thing. I look at the report and under "system," all things considered and implemented by SDG&E what they had — they had energy efficiency, they did not think it was enough. I agree. They have looked up solar but they consider, but they did not think it would be good enough. I think they might be wrong in that idea because there would be more locked up solar power. Okay. Maybe it won't be now, but there will be definitely much more. But then for distribution, generation what they

considered it said "small fossil fuel systems" is the only thing they considered for distribution generation. So I don't think they did their homework.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

We did say that we would have the opportunity also for Q & A. So if we've taken care of the people who want to add to their comments, we could move into this. If you wouldn't mind again coming to the microphone to state your comments.

MR. DORRANCE: Demian Dorrance again, Carmel Valley.

The proposed computer simulations that SDG&E has prepared to the impact to the Torrey Hills and Carmel Valley communities completely ignores all the homes and residences. They jump a 3-mile range and they picked the mall and the construction site to demonstrate no. The impact to the community would be — the impact is going to be far greater than is shown in these documents. And what they show is they show some low wooden structures being relayed by tall monopoles and moving existing circuits actually closer to homes than they are today. So not only would residents in the area naturally, as I do, prefer underground routing altogether. But I think it's reasonable to expect that any rerouting of existing circuits not be placed closer to people's residences than they already are today.

Those of us who bought in the area had to think long and hard about existing power lines and went through MSRF study before purchasing. And we certainly did not expect to see additional towers in that area, and we certainly didn't expect to see EMF ratings that are higher than we have accepted raising our families with. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Thank you.

Yes, sir?

MR. DORRANCE: Demian Dorrance. My final comment for the evening is I don't have a good understanding of how the various alternatives are evaluated and rejected. As I read through the NOP, I see that SDG&E has looked at things and rejected certain alternatives because they passed through high density housing. Well, the proposal as it exists today passes through high density housing. So I would encourage the PUC to have SDG&E and possibly an objective third party evaluate the alternatives so that we understand — and document the results — so that we understand how these various alternatives were rejected. One speaker spoke about burying one of the lines down the 56. That seems like an obvious solution to a problem. And yet it wasn't considered and it wasn't evaluated. So I'm at a loss as to understand how these various alternatives are evaluated and rejected and would encourage that document to be written. Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: I don't know whether you were here at the very beginning of the meeting, but CPUC and BLM are the independent third parties that are going to be doing the review of those alternatives, so they do a fresh from the start review.

MR. DORRANCE: Okay. Good. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Yes, ma'am?

MS. DOMINGUEZ: Hi. Helen Dominguez again.

I just think it's important that in the documentation that's going to be brought forward that there's a full disclosure of what can happen — what kind of chemical releases can happen if there is a fire when it's underground or overhead towers that are involved because it is in such close proximity to the public and the health is very important, especially with the children around. So I think it's important for somebody to do a study which will kind of — what toxicity would be in the air and what effects it is going to have on the people around it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. VILDIBILL: Hello. Mike Vildibill. I just wanted to make a very small point. It's actually an exclamation point on something that was stated earlier, but I felt that it needed to be brought out. We've all expressed concern and about whether SDG&E is doing something sneaky in trying to get power from Mexico into the United States. And that a topic that's reoccurring, and we don't ever seem to get a clear answer on how much of that is true or what degree that is true. But what you're collecting here also is community values and perspective on this. And I just want to say that I'm not alone in saying that many in the community have very deep and serious concerns about the prospect of increasing our reliance on foreign energy sources. And the idea of whether this really is a ruse to bring in power from Mexico — it does have environmental impact and potential for pollution impact. But I think also outside of the chart of your group but something that is of concern to the citizens is furthering increasing our reliance on foreign energy and looking at the trouble that continues to get our country and our region in something that we really don't want to be a part of. I do ask that you take serious consideration to the implication of Mexican energy as being part of this equation.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you. All right. If you have a question that you would like to ask of the panel, they will do their very best to answer it. And because of where we are, early in the process, you may have some very good questions for which there are not answers.

And I just need you to come up to the microphone and state your name and ask your question.

MR. VANDYKE: Marijo Vandyke. I have concern about first responders and neighborhood fire fighting capacity when it comes to dealing with overhead towers and these high voltage lines. I'm wondering if the City San Diego, City of Poway have the kind of equipment and training to deal with these mega lines. If there were to be a fire, how would they approach it? You're looking at a tower in the picture there's that's 160 feet tall, something like that. It is the size and height of a high-rise building. And yet this is in a suburban area where these types of buildings don't normally occur. And I'm wondering if there's capacity in the firefighter community to be able to handle that.

MR. MICHAELSON: I'll take that as a scoping comment for us to look at in the document as opposed to something that they can answer tonight. Is that okay?

MR. VANDYKE: Yes. I think it's clear that you're the independent assessor, let's say, of the alternatives. I wanted to ask if that is just going to be an evaluation of the alternatives already proposed by SDG&E and other sources or all alternatives on the table, and you'll be pursuing that.

MR. MICHAELSON: A little louder.

MR. VANDYKE: Okay. I have some written comments.

MR. MICHAELSON: Please, if you have anything that you were reading from that you would have in writing, we'd love have to it. Thank you very much.

Anyone else have a question? If not, we sincerely appreciate all the time and energy you put into doing your homework and taking time out of your busy lives to come and visit with us tonight. This has been a nice capstone on a series of some very useful and fruitful meetings that we've had.

And with that you're adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 8:29 p.m.)