

MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING
TRITON SUBSTATION PROJECT

CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH OF TEMECULA
31089 NICOLAS ROAD
TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2009

7:00 P.M.

Reported by: Martha L. Nelson

APPEARANCES

Iain Fisher, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

Karen Ladd, Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E&E)

Sylvia Yanez, Ecology and Environment, Inc. (E&E)

PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Chuck Washington, City Council Member
City of Temecula

Patrick Richardson, Planning and Redevelopment Director
City of Temecula

Colin Lavin, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

George Pratt

Rick Garcia, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

Sharon Mayberry

Michael Bolduc

Danalee Bettis

Michael McKernan

Phyllis Ontkean

Suzanne Zychowicz

Lee Carpenter

Jack Mayberry

Lee Edwards

Dan York, City Engineer
City of Temecula

Larry Roberts

Doris Luth

	iii
	<u>PAGE</u>
Proceedings	1
Introductions	1
Agenda	
Karen Ladd, E&E	2
CPUC's Role in the Project	
Iain Fisher, CPUC	4
Project Description	
Karen Ladd, E&E	8
Public Comment	
Councilmember Chuck Washington	10
Patrick Richardson	12
Colin Lavin	13
George Pratt	14
Rick Garcia	15
Sharon Mayberry	18
Michael Bolduc	19
Danalee Bettis	21
Michael McKernan	22
Phyllis Ontkian	23
Suzanne Zychowicz	24
Lee Carpenter	25
Jack Mayberry	28
Lee Edwards	29
Dan York	30
Larry Roberts	32
Michael McKernan	35
Doris Luth	35
Michael Bolduc	36
Lee Carpenter	37
Suzanne Zychowicz	38
Adjournment	39
Reporter's Certificate	40

PROCEEDINGS

7:17 p.m.

1
2
3 MS. LADD: Good evening, everyone. My name is
4 Karen Ladd and I am with Ecology and Environment. We are
5 the third party contractor for the environmental document,
6 working for the California Public Utilities Commission. We
7 prepared the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and
8 Initial Study for the Triton Substation Project on behalf of
9 the CPUC.

10 We are here tonight to share information with you
11 about the Triton Substation Project, which is proposed by
12 Southern California Edison. And we are here tonight to take
13 your comments on the Draft Initial Study and Mitigated
14 Negative Declaration and the project.

15 And now Sylvia Yanez will provide you some
16 information in Spanish.

17 MS. YANEZ: (Made a statement in Spanish.)

18 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: We can't hear you.

19 MS. YANEZ: I'm sorry, I can repeat it.

20 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: No, we can't hear
21 either one of you.

22 (Several people spoke at once.)

23 MS. LADD: Can you hear us now?

24 (Affirmative responses.)

25 MS. LADD: I apologize. Should I introduce the

1 meeting again?

2 (Nos.)

3 MS. LADD: Sylvia Yanez is here if anyone needs
4 assistance in Spanish.

5 Seated next to me is Iain Fisher. He is the
6 project manager for the project with the California Public
7 Utilities Commission. Mr. Fisher will summarize CPUC's role
8 in reviewing the proposed project and explain where we are
9 in that process.

10 I will then give a brief description of the
11 project and summarize the results of the Draft Mitigated
12 Negative Declaration and Initial Study.

13 After that we will spend the rest of the time
14 taking your comments on the environmental document.

15 There is a court reporter to record the
16 proceedings, which will become part of the public record.

17 If you would like to make oral comments please
18 make sure you have signed up at the registration table so
19 that I have you on my list. The speaker cards look like
20 this.

21 I will be calling the names of people who have
22 requested to speak on a first-come, first-served basis. I
23 will ask you to come up to the podium here, where you will
24 have three minutes to provide your comments. As the purpose
25 of the meeting is to take your comments we won't be

1 responding to comments or answering questions tonight.

2 When I call on you please come forward to the
3 podium and begin by stating your name as well as the name of
4 any agency or organization that you are representing.

5 Please speak clearly into the microphone to help make sure
6 that we have an accurate record of your comments.

7 I'll ask you to conclude your remarks within three
8 minutes. After two minutes I will hold up this yellow card
9 to let you know that you have one minute left.

10 If you have not concluded your remarks by the end
11 of your three minutes I will ask you to stop and then I will
12 invite the next person to come up to the podium. If you are
13 not finished with your comments when your time is up and
14 there is time left over after other registered speakers have
15 commented then you will be allowed to return to the podium to
16 continue.

17 I would also point out that providing oral
18 comments tonight is not the only way for you to provide
19 comments on the project. If you have prepared written
20 comments you may submit them to any one of us with a name
21 tag or you can give them to me directly.

22 And in addition you are welcome to submit your
23 comments in writing by mail, email or fax. At the
24 registration table we have a comment sheet that has the
25 addresses on it for your convenience. You are not required

1 to use that form but if you'd like you're welcome to do
2 that.

3 We'd appreciate it if you would turn off your cell
4 phones and pagers.

5 And now I would like to introduce you to Mr. Iain
6 Fisher, who is the project manager for the California Public
7 Utilities Commission.

8 MR. FISHER: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
9 As said, I am the project manager and representative of the
10 California Public Utilities Commission. I know some people
11 find my accent a little fast so I'll try to slow down. If I
12 get too fast slow me down. Thank you very much. Thank you.

13 The California Public Utilities Commission -- I'm
14 just going to set little concepts here as to what we are and
15 what we do. I'll then talk briefly about our process. How
16 you can participate in our process. Where it fits in
17 relative to SCE and their project.

18 We are the state commission charged with
19 regulating investor-owned utilities like SCE. We have the
20 authority to permit expansion of infrastructure such as the
21 proposed substation. It is part of our responsibility to
22 ensure that SCE maintain reliable service and also to assess
23 any of the environmental impacts they may cause -- it may
24 cause.

25 In April, SCE filed a permit to construct the

1 Triton substation. Under this permit the PUC has to examine
2 and make findings in two areas. Area 1, the environmental
3 impacts of the substation. We assess this under the
4 California Environmental Quality Act, also known as CEQA.
5 The Area 2 where we have to make findings, we have to ensure
6 that SCE are applying the EMF, electromagnetic frequency
7 reduction measures recommended by the Commission.

8 Before issuing the permit to construct the
9 Commission has to examine and disclose the environmental
10 effects of the projects. In order to do this, as I said
11 previously, we follow the guidelines and processes of CEQA.

12 CEQA's aim is to disclose environmental impacts and to
13 provide the decision-makers in this case, my Commission,
14 with the environmental information they need in order to
15 issue the permits, or not, as the case may be.

16 First of all we take the project as filed from the
17 applicant, in this case SCE, and we study whether there are
18 any ways we can mitigate those environmental impacts. Now
19 this is something I just have to reiterate about CEQA. As
20 the permitting agency, first we look at the project we are
21 supplied with and see whether that project can be mitigated
22 to less-than significant. These are legal terms within
23 CEQA. If it is actually possible to mitigate any
24 environmental impacts to less-than significant then there is
25 no requirement to look at alternative solutions to that

1 project.

2 We are now at the stage where we publish a Draft
3 Mitigated Negative Declaration. So we are effectively
4 saying, there are no environmental impacts of this project
5 that can't be mitigated or avoided.

6 We are weighing the available evidence -- we
7 weighed the available evidence that there were no
8 environmental impacts. The draft is now out for public
9 comment and that is why we are here.

10 Following from this we will respond to your
11 comments. We will respond to your comments and present
12 those comments along with a final document as part of the
13 evidence to the administrative law judge. The
14 administrative law judge is also a member of our Commission.

15 They are assigned to this case and they make an assessment
16 of whether we have followed CEQA correctly, whether we have
17 done it legally and whether there is anything substantially
18 wrong. The administrative law judge will weigh the evidence
19 and write a proposed decision the Commission is to vote
20 upon.

21 You can request to become a party to the
22 proceeding and file comments on their decision. You can
23 file comments on our document here. We have to answer and
24 reply to all of those.

25 Finally, the Commission will vote on the decision

1 as to whether to permit or not permit the actual substation.

2 The commissioners will assess the proposed
3 decision as presented by the judge and any commissioner may
4 opt to write alternative proposals, so there's another
5 option in there.

6 The commissioner will then vote on the decision on
7 whether to adopt this. This is all done in public session.

8 It is in San Francisco but it is done in public session.

9 So to recap. We have determined the project has
10 no environmental impacts that can't be mitigated or avoided.

11 You are now getting the opportunity to comment on
12 the project and documents. We will respond to the comments
13 in the final version.

14 Assuming there are no fatal flaws it will then go
15 forward to the ALJ, the administrative law judge, and they
16 will assess whether we have adequately covered CEQA
17 environmental issues, whether we have accurately interpreted
18 CEQA and will assess the evidence for EMF compliance. Then
19 it will go for a decision to our commissioners.

20 That in essence sums up our process. So I am
21 going to hand it back to Karen to describe the project. If
22 you have got any questions on the process or our decisions
23 come and ask me later.

24 MS. LADD: So I am just going to give a brief
25 description of the project.

1 Southern California Edison has proposed
2 constructing the Triton Substation project in Temecula. It
3 would be a 56 megavolt ampere, 115/12 kilovolt substation on
4 an approximately ten acre parcel directly across the street
5 from where we are now, at the southeast corner of Nicolas
6 Road and Calle Medusa. In addition to the substation some
7 parts of the project would be in Temecula, Murrieta and
8 unincorporated areas of Riverside County.

9 There is an existing 115 kV subtransmission line
10 that runs generally north-south about a quarter mile to the
11 west of here and the Triton substation would be looped into
12 it through a new 115 kV subtransmission line along Nicolas
13 Road. The subtransmission line loop-in would be installed
14 on seven to eight new tubular steel poles about 85 feet
15 high.

16 After construction of the new substation, the
17 Canine Substation, which is a temporary 33/12 kilovolt
18 substation that sits in the church parking lot adjacent to
19 Nicolas Road, would be decommissioned. And an emergency
20 transformer bank at the Auld Substation, which is about five
21 miles north, would also be decommissioned.

22 The project would also include installation of new
23 telecommunications lines from the new Triton Substation to
24 the existing Auld and Moraga Substations. The
25 telecommunications lines would be underbuilt primarily on

1 existing structures. And also minor telecommunications
2 equipment upgrades would be conducted within the existing
3 Auld, Moraga, Pauba, Pechanga, Stadler and Valley
4 Substations.

5 Southern California Edison has designed the
6 project to meet the long-term forecasted electrical demands
7 of the area; to maintain system reliability; and to enhance
8 operational flexibility. Southern California Edison
9 forecasts that demand in the service area may exceed the
10 designed operating limits of existing facilities as early as
11 next summer. The Triton Substation has also been designed
12 for potential future expansion from 56 megavolt ampere to
13 112 ampere, which would involve installation of up to two
14 new transformers within the boundaries of the proposed
15 substation.

16 Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality
17 Act, or CEQA, we conducted an Initial Study of the
18 potentially significant environmental effects that could
19 result from the project. We evaluated potential effects
20 related to: aesthetics; agriculture and forest resources;
21 air quality and greenhouse gases; biological resources;
22 cultural resources; geology and soils; hazards and hazardous
23 materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and
24 planning; mineral resources; noise; population and housing;
25 public services; recreation; transportation and traffic; and

1 utilities and service systems.

2 While we concluded that the project may result in
3 potentially significant impacts related to biological
4 resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards
5 and hazardous materials, and noise, we also found that
6 implementation of a number of mitigation measures would
7 avoid or reduce those impacts to less-than significant
8 levels.

9 Now we will open the meeting up to take your
10 comments on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and
11 Initial Study, which will be taken into consideration as we
12 prepare the final version of that document.

13 The first speaker on my list is Chuck Washington
14 with the City of Temecula.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER WASHINGTON: Good evening to
16 representatives from the California Public Utilities
17 Commission and also from Ecology and Environment. And also
18 good evening to my fellow residents and neighbors of
19 Temecula.

20 We are in the city of Temecula and I think there
21 may be some confusion as to jurisdictional boundaries. I
22 represent the City Council here, I am a council member on
23 the City of Temecula City Council. We also have staff from
24 the City of Temecula here because we wanted to have our
25 voice heard in this hearing.

1 We want also for our citizens to understand that
2 this is not within the jurisdiction of the city of Temecula,
3 and that had it been, this project would not have been
4 approved at that site. We have concerns about that site and
5 how it impacts our community.

6 And while the report on how the Negative Dec was
7 prepared, how it addressed the issues raised in CEQA, it
8 didn't mention that visual impacts are considered. There
9 were no comments about the visual impacts and how those
10 impacts are mitigated.

11 The original site that was proposed for this would
12 eliminate the need for the seven to eight, 85-foot poles,
13 which creates quite a drastic and dramatic impact on the
14 community.

15 Furthermore, we were told that one overriding
16 decision factor in not utilizing the original site was the
17 cost of developing that site.

18 I believe and it is my understanding that the
19 difference in cost would probably be eliminated completely
20 by the elimination of those poles, those 85-foot poles. In
21 addition to that we believe that because the project is
22 going to be such a long-term project and have such an impact
23 on our community that in the long-term a small increase in
24 cost would certainly be warranted.

25 I understand there's a need for better electricity

1 and power transmission. We don't have a problem with Edison
2 providing service to its customers, its ratepayers, to my
3 constituents. But we think that they ought to be listening
4 a little bit more to the needs of our community, especially
5 in light of the fact that the community does not have a say
6 in this project but rather it comes from somewhere in San
7 Francisco under the California Public Utilities Commission.

8 So we ask that the public record reflect the City
9 of Temecula is opposed to this site. And if this site is
10 ultimately the one that is picked that we want to see
11 certain mitigating measures taken. Thank you.

12 And for the record my name is Chuck Washington. I
13 think I failed to mention that.

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. LADD: Next we have Patrick Richardson, City
16 of Temecula.

17 MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. My name is Patrick
18 Richardson, I am the planning and redevelopment director
19 with the City of Temecula.

20 To restate what Councilman Washington stated, the
21 City is opposed to the project at the current location. We
22 feel that the alternative site which was originally
23 identified is the more appropriate site for the project. We
24 would hope that Southern California Edison as well as the
25 Public Utilities Commission would agree to look at

1 alternative sites other than what is being proposed.

2 If that is not the case, we have been working with
3 the Public Utilities Commission staff on potential
4 mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts. I was
5 surprised to learn that one of the areas that you felt did
6 not need to be mitigated were the aesthetic impacts of the
7 project.

8 In August of this year we provided an extensive
9 list of comments to Southern California Edison and the CPUC
10 was also copied on that letter. And we had requested that
11 these comments be included as mitigation measures as we do
12 not have jurisdiction over the approval of this project. It
13 was our feeling that the only way that we could ensure that
14 these items would be fully implemented as part of the
15 project was that they be included as mitigation measures.

16 We will be resubmitting these extensive comments
17 as part of the public process by December 17. And we would
18 ask that in the final mitigation -- Mitigated Negative
19 Declaration, that these items be included as part of the
20 project mitigation measures if the project is approved.
21 Thank you.

22 MS. LADD: Colin Lavin.

23 MR. LAVIN: How are you guys doing? My name is
24 Colin Lavin, I'm with IBEW, that's the International
25 Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

1 And this project here will provide some of our
2 members with work for a couple of months. But more
3 importantly what it will do is provide relief for the grid
4 system. As long as there is growth out here in Temecula and
5 the surrounding areas, and everybody wants to have a big
6 screen TV, that's something we need to fix. Thank you.

7 MS. LADD: George Pratt.

8 MR. PRATT: My name is George Pratt. I represent
9 Mr. Lawrence Lasagna, the owner of the original site that
10 you guys were looking at.

11 I'm not going to get into any of the negotiations
12 that went on with the original site; we do have an attorney
13 on record for that. But our concern today is basically the
14 pole locations and how they are going to impact the original
15 property that you guys were looking at.

16 Basically our concern is those poles could end up
17 in the middle of the property as it fronts Nicolas Road. We
18 feel that either the -- I know it's expensive. But we feel
19 that they either have to go underground or all the lines be
20 shipped to the other side of the road where there's
21 presently nothing there. That would be a better situation.

22 And then tie into that existing line.

23 Again I sympathize with everybody here. I know
24 that they do not want the substation at that location but
25 let's just say that the original negotiations did not go

1 well.

2 So again, our concern today is basically the pole
3 location. And according to that map they are not fixed, so
4 I really don't have any idea of where they are going to be.

5 And it doesn't help us out at all in deciding on giving you
6 guys a good comment on of it.

7 But we looked at it and we think that they should
8 be shifted to the other side of the road or go underground
9 as it goes through that anywhere. It will ruin the
10 aesthetic value of the area for many, many years to come and
11 it could ruin the possible use of the property, adjacent
12 properties in the future. Thank you.

13 MS. LADD: Rick Garcia.

14 MR. GARCIA: My name is Rick Garcia and I also
15 represent IBEW, which is the International Brotherhood of
16 Electrical Workers. We represent the linemen, all the
17 utility workers that we have out there.

18 One of the things that I want to make sure. I had
19 a question for Ms. Karen was, on the project itself did it
20 give or do you have an estimation of how long the project
21 will be for manpower?

22 MR. FISHER: We do but I can't remember it off the
23 top of my head.

24 MR. GARCIA: Pardon me?

25 MR. FISHER: We do, yes, but I don't remember it

1 off the top of my head.

2 MR. GARCIA: Okay. Well, for the way I'm looking
3 at it here, 150/112 kilovolt, let me ask you. Would you
4 figure out it's about maybe 45, 50 men on a three, four
5 month basis, something like that? Well basically. So
6 you're looking at a project itself, just to give everybody
7 in the public an idea here, you're looking at about maybe
8 putting to work 45, 50 men. And the project itself would
9 probably be anywhere from three-and-a-half to four months.
10 So it's basically our contractors coming in here, doing the
11 project. Get in, do the project and then basically leave,
12 you know. You know, and off we go right there.

13 But what I wanted to bring out is to make the
14 community understand. The 115 kV volt is a safe, electrical
15 transmission. We are not talking about a 300 transmission,
16 we're not talking about a 500 megawatt, which is C, coming
17 in from Las Vegas and going into the city itself. So just
18 to let you know that this is a safe transmission line, which
19 is adequate and suitable going into the community itself
20 there.

21 Whether you propose to have it at this site or at
22 another site right there. We do ask you to please do give
23 your recommendations to Edison to go ahead and go forward
24 for a future project that's needed here.

25 It's like for most of you that understand. You

1 have your own house and you have your own electrical panel.

2 If you start adding the pool, adding the air conditioner,
3 adding all of the other stuff, sooner or later you are going
4 to have to upgrade. You are going to have to upgrade. And
5 especially if you are in this area, we see the community
6 growing. We see the community growing and a need that needs
7 to be here for electricity itself out here.

8 One of the things that we do ask you to look into
9 is with the emissions, the pollution and everything. If we
10 don't upgrade the system what's going to happen is the old
11 system will start wearing, tearing down itself. You'll
12 start having situations where you might have possibilities
13 of rolling blackouts during the summer because the situation
14 is that it is not being upkeep.

15 And every time our Edison people or our linemen
16 come in here and do upkeep the old system then becomes a
17 potential hazard there for the community. Because now
18 you're removing, you know, old transformer banks, capacitors
19 and things like that where that could be almost lethal and
20 potentially harmful for the community out here.

21 It's like the water lines. It's like the water
22 lines you see in LA that keep breaking down, breaking down.

23 Where sooner or later one day you're going to have to just
24 renovate it and get rid of the iron pipes and go with a new
25 system. Thank you.

1 MS. LADD: Sharon Mayberry.

2 MALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Do you live here
3 in the city?

4 MR. GARCIA: No I don't but I do, I do represent
5 8700 members that work all over Southern California.

6 (Several people from the audience speaking
7 to Mr. Garcia.)

8 MS. LADD: Sharon Mayberry.

9 MS. MAYBERRY: I'm a resident, Sharon Mayberry.
10 The thing I have a problem with is the low-profile
11 way they came in with this project. A lot of other projects
12 you'll see they put a public hearing sign, a large sign up
13 on a plot of land to alert you to things that are coming.
14 The only time we ever saw a sign was a piece of paper that
15 couldn't have been more than maybe 11 by 20 at the most on a
16 little stake that was just paper. And when the rain came it
17 washed, fell over and blew away. Then they came out and put
18 another one up and it was really tiny. You wouldn't even
19 know what that thing said unless you got out of your car and
20 walked over through the mud.

21 And I just want to know why such an organization
22 as Edison who has many resources and multimillion dollars
23 couldn't come in with a regular sign up there just to let
24 everybody know what was going on, unless they were trying to
25 come in under the radar. And that's the impression I got

1 was that we're going to build this and they're going to know
2 about it when we're already halfway through it, and not give
3 us a chance to really adequately respond.

4 And I just want to know why this organization
5 doesn't abide by -- I can understand they're probably doing
6 it to the letter of the law but not the spirit of the law.
7 I don't know how big a sign has to be, but on a project like
8 this I think it should have been a little bit bigger, posted
9 on the acreage. Just to let us all know what was going on a
10 little further ahead of time than just within a few months.

11 (Applause.)

12 MS. LADD: Michael Bolding?

13 MR. BOLDUC: Bolduc.

14 MS. LADD: Bolduc?

15 MR. BOLDUC: Good job.

16 They used to say, five minutes a bullet. I've got
17 six bullets so I better go fast.

18 I moved to -- I'm a resident. My name is Michael
19 Bolduc, I live on Calle Medusa. I moved here in April of
20 2006. I moved here from South Lake, Texas, then thought to
21 be one of the top three cities in America.

22 And there in Texas we struggled with power because
23 we were growing so quickly. The utility was really strapped
24 to make sure there was adequate power. There was lots of
25 dipping underground and coming up out of the ground, going

1 up wood poles, going back underground. It looked pathetic,
2 it was not well-organized.

3 I am very gratified tonight to hear that my city
4 representatives are here. Because I've got to be honest
5 with you, like we heard a moment ago, my neighbor, Scott
6 McKeown, came to me about a month and a half ago and said,
7 do you see all the activity in the lot over there. I said,
8 no. Well, I think they're putting in an apartment building.

9 Well that's not the case but like everyone I was not aware.

10 So ultimately I got involved. And for those of us
11 living in the neighborhood, Calle Medusa represents a
12 challenge. We are the easiest crosstown pathway in the area
13 so traffic coming down this street, even though
14 theoretically mitigated to 25, never goes 25.

15 Looking at Nicolas Road. When you look at the
16 front of the church -- when the church built here they had
17 to expand Nicolas to make room for the future of multiple
18 lanes. I don't see any of that in this power plant. So if
19 you take this land and put it into a power plant is it ever
20 going to be four lanes like the rest of Nicolas Road?

21 The other thing that is really important is the
22 land you took was purchased without any of us knowing that
23 you were putting taxpayer dollars into buying that land. I
24 know there was -- no, you can't ask questions. I know there
25 was --

1 (Laughter and applause.)_

2 MR. BOLDUC: I know there was another site, site
3 that you looked at just on the west side of the church
4 property. It's appropriate. It's under the existing
5 transmission lines, there would be no poles, it's the right
6 site. So I've got to go fast, I've got one minute.

7 This land is low-density residential, low-density
8 residential. The City has a plan. And you took the
9 position that because it wasn't approved you could jam in a
10 power station. That's what I see.

11 The issue facing most of us who live in this
12 neighborhood comes down to dollars. I put \$650,000 into my
13 property in 2006; it's worth 285,000 today. That's my
14 problem. But it's also your problem because the state tax
15 revenues have gone down. So if you are going to change the
16 profile of a residential neighborhood with power what does
17 that do to our values? I don't see you showing any concern
18 for the citizens outside of the legitimate concern to make
19 sure that power needs are met. That's it. Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MS. LADD: Danalee Bettis. Sorry if I'm mangling
22 your name.

23 MS. BETTIS: Hello. I am Danalee Bettis and I'm a
24 resident and I am not pleased with your selection of plants
25 that you have chosen on your scenarios. I don't know where

1 your other site location was but I would like you to
2 consider better planning that would actually enhance the
3 property. Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. LADD: Michael McLaren.

6 MR. MCKERNAN: Could it be McKernan?

7 MR. FISHER: McKernan.

8 MS. LADD: I'm sorry.

9 MR. MCKERNAN: That's all right.

10 I am also a resident of Temecula. When we
11 purchased our property we didn't have to worry about 85 foot
12 poles. None of that existed. That's why we bought here.
13 We had a beautiful look into the valley, a nice rural area.
14 We expected it to grow but not be devastated by an ugly
15 facility like this with great big poles sticking out in the
16 middle of our valley. It's going to make it look like
17 downtown -- okay, you can see a lot of places.

18 We object to the location of this project. There
19 are a lot of other properties, there are a lot of other
20 locations, whether it be just down the street or whether it
21 be a mile from here. There are areas that are better suited
22 for a facility like this that's not so much in public view
23 and is not going to impact an entire valley negatively like
24 this.

25 Now I keep hearing that these issues can be

1 mitigated. I'd hate to be a mitigated person. This is a
2 low-density housing area. We're supposed to be two-and-a-
3 half acres. This impacts our families, it impacts the whole
4 neighborhood, the complexion of it. This is just the wrong
5 area to have this.

6 There are areas -- we've got a whole area out on
7 -- Roripaugh Ranch area that's now abandoned. They could
8 design a whole area around the facility. They could hide it
9 somewhere else, not put it in the middle of a large
10 intersection in the middle of this valley. It's just the
11 wrong place to have it.

12 I have one more comment; at the end I'd like to
13 come back up.

14 MS. LADD: Okay.

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. LADD: Phyllis Ontkean.

17 MS. ONTKEAN: Having my home up here at the top of
18 the hill. I bought that house -- and it's a beautiful
19 residential area. And I object to somebody coming down here
20 and making a pile of garbage down here, commercial stuff.
21 It wasn't meant for that in the first place. I never would
22 have bought a home where I had to drive past an eyesore like
23 that and I object to it. And I think you are not being very
24 honest when you never did any advertising of what you were
25 going to do.

1 And in speaking to my council members we have no
2 say in this. I thought this was supposed to be America and
3 that you had the right to object to things. Now you have
4 taken that away from us. And I think it is wrong and you
5 both should be ashamed.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. LADD: Suzanne Zychowicz. Sorry if I
8 mispronounced it.

9 MS. ZYCHOWICZ: No, thank you, you did pretty
10 good, actually.

11 My name is Suzanne Zychowicz. I'm a Temecula
12 resident and a very nearby neighbor, just over the hill. I
13 haven't had a lot of time to do any research on this issue,
14 at least not sufficient, so I'm speaking from what I do know
15 of it.

16 But my first impression is that I'm definitely
17 opposed to this project. It seems like the siting was not
18 -- hardly any thought must have been given to that siting.
19 The overall project idea of locating that many and that tall
20 of poles where they are currently planned to be located
21 doesn't take into account the widening and the construction
22 that will be going on on Nicolas Road.

23 So I think it's really a waste of money, right
24 now, to push this in here, right now. I understand the need
25 for, you know, getting on the grid and expanding our

1 capacity. However, being a resident of 20 years. What has
2 been here has always met my needs and not failed. And that,
3 in your circle zone, pretty much consists, at least where I
4 live immediately, probably less than a quarter of a mile
5 from here, maybe a tenth over the hill.

6 This does not, this expansion does not seem to be
7 meeting just inside that circle. But however, you know, and
8 if you did your assessments correctly in that particular
9 area you'd probably find older homes, some rural. I agree
10 that it's a rural area but it's also a very high-density
11 area that impacts a lot of people. Not just a few people
12 that you're hiding some poles, it impacts a lot. And mostly
13 from an aesthetic viewpoint.

14 I'd recommend that if there is any way to hold off
15 on the project until money can be sequestered to bury the
16 lines, make them more aesthetically pleasing, locate them in
17 another site, that that would be the preferable
18 recommendation for this project. And I think that's
19 possible if you give it some serious thought and really
20 evaluate the negative impacts that have not been mitigated
21 with this project. Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. LADD: Lee Carpenter. Lee Carpenter.

24 MS. CARPENTER: Good evening. I'd like to say
25 first of all that, before I make additional comments, that I

1 am opposed to this project. I only recently found out about
2 it about a week ago.

3 I moved to this valley in 1980. I don't currently
4 live here but I am in negotiation to buy property to move
5 back for my retirement.

6 I lived here for 27 years. I lived on that
7 property. I can tell you that in 1980 when I moved in, that
8 ten acres is two, five acre parcels. The second parcel in
9 is where I lived. The front three acres was underwater for
10 weeks, probably in excess of two months.

11 Now I realize that engineers can take care of
12 certain things like water and raise, you know, with fill and
13 everything. But I'm a little concerned about having an
14 electrical facility of that magnitude and another hundred
15 year flood. I know several people that are here tonight
16 that I haven't seen in a while.

17 As far as the electrical workers, I am in total
18 support of them having jobs. I'm retired from AT&T and I
19 currently work for the Department of Homeland Security. And
20 I believe that people should have jobs and I think that they
21 can have their jobs at another location.

22 I am also, I am also and have been friends with
23 the Lasagnas for many years. In fact, Lawrence put in my
24 septic tank in my first home after we moved from -- I
25 believe from Nicolas Road we lived out on Liefer Road for 15

1 years before my husband passed away.

2 But the people in this valley had an expectation
3 when they moved here that their visual peace of mind would
4 never be disturbed. We have never been allowed to subdivide
5 less than two-and-a-half acres and there were certain other
6 restrictions.

7 In addition to the 85 foot poles, which you cannot
8 landscape away, that facility is not going to be -- there is
9 no way to make that beautiful. When you come down Calle
10 Medusa you are going to see that. If you come in from the
11 east side on Nicolas Road you are going to see it. If you
12 come down Liefer Road or if you live up on the hill on
13 Liefer that is always going to be a visual eyesore.

14 So I would say that perhaps there needs to be more
15 consideration. In addition, I don't have a take one way or
16 the other on what the alternate location might be except
17 that it's better thought out.

18 But the Lasagna property is adjacent to where the
19 current Edison lines and the Edison easement is and this
20 doesn't make a lot of sense. To put it --

21 And not only that, I'm a member of the church next
22 door. I don't want to leave church every Sunday morning and
23 look at that thing across the street. I don't think that
24 that's fair to the residents and to the people who are
25 church members of this church and that church to have that

1 kind of thing.

2 So anyway, I know I'm at the end of my time, thank
3 you very much. I think that I am in the majority of
4 opposition.

5 (Applause.)

6 MS. LADD: Jack Mayberry.

7 MR. MAYBERRY: My name is Jack Mayberry. I hadn't
8 planned to speak but sitting here I sort of got my dander
9 up. First of all I'd like to thank Mr. Washington and the
10 people from the City for coming. It's gratifying to know
11 that there's at least some level of government that still
12 tries to support the citizens.

13 I agree that it's nice to have jobs for the
14 electrical workers but they are going to build the plant
15 wherever you locate it, whether you locate it 20 miles out
16 or downtown Temecula. They are going to have the jobs.

17 I think there are some things that we could
18 probably agree on. One, we need the electrical plant. And
19 two, the impact is minimal for those of you that live in San
20 Francisco and don't live in Temecula.

21 The signs that were put up were, as my wife said,
22 trying to come under the radar, and the whole thing kind of
23 has a dirty tint to it. I think if you put some proper
24 signs up and let the public really know what was going then
25 this room would not be big enough to hold the people that

1 would come down to protest. Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. LADD: Lee Edwards. Lee Edwards.

4 MR. EDWARDS: Good evening. My name is Lee
5 Edwards and I am a resident here in Temecula on Yardley
6 Court.

7 I am adamantly opposed to the location you guys
8 are proposing to install this facility. I think there is a
9 number of alternates that were mentioned in your studies
10 that were overlooked or cast aside, due mainly to cost, not
11 necessarily to impact to the local, surrounding community.
12 A case in point is off of the end of French Valley Airport
13 and the industrial park in that area over closer towards the
14 prison facility.

15 As far as the IBEW goes. I too agree the
16 electrical workers need their work but it could be done at
17 any spot, at any one of the proposed locations.

18 Another thing I've got a real issue with is the
19 last time that we had utilities installed down Nicolas Road
20 the road was left a disaster. I've lived here since '90 and
21 that road has been in horrible condition since. The traffic
22 that is going to be required to put the facility in place is
23 just going to trash that road even more. I have seen
24 nothing in the documents that show any type of proposal for
25 replacements of the road, anything of that sort at all.

1 Needless to say I'd just be reiterating the
2 eyesore that the place is, not only to the people right down
3 at the valley bottom but to the surrounding communities.
4 This is very impacting as far as a densely packed
5 residential community that I don't think you guys have
6 really shown clearly in your -- not only in your overhead
7 views there but in your proposed maps. And I think you guys
8 really need to take another look at the alternate locations.
9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. LADD: Dan York.

12 MR. YORK: Thank you. Dan York, city engineer,
13 City of Temecula. You have already heard the City of
14 Temecula's position. I thought it would be helpful to
15 comment on a couple of the technical aspects as it relates
16 to the environmental document.

17 The first item is the pole locations. Eight pole
18 locations and 85 foot steel poles. If it was placed at the
19 current or the proposed site, initially we wouldn't have
20 those poles. It is still unclear to the City where those
21 poles would fit relative to the ultimate right-of-way of
22 Nicolas Road. We currently do not have all of the ultimate
23 right-of-way so that will need to be addressed.

24 Secondly, as far as construction equipment and
25 traffic control. There was some discussion in the

1 environmental document about impacts. It was listed as
2 being less-than significant. The placement of 85 foot high
3 poles will require placement of cranes for a period of time.

4 Where those are going to be located, what that impact does
5 to our streets and the movement of our citizens is still not
6 clear to us.

7 We have commented and asked for full street
8 improvement widening on Calle Medusa and Nicolas Road as it
9 relates to the four properties that they bought. What they
10 currently purchased, the four parcels on Nicolas Road
11 between Calle Girasol and Calle Medusa.

12 And through a state lot line adjustment procedure
13 would actually minimize the improvements along Nicolas Road
14 and then require -- there's additional parcels that take
15 access off of Nicolas. We have asked for an access off of
16 Calle Girasol, which if a normal development would have come
17 in you would have done that because Nicolas Road in our
18 general plan is not to have those additional access points
19 off of Nicolas Road. So the location of where they chose
20 does have additional impacts to that property, to that
21 street and how it would be designed in the future.

22 The final thing I wanted to mention is on the
23 hydrology aspect. This area is in a flood plain and the
24 actual flood plain limits and the flood way have not been
25 defined yet. A study will need to be done as part of this

1 and it will also have an impact on the Nicolas Road
2 elevation. We are working with Edison on the extent of that
3 but the current comments have not fully satisfied the City's
4 concerns on that and we will continue to work with them.
5 But from a technical point it would be good to put that on
6 the record. Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MS. LADD: Larry Roberts.

9 MR. ROBERTS: My name is Larry Roberts. I'm a
10 resident and I want to go on record as saying I oppose the
11 placing of the substation at the current location.

12 I am very disappointed that the focus of the
13 Commission is strictly meeting legal requirements without
14 the consideration of the residents and the true impact to
15 the community and against the recommendations of the city
16 that it is designed to serve. It appears that the
17 Commission is serving the utility providers more than the
18 citizens. I recommend that the Commission do the right
19 thing for the people it serves and find a better location.

20 (Applause.)

21 MS. LADD: I have been through all of the cards
22 that I had for people who signed up. There was one
23 gentleman who asked to come back. Are there other people
24 who have not had an opportunity to speak, who after hearing
25 comments have decided to make some oral comments?

1 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Are you going to
2 respond to any questions at all tonight? None whatsoever.

3 You said you were a third party. Hired by whom?

4 MR. FISHER: By me.

5 MS. LADD: I'm a contractor to the California
6 Public Utilities Commission.

7 MR. FISHER: To my Commission.

8 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: But we don't get a
9 chance to hire our own environmental study, we the people?
10 We have to accept yours that were hired by the Commission?

11 MR. FISHER: No, no, this is open for your comment
12 and open for you to challenge. I can go through that again
13 if you want.

14 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: It seems like we ought
15 to at least get somebody else to (inaudible).

16 MR. FISHER: Sorry?

17 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: We should at least get
18 to hire our own environmental study. I mean, you are making
19 a decision based on people --

20 MS. LADD: Could you come up to the podium and get
21 your comments on the record.

22 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: You know, I sort of
23 feel like we're in a Jim Croce song, you know. Tugging on
24 Superman's cape and spitting in the wind. You know, you
25 guys were hired by the Public Utilities Commission so you're

1 going to give them whatever kind of report they want. We
2 the people ought to have a chance to have our own
3 environmental study. Because it is affecting us.

4 MR. FISHER: You have opportunity to challenge
5 that.

6 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: How much time do we
7 have to challenge it?

8 MR. FISHER: You've got until the 17th to register
9 comments.

10 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Before the 17th. We
11 have ten days.

12 MR. FISHER: Correct.

13 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Wow. How long have
14 you guys had?

15 MR. FISHER: We have been actually writing it for
16 the past nine months.

17 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Yeah. And how long
18 did the study go before that?

19 MR. FISHER: Probably about two years.

20 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: About two years. And
21 we've got --

22 MR. FISHER: That was -- that was SCE's study.

23 MS. LADD: I am going to allow you to come back
24 up. If you would like to fill out a card and give it to me.
25 Please state your name again.

1 MR. MCKERNAN: Michael McKernan, a resident. I'm
2 giving notice that in the next few days on behalf of my
3 family, neighbors and community we intend on filing a writ
4 of mandamus in the Riverside Superior Court naming the City
5 of Temecula. We also intend on filing an injunction asking
6 for injunctive relief against SCE, the City of Temecula and
7 the PUC from moving forward with this project.

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. LADD: Doris Luth.

10 MS. LUTH: I'm Doris Luth and I just wanted to be
11 on the record that I am also opposed to it. I've lived here
12 for 20 years, we moved out from LA County. In LA County the
13 power plants and all the big poles were down by the river
14 bed so you couldn't see them, you know, not in the city.
15 And we moved out here because of the ruralness of it and the
16 openness and just the pretty views. And coming up the hill
17 to our house and going down the hill.

18 And it's just really disturbing that with so many
19 other places in town that are far out and waiting to serve
20 people, like in the business complexes off of Diaz way in
21 the back or out past the airport by the prison. It's not
22 going to bother anybody's homes out there because there
23 aren't any. That you would have to pick a pristine,
24 gorgeous, nice place that we see every day and put such a
25 monstrosity, you know.

1 I know you guys don't live here; I know you're
2 doing your job. But we live here and it really concerns us.
3 That's it.

4 MS. LADD: Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: This is kind of
7 a quick question. Does this thing hum? Is it going to make
8 a loud, humming noise that we are all going to hear?

9 (Yeses.)

10 FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: How loud?

11 (Several people began speaking at once away
12 from the microphones.)

13 MS. LADD: Were there other people who wanted to
14 make a comment? Would you fill out a card.

15 MR. BOLDUC: I did.

16 MS. LADD: Okay.

17 MR. BOLDUC: I already spoke so I'll take a short.

18 MS. LADD: Okay.

19 MR. BOLDUC: Michael Bolduc again. I'm sorry I
20 didn't say it clearly the first time but I am opposed to the
21 project. While I got caught up in emotion the last time the
22 couple of things I missed were your website is very clear,
23 it has good information. So as a source I would recommend
24 everybody use it, unless it's in the CD.

25 But ultimately on your website you show the plan

1 from 2008 that was tied to what I've heard called Site B,
2 which is over here under the existing power lines. It seems
3 to me that unsightly power line pathway isn't going to
4 change. So if you're stuck with location, which is tied to
5 the location of power lines, at a minimum I suggest moving
6 back to the power line location away from the neighborhood
7 and a declared lot that is declared low-use residential.

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. LADD: State your name again, please.

10 MS. CARPENTER: Lee Carpenter. Since I did run
11 out of time. When I was talking about the hydraulic
12 problem, the water in 1970 that was in the front portion of
13 the property where I had lived. Because in 1993 I was on
14 Liefer Road -- and those of you who were here know that the
15 creek stayed high for days. I had to call in TV helicopters
16 in order to get FEMA to come over and put that bridge in on
17 Liefer Road. And I was there for the ribbon cutting and all
18 of that and it was a kind of a joke at that time, it was
19 Lee's bridge.

20 My point in bringing that up is that in 1993 the
21 front of that property was once again a lake. This isn't --
22 there wasn't a one-time thing. Even though they may call it
23 a hundred year flood it happens a lot more often than every
24 hundred years. And people who live here that live in this
25 valley and have lived here for 20, 25 years, they know what

1 I'm talking about. So it is -- I think there's a safety
2 issue here as well.

3 And tacking on to that the other property. And I
4 don't know what other properties may have been proposed
5 other than the one that's that way, the Lasagna property.
6 That was not under water. And also it's further from the
7 creek. When the creek overflows it doesn't go that way it
8 comes this way, always. So if you could include that in the
9 comments from us I'd sure appreciate that, thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. LADD: Come up.

12 MS. ZYCHOWICZ: Again, I'm Suzanne Zychowicz, I
13 was up earlier too.

14 I just wanted to add as far as unmitigated effects
15 with the quality of life issues, that everybody really has
16 voiced a concern over the visual aesthetic looks of the
17 poles. Also as far as the substation goes I think that we
18 could do much better with this project and make it more 21st
19 century.

20 For example, I'm sure you are aware that Anaheim
21 has put a pretty large size substation facility itself
22 underground. Other than I know the cost of burying these
23 lines, the telecommunication lines and electrical lines, is
24 more cost prohibitive. However, if the development that is
25 intended to go in in Roripaugh Ranch, Johnson Ranch, that's

1 what we're building these for. Then you can find some other
2 sources to help you mitigate excess cost to preserve the
3 quality of life for the residents in this area. Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. LADD: Did I see another hand?

6 If there's no other comments then we'll call the
7 meeting to a close.

8 Thank you all for coming and thank you all for
9 providing comments.

10 (Thereupon the Public Meeting was
11 adjourned at 8:15 p.m.)

12 --oOo--
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, MARTHA NELSON, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing Scoping Meeting was reported by me and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in this matter, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of December, 2009.

Martha L. Nelson
Official Reporter