

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

STATEMENT OF MR. MAXWELL

MR. MAXWELL: Hi. My name is Craig Maxwell. And I would like to ask a rhetorical question. If we were considering a proposal to link power from the Owens Valley to the Bay Area, and it was determined that the most fiscally expedient route was through the heart of the Yosemite Valley, what do you suppose the public reaction would be? Do you think SDG&E would even have a chance to suggest this project? The question answers itself.

C0240-1

But my next question isn't so rhetorical. What is it that makes SDG&E think that our wilderness is any less valuable? And in the light of this, it is perhaps important to keep in mind that on March 16th through the 22nd, the Borrego Springs Plein Air Invitational will feature the works from artists from all over the area who have captured the sublime stillness and beauty of this area. But absent from their renderings will be housing developments, strip malls, and hideously ugly steel towers linked by sagging wires perpetually buzzing and crackling.

There is a vision that must be saved for the sake of future generation of artists and nature lovers everywhere. Please say no to this proposal. Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you. Mr. Gastil.

STATEMENT OF MS. GASTIL

MS. GASTIL: Hello. There is two of us. But my husband is disabled, and he has asked me to read his statement for him. He is right there. He is standing up, and I'm going to read his statement first.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

MS. GASTIL: This is his statement. I'm Gordon Gastil. I was born and raised in San Diego. I'm a geologist. After decades of teaching, I'm now a professor meritus at San Diego State University in geology. I've taught many field geology classes here in Julian and other unspoiled areas of our beautiful San Diego backcountry.

C0241-1

I'm very familiar with geothermal energy elsewhere in the world. Rather than transporting geothermal power to the large energy users, those users are located near the power source. Salvador Prieto in Baja, California, is one example of this.

Let the users locate near the power source. Do not blight our countryside with dangerous, unsightly, expensive lines to transport the power. You bring the users to the source. You don't bring the source to the user. The attraction to the user of geothermal energy is the extremely cheap power available at the source.

And I have this statement in writing standard signed.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Ms. Gastil. We do appreciate your time.

MS. GASTIL: Now I would like to speak for myself. My name is Janet Gastil. I'm a San Diego County resident since 1946 when my parents brought me here.

C0241-2

I'm concerned about visual blithe and environmental impact of the proposed power lines. If we must have power transport, which I doubt, it should be put underground only.

We all want to see the beautiful, unspoiled meadows, ranches and oak forests of our countryside. Once these big power poles and wires go in, they will stay for decades. Look at Payne Bottom, a part of the old Tailem Ranch off the Eagle Peak Road. It was spoiled by high voltage power lines long ago, and those lines are still there. As a realtor, I sold that property back in the late 80s. I

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

don't know how many people I showed it to and they said, oh, good. There is power here. And I had to say, no, no you can't hook into these high voltage lines, which they still can't.

C0241-2 cont.

As a realtor you might think my first concern would be property values, which are of course reduced seriously when power lines are put in aboveground. But my primary concern is everyone's view, and how it is spoiled. Not just residents, sellers and buyers, but everyone, students, children, tourists, all of us. We are here for the tranquility, and visual impact is very important to us all. So, please, if you must have this line, put it underground.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

MS. GASTIL: Thank you for having the hearing in Julian.

STATEMENT OF MR. MILLER

MR. MILLER: My name is Skip Miller. I've lived in the Boulder Creek area for the past 30 years. And I have a little backcountry prospective.

C0242-1

People live in cities and suburbs for the security and the conveniences provided by development. They live in houses surrounded by such development, and this is their home. People choose the backcountry despite certain risks and inconveniences for a variety of reasons: the natural surroundings, the views and the absence of development.

My house was destroyed in the 2003 Cedar Fire and again in the 2007 wildfires. To me, the house can be rebuilt, but my home is the location and the surroundings. And the installation of these monstrous towers would destroy my home. And I think that perspective and that distinction needs to be made to fully understand and appreciate the people's passion here for their land.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much. Woody Barnes, and those with 26 through 29, come up.

STATEMENT OF MR. BARNES

MR. BARNES: My name is Franklin Barnes. My family has been in Julian area over 100 years. I've been here over 70 years. I'm a farmer. I have a background in botany. I want to indicate the following comments are mine and do not represent any group.

C0243-1

First, I want to make it clear that I'm a great admirer of electricity and remember when many in this area did not have electricity. Secondly, I firmly believe that the future demands for electricity in the San Diego region cannot be met with existing sources and conservation alone. And it is highly questionable whether it can be made with solar on roofs alone.

I have read portions, but not all, of the 3500 pages of the EIR. And I have the following comments. First, it would take for the 90 days we have allowed to read it, you would have to read about 35 pages a day, I think, which is probably more than a little more than most of us can do.

Secondly, I agree with the environmental rankings. And Volume 1 on page ES.2, I think they are rather well done. I agree that the number one choice for new all-area source generation deserves serious consideration based on less overall environmental damage than the other alternatives. I believe that upgrading the Encino and South Bay plants need to be more steady. I think it is not adequately violated.

I think, in addition, a serious shortfall in this EIR is the failure to fully consider upgrading nuclear power as a component of electrical generation. While radioactive waste management needs solving, I think that it is probably less of a problem than a CO2 problem. Further, if fossil fuels should

C0243-2

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

be used for electric generation, I think it is appropriate that the waste products be emitted in the area where the benefit is received, not in some remote area. C0243-3

The weakness of Plan 1 is clearly that the renewable energy from solar and wind are best generated in the desert and the mountains. If they are generated there, it would still need some form of a transmission line. I think concepts, or Alternatives 2 and 3 have possibilities, but Alternative 3 seems to concentrate only on transmission and ignores the costs and inefficiencies of the Decker Canyon, Santa Rosa Power Plant pump stations. C0243-4
C0243-5

Alternative 4, the southern route, and I would use Interstate 8 with the alternatives Campo North and West Buckman Springs, while not as environmental benign as paralleling the existing Southwest Power Link, which I think would be the most environmentally benign of all, meets most of the goals of San Diego Gas & Electric with minimal environmental damage, except in the Buckman Springs area. I think important advantages of this route include proximity. Oh, oh. I'll turn this in. C0243-6

ALJ WEISSMAN: Why don't you take a couple of moments to come to a conclusion.

MR. BARNES: Okay. My conclusions are that I think the proposals for No. 4, with a combination of No. 1 would be the best of all alternatives. And I think this would do the least environmental — overall environmental damage, and get the electricity that will probably be needed. Thank you. C0243-7

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Barnes. We look forward to seeing your completed statement.

STATEMENT OF MS. FALLER

MS. FALLER: Good day. Thank you for coming to Julian, our small historic town, which is known as the gem of San Diego. C0244-1

This Powerlink will be very devastating with the environmental impact for the Eagles and the Horny Toads and all the species it will impact.

San Diego Gas & Electric now cannot maintain the lines that are up. With this Powerlink, they will have additional lines. And with Santa Ana winds going up to 80 miles an hour plus, the fire impact will be devastating. There will be larger fires, more devastating fires in this county. The value of property will dramatically decrease on those individuals that own where the Powerlinks are going to go through. C0244-2
C0244-3

We need another option. We need alternatives. This cannot happen. Thank you. C0244-4

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you. Pam Nelson, followed by John Raifsnider.

STATEMENT OF MS. NELSON

MS. NELSON: Thank you for coming today. I'm Pam Nelson from Warner Springs. C0245-1

Please do not support the Powerlink. It is not needed. Your analysts have identified good alternatives, proposals in the top two choices. This Powerlink would send electricity in inefficient, expensive and polluting manners. It would blithe the backcountry with towers that are dangerous and would go through fire prone areas.

Electrical security would be compromised by promoting this system instead of increasing independent, local user production. Just yesterday in Florida there were large blackouts due to the large — they have a big electrical system there, due to one little substation that had some problem. So this does not increase our security, electrical security hooking up to a big system. We have to promote local production.

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

Alternatives are available as suggested in Proposal 1 with solar, wind and cogeneration. I don't support nuclear power at all, because radioactivity is way more dangerous than — immediately now than — we could do something as far as global and cut back on our CO2 footprint.

C0245-1 cont.

Our own residence is powered by a small set of PV panels and a wind generator, and we are always giving back electricity to SDG&E. We can't use it all. So we are living proof.

It is understandable that Sempra and SDG&E need to protect their business, but this project does not protect the community. In fact, it is dangerous and degrading and not protecting us at all.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. RAIFSNIDER

MR. RAIFSNIDER: John Raifsnider again from Julian.

I want to complete a thought I commenced last evening. And that there is a bigger energy crisis behind the energy dispute that is going on here. It is a human energy crisis, the division of our human energy. I define it as a division between the head and the heart. The head being the corporation with its will and intention, and the heart being the community, the people, with their vision, with its vision.

C0246-1

And so as a solution I propose that we come together, and I mean this on many fronts. That the urban and rural communities, the corporation and business and political servants, and the wide community of greater citizens should all come together. This coming together will begin with denying the new big, rickety Tinkertoy corporation. The corporation head and its business interests see the community as mere consumers. They need a substitute that delivers. But the heart of the community is awakening. We can see it here.

We are refusing to be suckers anymore. We, the heart of the community, are not mere consumers. We are creators, we are cocreators, the mighty head must join us and become our cocreators. Listen to your heart, the people, almighty head. May the chambers of commerce heads step out of their chambers and breathe in sky and the unscathed earth again. May heads and corporate towers come down where the hearts of the people live. May political heads find hearts to serve the people, as they've always said.

Please do deny this head its heady victory. Once defeated, it will be humbled that it may come to us, the people, the community and listen to its heart. Then we can talk and build something together, the way that every healthy body should.

Please deny the power company the consummation of its desire. It will have no choice but to join the community. It will earn the respect of the community and will not need to rule by force and fear. We will work together, a perfect marriage of head and heart. The community, the people have the vision, more powerful than all the money and political connections of the corporation. The vision of the people will prevail. It can only be delayed, but cannot be stopped. If it is delayed, a great waste and loss of resources will ensue. If the decision is acted on now, great energy and power to create will flow in, dawning like the sunrise we all seek.

So, no high wire acts across the sky are needed when the power of the sun is already splashing across our faces. No underground, no overground. The power in the sky, the solar energy already has a transmission system on beams of light to each one of us. Every tree and flower is already part of this system. Let us be part of it too. We the heart of the community, the heart of the people have spoken.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you. Betty Birdsell, followed by numbers through 32.

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

STATEMENT OF MS. BIRDSELL

MS. BIRDSELL: Thank you, Judge Weissman, Commissioner Grueneich for coming. We appreciate you changing your plans and coming to Julian.

On behalf of the Julian Community Planning Group, please know that we are listening to our constituency. And that we are working toward forming an opinion regarding the central link of the power — of the Powerlink.

C0247-1

Now, on behalf of the chamber of commerce, at a recent meeting of the chamber of commerce board of directors put the following action regarding San Diego Gas & Electric Sunrise Powerlink Project. A motion was made and carried unanimously to oppose the Powerlink Project, especially the central link which is the proposed passage through the Santa Ysabel, Julian, Mesa Grande area.

The objection to the project is based on several factors. The economy of Julian is based to a great degree on tourism. The backcountry's natural pristine features attract these tourists. Should the power line and the supporting steel towers be installed, the natural beauty of the area will be greatly impacted and compromised.

The backcountry is subject to wildfires. And suppression of fire is crucial to our survival. The ability to affectively and quickly fight fire near the towers is greatly reduced if not prohibited due to safety issues. Shutting down the power doesn't immediately take aware the dangers. It takes time for the flow of power to subside in the high voltage lines. That fire won't wait.

C0247-2

Private property for corporate use through the process of eminent domain is an objectionable issue. The ranchers and the other property owners whose lands will be effected have asked SDG&E about several issues regarding the development and maintenance and access roads. The answers were not acceptable. SDG&E has a right to cease more properties for development of maintenance roads other than others already proposed.

C0247-3

Part of the proposed path of the power lines is a very remote area of San Diego County near Mesa Grande. SDG&E stated that helicopters might be used to deliver materials and/or equipment to the area. In response to requests for prior notifications so the ranchers might move livestock out of the area, SDG&E stated no such notification would be made. Loss of livestock could result. The ranchers take great care to respect their land, to make improvements and changes that don't destroy the land but are in agreement with the natural features of the ranches. When asked if the access roads would be developed with the lay of the land so that natural contours are respected to prevent erosion that would destroy surrounding property, SDG&E responded that they may or may not take that into consideration.

C0247-4

Overall these issues are the concerns of not only the Julian Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, but also local residents. Please consider our concerns when making your decision regarding approval of this Powerlink Project.

The proposed opportunity for expansion of the tower in the power line system is to me personally very alarming. The Governor and the State Legislature encourage a path that leads, in their words, to a greener energy future. Let's hope that that greener path doesn't destroy the beautiful green path we already enjoy. Thank you.

C0247-5

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you. Gidon Singer.

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

STATEMENT OF MR. SINGER

MR. SINGER: I'm here again. I was here Monday. I'm not a good public speaker. I don't know what else to do but come here and try to do something. I'll focus on one aspect, as many of you have more intelligently spoken on the fire and the green, or the lack of green proposal of the Sunrise Powerlink.

C0248-1

Basically there are a variety of energy solutions out there, and self-sufficient locally generated are obviously the best. I have a friend that has a completely green house at Ocean Beach. He pays \$30 a year to SDG&E, plus \$60 net metering fee. If it is doable in Imperial Valley, it is doable here.

The bottom line is we have parklands that are one of a kind, Cleveland Forest, Anza-Borrego Desert Park. Once they are ruined, once they've got towers and development along them, that is it. As Gertrude Stein said, "There will be no there there." Or Professor of Columbia architectural historian and planner, Kenneth Rampton, it creates universal placelessness. That is just — you advocate all geological, cultural and archeological history.

C0248-2

I've been here for over 40 years, or close to 40 years. I've seen our backcountry diminished. Parks are to be in perpetuity. You have to maintain that. I don't care if Sempra had green solar panels all out there ready to go, 100 percent green. It is not green when it goes through parklands and devastates. The gentleman earlier, the civil engineer, you want to see an example of road cuts in erosion and access roads and footprints? Go look at the San Thomas Valley just south of Ensenada. You will see physical examples of the degradation.

As I was preparing my speech I was listening to a Tom Waits song. It is called — it is, "What is He Building There?" So this is kind of analogous. Just replace "he" replace "SDG&E" and "building" replace "proposing." What is he building in there? He took the old tire swing from the pepper tree. He has no children of his own, you see. He has no dog. He has no friends. What are those little packages he sends? What is he building in there. I'll tell you one thing, it is not a playhouse for the children.

I'll end my little spiel with a Gary Schneider poem, which I think is applicable. It is called, "For the Children." The rising hills, the slopes of statistics lack a forest. The steep climb of everything going up, up, as we all go down. In the next century or the one beyond that, they say our valleys and pastures meet there in peace, if we make it. To climb these coming cliffs, one word to you, to you and your children, stay together, learn the flowers and go light. Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you. April Kochur.

STATEMENT OF KOCHUR

MS. KOCHUR: First off, my name is April Kochur K-o-c-h-u-r.

First off, one thing I would like to say is according to SDG&E, they have claimed that it would cost approximately 25 to \$35,000 for solar panels to be installed. However, license contractors say they can do it between 10 and \$15,000. So that is a correction that needs to be made in the newspaper.

C0249-1

My other comment is regarding the property of — private property along the route. We've heard so many comments and voices from property owners who oppose this, which I think is great. However, one question and concern I have is, are there any public official who owns property along those routes?

C0249-2

My last comment is the magnitude of the Powerlink is being based on a decision by five individuals rather than having it on a ballot for each and every one of us to decide whether or not we want this ballot. Thank you.

C0249-3

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MS. MANYA TRAUB

MS. MANYA TRAUB: I'm here to support the no. I'm here as part of the Traub family. We've been on the Vulcan Mountain for 85 years. Our grandfather surveyed this area, the very first surveying of this area was done by him. That is how we got here.

We are right off San Felipe Road in the Pines Fire. Again, we all knew about the Pines Fire and the electrical situation that started that. We lost 600 or more oak trees. Our home is called "Los Robles," means many oaks. Not anymore. We lost two homes, trailers, many outbuildings. This is very emotional, of course, which caused the downed tower lines situation.

Four years of dealing with the government, and getting ready to rebuild, we now have SDG&E, you guys, the other guys, right in our backyard. They are taking core samples 300 yards from our property line. Amazing. It was a total shock to know that they were right there in our yard.

Erosion, the roads have erosion makes all over them in our property, or on our property talking, about your access lines. I would like to invite you all to come see them. The substation is supposed to be right there. Right there. I could spit to where the power substation is supposed to be.

So my concerns are no, I don't want this there. Please do not put it there. I don't want to see it there. I don't want to hear about it there. I agree there are other ways to do this.

I had no contact from anybody to tell me this was happening. If I were a year-around resident here, I would have known. I'm not at this current time, because I have no home.

Secondly, the environmental impact, I've already seen it just from the erosion alone.

Thirdly, the EMF damages which is a very, very real threat. I don't want to live under the power lines. I don't want to live next to the substation. This is my sanctuary. This is where I stay to keep sane.

And, fourthly, the expense to rebuild a home. I would like to know if it is going to happen there, because I don't want to put my last two nickles in a spot that is going to be shared with a substation.

Thank you for listening to me. I would like to hand it over to my sister.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MS. LISA TRAUB

MS. LISA TRAUB: My name is Lisa. And, sorry, folks. It is bad enough what all these people have done coming up to Julian. I know it is your livelihood or whatever. We don't want to have to see the lights of a substation, the hum of a substation.

We have two resident eagles on our property, two resident mountain lions, thousands of turkeys, squirrels. If I were living in Malibu or any other fancy area, sure as hell you guys wouldn't be there. I would like to see you guys have a big beam of light that you could look outside your window too and see that.

Our kids will die owning that property, and hopefully their kids also. We don't want the health risk. We don't want anymore fire. We have kept our property so blasted clean so that fire would never hit us. We have worked like dogs to maintain it. This has happened to us. We've been in the middle of three fires now.

C0250-1

C0251-1

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

Not only that, but these people have gone on our private property. They have put their equipment on our property, which is inexcusable, without any consideration of asking. And for the first time in my life, our property has been broken into, our barn has been ransacked. There are people in their cars 24 hours a day, security people, watching this equipment. Guess what? They are watching our stuff too. We are watching them walk away. I don't want to have somebody come open my gate on my property. They don't belong there. This tower plant doesn't belong there.

C0251-1 cont.

I'm not an expert. We don't — take this someplace else. I don't care where you take it. We do not want it here. And our future doesn't want it here. Our kids may not have Yosemite to go to. This is their sanctuary, please.

STATEMENT OF MS. RENEE TRAUB

MS. RENEE TRAUB: Okay. I'm the sister with the kids, the fourth generation. My kids wanted to be here. They couldn't. I've got a seven year old, a 12 year old and 16 year old. All of them are men. The first thing they said is what is going to happen to the deer during deer season, Mom? They are not going to come to the house. Our property has been open range since we've owned it.

C0252-1

Every hunting season the turkeys come, the deer come, the resident mountain lion that has been there hasn't even migrated like they normally do. My kids wake up to turkeys and squirrels in the front yard.

Substation, from our house to main street, ain't going to happen. They got 500 acres in this last bid for property. There is a valley on the other side of this nice ridge, no houses within any distance of them. Build the damn thing there, if you have to build it, or don't build it at all, which is better.

I want the wildlife to stay. I want the wildflowers to come back and not have to wait for another damn fire to bring them out. I want my kids to be able to pass down what we had passed down to us, and what my father had passed down to him and what my grandfather was able to find when he came here.

I don't want to have LA City in my backyard again. It is bad enough I work in the city. I don't want to be able to come up every weekend and look out my door and say, shit, I'm still at work. There is another power plant. Oh, my God. I want to be able to bring my dog up and let him run on our acreage, and not have to worry about him chewing up the security guy sitting there watching the power plant because he is on our property.

I want it to stay the way it was for this generation, for the generations to come, and for anybody who even remotely thinks that there might be a generation after that, and a generation after that and a generation after that. Because mankind is spreading out further. We need to keep our natural resources where they are. Thank you. That is all I have to say.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MR. COSTANZO

MR. COSTANZO: I've come to a lot of these meetings. Each time I see a new route by SDG&E. Not one of them is worth a damn, excuse me. SDG&E does not need to put power lines anywhere on any of these routes. There is other alternatives. Thousands of people put their money together to pay to build towers for the report he made. My wife and I put money in to publish that report. That report should carry more weight than it is. He put a lot of time into it.

C0253-1

The other thing that I want to say is SDG&E has got a lot on our gate in Mesa Grande. In the last, let's see, the last three months of last year our property was broken into three times. Twice the

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

SDG&E lock was open. The third time the whole chain disappeared with all the locks on it. Whoever was breaking in had keys to the SDG&E lock, and they had no responsibility for that at all.

C0253-1 cont.

You ranchers, they would do nothing. We had probably \$15,000 worth of loss and damage. And SDG&E took no responsibility for their lock being open. Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. BEMAN

MR. BEMAN: Hello. My name Daniel Beman. And I can tell you how the sun works. We have got all these shades closed because the sun is working. It works. You see back there was a paper, because I made a spill and I wiped it up with a paper. That paper is flat dry. This young man will testify that I'm cooking my pizza in my car right now, and a solar panel is charging my battery. The sun works. Let's use it rightly.

C0254-1

I have a website, freedomplease.org. I'm not making any money, just like the other speakers before. This is all about you. Everybody that is a ratepayer. I tried to illustrate it the other night. If there is 1 million ratepayers and it is a million dollar project, that is \$1,000 from each of our pockets. I don't have it. We can do alternatives.

Hopefully God is going to bless me, and I'm going to live in Boulevard. And they take over that area if they move down there. I don't care. If you see there is wind, I live — if I get my house there it will be three miles from windmills. If you see — Google has done this same type of thing. They have solar panels all over their buildings. It will run. They have excess power. You too should have it. But SDG&E should pay you for it, not get it free like they get it now.

I live in public housing. I think it should be a right that if you live in public housing, the roof should be enabled so you can generate energy and give back to your community. Not just power your own homes, but give back to your own community.

Now, what do I know? I know because I was a lighting and maintenance district in the City of San Diego. We had to put in so many lights every year. They paid extra taxes to have these lights put in. But SDG&E wouldn't let us put them in, because it took so long for them to get them done. What did we do? What did we do? We did the first Solar Street Light Program in the City of San Diego. North Park, Garfield School. Go drive around. You will see tons of them. This is what we can do for change. We do not have to go to old-time technology. It is available. We need to change it.

Now, my major concern I illustrated the other night was with the Indian grounds. Because I was raised by Dennis Banks, that Dennis Banks mother of Wounded Knee. I understand about Indians. We need to give them heritage and opportunity to survive as our culture is. I'm afraid of what is going to happen at Santa Ysabel area and us too.

C0254-2

We need to look at it. SDG&E took over \$10 million to underground from the ratepayers and never did it in San Diego. The city council didn't hold their feet to their fire. I don't know if the CPUC is going to hold them to it either. But we have to do something. We all have to do something. If there was solar panels on that roof, we could run this whole building. Just the solar panels on that roof where you see all the reflective signs. It is possible. We need to do it now. Don't let them do this. Thank you.

C0254-3

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much. Patty Reedy is the last speaker who signed up.

While she is speaking, of course listen to her carefully, but also if any of the rest of you would like to make any comments before we close.

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

STATEMENT OF MS. REEDY

MS. REEDY: My name is Patty Reedy. I'm off Bolder Creek also. Very remote area. But you could also call me Already Environmentally Impacted Patty, because I did lose my house, my place, as well as Skip and other neighbors on October 21st. We barely made it with our lives. This would be attributed to the power lines behind us. And I'm very nervous right now.

C0255-1

This is something that should not go through. The winds that we have in our area are horribly high. It was probably 110 miles that night. As I say, we were very lucky to get out. I guess that is about all I have to say.

The impact on this area if the power lines do go through would be detrimental. It would ruin the heart and soul of our area. And because we are the heart and soul, the land is us, and we are the land. And I don't think that these lines should go through, because it is pristine, very untouched area. Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Is there anybody else who is interested in making a comment, anybody else? Last call.

STATEMENT OF MR. LINTHICOME

MR. LINTHICOME: Thank you. My name is Terry Linthicome. I live out of Mesa Grande. I'm a neighbor of Norm's.

C0256-1

And give you an idea how rural our area is, I went to get a plot from the County of San Diego with our property. To find out that Mesa Grande Road hadn't been surveyed since 1968. The County of San Diego does not have plots of our property out there. This is a very pristine country out there. The home I live in was built in 1883. It is an old Spanish adobe.

And one of the routes would have taken our entire property. I understand that there is all different routes and all different ways that they could do this. But bottom line is the technology that they are talking about using is antiquated. It is only a transmission system. It is not a production system. We are planning on using it from anywhere they can get it or make it.

If you have driven by the solar panels on 395 by Bakersfield going out to Las Vegas, you see the footprint is enormous. If you plan to do that in the desert, the destruction is enormous, let alone the transmission lines.

Bottom line though is they are going to get it from Mexico. They are going to bring it in from Cole, from Utah someplace. They are building a super grid, and that is not a secure system for us here in San Diego.

C0256-2

Locally produced power, we had solar power right out here in Lake Henshaw for about 20 years. The reason it was taken down now was they couldn't control all the little fires that the solar panels made because it was a mirror system. So they've just taken a law to outlaw our lightbulbs only to replace them with these compact fluorescent lights. Which if you were to break one in your home now you need a HAZMAT team.

C0256-3

That is the type of technology we don't want in our community. We need a better solution rather than these fixes now, let's do it now, let's do it now. No, we could wait. There are other ways. Solar panels, thin solar films, different types of constructions are all available to us.

And we shouldn't go with the big corporation eminent domaining our properties in order that they could provide more profits to the bottom line. This is not needed at this time here in San Diego.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much for your time.

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

STATEMENT OF MS. DIADRO

MS. DIADRO: Thank you very much for coming. I'm not from this area.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Please indicate your name.

MS. DIADRO: My name is Christine Diadro. I live in Marietta. We live in the — spitting distance from where the LEAPS towers are going to be.

I was late coming in this morning because of the traffic coming up the hill. And as I was coming up the hill, up to this beautiful area, the fire devastation up here reminded me how devastated I felt when we had the wildfires where we live. We helped people evacuate. It was such a sad, terrible time. People lost hope, people lost land, people lost many, many things. And I don't know if people could ever get that back.

We were in the process of building a home. And my husband and I haven't had a TV for two years. And, man, we know each other better now than we ever have. We visit, we talk, we read books. We talk about our neighbors, we visit with our neighbors and we are not in the house using power to watch the boob tube.

I think the human race has become very narcissistic. I think we have become very spoiled. If the temperature is not between 68 and 72, we are too hot or we are too cold. Last summer it was 115 in our little trailer. When the oak tree wasn't shading our trailer, I thought I am going to see what can I do to cool myself down. And I went out, and got the garden house and I felt really good. I felt like I started the day again.

I do think that this — I do think the energy situation is a situation that needs to be rethought of and relooked at. I think it is an antiquated style. Last year when we were having our fires in Marietta and down in Delouse, in that area, it almost — it was a very frightening thing to me. Because as I went to Avocado Mesa, and I looked out, it showed a tremendous view. You could see three fires raging fast. And at that time I thought to myself my God, what would we do in a terrorism situation? Because all of our resources were being used to fight those fires, and what would have happened if something else would have happened?

So I looked at the little boy that was in here, Luke, I wrote his name down. And I thought he was such a refreshing sight to see for youth, the way youth should be able to be, the way we used be when we were kids. The kids spend too much time on computers, that means electricity. The kids spend too much time blow-drying their hair. It uses too much electricity. And at the same time they use too much time on My Space, and they don't have the freedom to run about and do the things that kids need to do.

So I think we need to share this land, and I think we need to rethink about what we need to do in order to kind of get back with each other and realize that there is other things we can do besides use power. We can use our own inner power with each other.

There is neighborhoods that don't even know each other that live next door. If we could allow ourselves to be a little uncomfortable, and go outside and sit on the porch maybe, or take a garden hose and look like the dickens after you do it, but so what? We get to know each other. We can drink lemonade together again.

I think the human race needs to become where we care again, and not let money and power and greed and all the things that happen with this whole deal become our way of life, because then we have nowhere to go.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much for your time. I can understand a little better why the kids kept throwing those water balloons at me all the time.

C0257-1

Comment Set C, cont.
Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

JULIAN, CALIFORNIA
February 27, 2008 - 10:30 A.M.

What we just completed is the critically important part of the process of deliberating the Sunrise Project. What we do can be phenomenally abstract sometimes. It is a very big state, and we are dealing with huge economic and structural issues. So actually talking to people, coming out and learning from you is a very good and important part of what we need to do. And it has been very enriching three days. I want to thank you all for contributing to that process.

COMMISSIONER GRUENEICH: I want to thank everyone for coming, and as Steve said, contributing.

ALJ WEISSMAN: So I hope the rest of your day goes well. This hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 12:50 p.m., this public participation hearing then adjourned.)

Responses to Comment Set C Public Participation Hearing - Julian 2/27/08

Greg Courson

C0220-1 The commenter's views and concern regarding fire risk and the serious fire hazards of San Diego County and support for the analysis of fire impacts in the Draft EIR/EIS is acknowledged. The commenter's support for the environmentally superior alternatives is acknowledged. Also, please see General Response GR-9 regarding fire risk.

C0220-2 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project through ABDSP is acknowledged.

Eric Stamets

C0221-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the need for the Proposed Project and concern with SDG&E's financial incentives to build the Proposed Project are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding purpose, need, and cost-benefit of the Proposed Project. The commenter's concern regarding the impacts of the Proposed Project on the San Diego backcountry is acknowledged.

C0221-2 The commenter's opposition to the current easement through the ABDSP and suggestion to underground the current transmission line through the park along a southern route is acknowledged. The current 69 kV transmission line through the ABDSP runs from the Warners Substation to the town of Borrego Springs. Undergrounding it along a southern route is not viable because it would not reach Borrego Springs.

C0221-3 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the growth of San Diego and growth inducing effects of the Proposed Project are acknowledged. Growth inducing effects of the Proposed Project were analyzed in Section F.2 of Volume 5 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Growth related to additional provision of power is analyzed in Section F.2.2 and the Proposed Project is not intended to supply power related to growth for any particular development, either directly or indirectly and would not result in direct growth-inducing impacts. However, the Proposed Project would facilitate growth indirectly by removing obstacles to population growth through the additional increased capacity of electric power that it would make available.

Socioeconomics Section D.14.2 (Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project) provides a description of the existing populations within the Proposed Project area. Growth in the Proposed Project areas is expected to occur with or without implementation of the Proposed Project. With implementation of the Proposed Project, SDG&E is responding to anticipated future load growth in a timely manner. An assessment of the significant cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project is provided in Section G of the EIR/EIS (Cumulative Scenario and Impacts).

C0221-4 The commenter's views and concern regarding fire risk along all proposed routes, northern and southern and concern that the project would impede firefighting is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding fire risk. The commenter's concern regarding the cost of the Proposed Project is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 concerning the cost-benefit of the Proposed Project.

C0221-5 The commenter's views regarding the non-renewable status of geothermal power and the effect extracting geothermal power may have on earthquakes is acknowledged. Water injection into geothermal systems is often required for extended and sustained production of geothermal resources and as a means to dispose of the geothermal fluid or condensate. Seismicity accompanying fluid injection is known to have occurred at Rangely, Colorado, and the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, near Boulder, Colorado. Seismicity at the Colorado sites was most likely due to high pressure waste fluid injection. The magnitudes of earthquakes generated in this manner are typically quite low ($M < 3.0$) and referred to as microearthquakes or microseismicity. Studies have demonstrated that microearthquakes at the Geysers geothermal area in northern California are associated with both water injection and steam extraction. In the existing Salton Sea geothermal field low injection pressures are used to re-inject geothermal fluids. Consequently, the potential for seismicity related to fluid injection is low and no large earthquakes have been linked to the geothermal field operations. The potential for geothermal induced seismicity in the proposed West Mesa geothermal area is likely comparable to the Salton Sea area due to similar geologic and tectonic setting.

The commenter's objection to the Proposed Project is acknowledged.

Benjamin Kwon

C0222-1 The commenter's support for the environmentally superior route because of ease in installing and maintaining purposes is acknowledged. The environmentally superior transmission line alternative is the LEAPS Transmission-Only Alternative.

Art Cole

C0223-1 The commenter views and concerns regarding the threats to the security of our transmission system and support for diversified point source power grids are acknowledged. Impact PS-5 in Section D.10.25 of Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses outages to transmission or substation facilities. If the Sunrise Powerlink transmission line or a substation along the transmission line were damaged (e.g., from terrorism or a major wildfire) and this resulted in a power outage, SDG&E would reroute electricity using other components of the regional transmission system. The regional transmission system is interconnected in such a way that it is not possible to say that a single line outage would cause an outage at a specific hospital, airport, security facility, etc. In addition, although most facilities of this type may receive power from the SDG&E transmission system supplied by the proposed Sunrise line, major facilities would also have back up power/generators to prevent electricity interruptions in the event of an outage. Therefore, this impact is considered to be adverse, but less than significant.

C0223-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the impacts to national parks, the National Forest System and the State Park System are acknowledged. Impacts to the State parks and National Forests are fully disclosed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

C0223-3 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the cost of the Proposed Project and the investment in an aging technology and support for a new energy paradigm and diversified energy sources are acknowledged. Please see Response to Comment C0223-1 regard-

ing terrorist threats to the transmission systems. The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project is acknowledged.

Ken Childs

C0224-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the proposed northern route and the impacts to property values and to the commenter's ranching business are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-10 regarding property values. Impacts to agriculture are analyzed in Section D.6 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

The commenter's views and concerns about the Green Path are acknowledged. Section 4.9.27 in Appendix 1 (Alternatives Screening Report) of Volume 6 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the reasons the Green Path Coordinated Projects Alternative was eliminated from detailed consideration.

C0224-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding fire risk and transmission lines are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 concerning fire risk including maintenance of transmission lines.

C0224-3 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the importation of energy from Mexico and the lack of strict environmental standards in Mexico are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-7 regarding the Sunrise Powerlink connection to Mexican power generation.

C0224-4 The commenter's views and concerns regarding SDG&E stated objective to import renewable energy from the Imperial Valley and the creation of jobs is acknowledged. The commenter suggests the stated objectives are misleading. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding purpose and need of the Proposed Project.

Mary Aldern

C0225-1 The commenter's concern regarding the environmental impacts of the future transmission system expansion routes is acknowledged. The impacts of the future transmission system expansions are analyzed in addition to the analysis of the Proposed Project in the D Sections and the E Sections of the Draft EIR/EIS. It is stated in Section B.2.7.1 that the Central East Substation would accommodate up to six 230 kV circuits. Six circuits can be supported by three sets of double-circuit towers, and the three potential routes analyzed for a full 230 kV build-out would easily accommodate all six potential future 230 kV circuits. See Response to Comment B0013-1.

Additionally, the SDG&E 500 kV Full Loop Alternative was analyzed in Section 4.9.18 in Appendix 1 (Alternatives Screening Report) in Volume 6 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The route of the 500 kV Full Loop Alternative would follow that of the Proposed Project from the Imperial Valley Substation to the proposed Central East Substation. Then it would continue to a new substation in SCE's service territory between the Serrano and Valley Substations (possibly near Lee Lake), as shown on the map of System Alternatives Eliminated (Figure Ap.1-31). This alternative has been eliminated from further consideration because it does not pose an option to the Proposed Project, but rather an expansion of the Proposed Project. By expanding the Sunrise Powerlink Project to include an interconnection with the SCE system, this alternative would enhance the Proposed Proj-

ect's ability to meet several of the project objectives. However, this alternative would not avoid or minimize any of the Proposed Project's environmental impacts, but rather it would add impacts due to the additional construction and ROW required.

The commenter's views and concerns regarding the cost of the Proposed Project are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding the cost-benefit of the project.

Kathleen Beck

C0226-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and support for the Jim Bell and Heather Honey plan for rooftop solar power and the jobs it would create is acknowledged. The All Solar Alternative in Section 4.10.7 in Appendix 1 in Volume 6 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses the Jim Bell "Creating a Sustainable Economy and Future on Our Planet: The San Diego/Tijuana Region," proposal. This proposal was used as a reference for the All-Solar Alternative. Also, please see General Response GR-6 regarding the San Diego Smart Energy 2020 plan and the All-Solar Alternative.

C0226-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding increased cost of natural gas and nonrenewable fuels and concern regarding the importation of LNG produced energy is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-7 regarding the connection of the Sunrise Powerlink with Mexican power generation.

C0226-3 Please see Response to Comment C0226-1 regarding the Jim Bell plan and rooftop solar PV in San Diego.

Katy Moretti

C0227-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project is acknowledged. Please see also the Responses to Comment Set D0190, which are made by the same commenter.

C0227-2 The commenter's views that an objective of the Proposed Power is to import energy from Mexico are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-7 regarding the connection of the Sunrise Powerlink with Mexican power generation. The commenter's view that the line may not be necessary is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding purpose and need for the Proposed Project.

C0227-3 Please see Response to Comment D0190-27.

C0227-4 The commenter's support for the non-wires alternatives and the Environmentally Superior Southern Route and opposition to the Proposed Project is acknowledged.

C0227-5 The commenter's views and concerns regarding wildfires and the increase of fuels for wildfires are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding fire risk.

C0227-6 The commenter's concern regarding the cost of the Proposed Project and the reduction of SDG&E claimed net benefits to ratepayers is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding the cost-benefit of the Proposed Project.

Sandy Moretti

C0228-1 The commenter's concerns regarding needs for the Proposed Project and support for the least environmentally detrimental alternatives are acknowledged. The commenter's views and concern regarding the impacts of the towers and access roads on ranching families and the impacts to viewsheds are acknowledged. Impacts to ranching are considered in Section D.6 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Visual impacts are analyzed in Section D.3 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Rick Johnson

C0229-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project, especially the northern route alternatives because of environmental impacts is acknowledged.

C0229-2 The commenter's support for smart building, conservation, a carbon tax, and other better local sources and opposition to importing energy from Mexico is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-7 regarding the connection of the Sunrise Powerlink with Mexican power generation.

An Energy Efficiency Alternative is discussed in Section 4.10.5 of Appendix 1 in Volume 6 of the Draft EIR/EIS. This alternative is not technically feasible because SDG&E is required already to achieve aggressive energy efficiency goals laid out by the CPUC in 2004 (*Energy Savings Goals for Program Year 2006 and Beyond* (2004) Cal. P.U.C. Dec. No. 04-09-060), with the aim of exceeding the maximum achievable potential energy savings defined at that time. Additional energy efficiency beyond that occurring in the baseline condition may be technically possible, but it is speculative to assume such a level of energy efficiency is achievable.

Ken Wright

C0230-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and support for the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS are acknowledged. The commenter's views and concerns regarding the environmental quality of the backcountry and impacts to the state parks, natural forest lands, BLM lands, and private lands are acknowledged.

Carol Schloo-Wright

C0231-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project in its entirety and concern regarding need of the Proposed Project is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding purpose and need of the project.

C0231-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding Stirling solar energy are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-5 regarding the status of renewable energy in Imperial Valley.

C0231-3 The commenter's concern regarding importing energy from Mexico and LNG energy is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-7 regarding the Sunrise Powerlink connection with Mexican power generation.

C0231-4 The commenter's concern regarding an increase in fire risk because of the Proposed Project is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding fire risk. The commenter's support of the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS, the non-wires alternatives, and the San Diego Smart Energy Plan 2020 is acknowledged.

Norman Feigel

C0232-1 The commenter's support of a southern route alternatives and opposition to a transmission line through the ABDSP, Ranchita, Warners, Santa Ysabel, and other regions is acknowledged. The commenter's concerns regarding an increase in access roads and the threat of trespassers and gates that are left ajar are acknowledged.

The commenter's views and concerns regarding fire risk and the impacts to firefighting abilities are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding fire risk. Impact F-3 in Section D.15.8 in Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the impacts of the Proposed Project to firefighting effectiveness and concludes this would be significant and unmitigable.

C0232-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding impacts to the health of cattle caused by the Proposed Project are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 concerning EMF. Section D.6.7 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses impact to agriculture including cattle rearing.

C0232-3 The commenter's concern that the Proposed Project will cause erosion is acknowledged. Impact H-1 in Section D.12.7 in Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the impacts of increased erosion to the water supply and concludes they would be less than significant. The commenter's opposition to the proposed route through the ABDSP is acknowledged.

Jennifer Smith

C0233-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding fire risk caused by power lines is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding wildfire risk. The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project is acknowledged.

Luke Smith

C0234-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding impacts to the desert landscape, contamination caused by the transmission towers, and impacts due to EMF are acknowledged. Impacts to visual resources are addressed in Section D.3 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Please see General Response GR-10 concerning EMF. The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and the impacts to Santa Ysabel and the ABDSP are acknowledged.

Bob Stuart

C0235-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the fire risk of transmission lines is acknowledged. The commenter suggests that if the Sunrise Powerlink is needed, the line should be entirely underground. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding the purpose and need for the Proposed Project. Section 4.9.26 of Appendix 1 (Alternatives

Screening Report) in Volume 6 of the Draft EIR/EIS discusses the reasons that an All Underground 230 kV or 500 kV Alternative was not carried forward for full analysis in the EIR/EIS. Please note, the Environmentally Superior Northern Route includes undergrounding the transmission lines through the ABDSP. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding fire risk.

C0235-2 The commenter's support for undergrounding the transmission lines is acknowledged.

Denis Trafecanty

C0236-1 The commenter's report about the Public Participation Hearings and support for following the request of the public is acknowledged.

C0236-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the San Diego backcountry and the Santa Ysabel Preserve are acknowledged. While the EIR/EIS does not include the view from the Santa Ysabel Preserve, Figure D.3-18A in Section D.3.7 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS presents the existing view to the west toward the span of SR78 from KVP 17 on westbound SR78, approximately 0.4 miles west of the intersection with SR79. This viewpoint analysis is representative of project views from Santa Ysabel Valley in general and SR78 in particular. Impact V-20 analyzes the increased structure contrast, industrial character, view blockage, and skylining from the key viewpoint and concludes it would be significant and unmitigable.

The commenter's views and concerns regarding impacts to bald eagles from the Proposed Project are acknowledged. Impact B-7I in Section D.2.11 in Volume 1 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the impact to bald eagles and concludes there would be no impact.

Shannon Davis

C0237-1 The commenter's concerns regarding her scoping comments are acknowledged. The commenter's scoping letters were published in full in the March 2007, Scoping Report Part Two, available for review at 26 repositories. Section J, Public Participation, in Volume 5 of the Draft EIR/EIS only describes the scoping process and public participation program for the Sunrise Powerlink Project.

C0237-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the impact of the Proposed Project to the Quino checkerspot butterfly and the impact of the electrical substation fire at the Barrett Substation are acknowledged. See Response to Comment C0012 regarding Quino checkerspot butterfly. The Barrett Substation would not be connected to the Sunrise Powerlink Project; the Modified Route D Alternative route would pass to the east of the substation.

C0237-3 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the integrity of the Sunrise Powerlink EIR/EIS and the relationship it may have with the FERC West-Wide Energy Corridor are acknowledged. See Response to Comment C0088-1. Please note, the consultants who prepared the EIR/EIS are under contract to the CPUC and also take direction from the BLM as the federal Lead Agency. The consultants work under strict conflict of interest rules to ensure that they have no relationship with the Applicant. Previous EIR cases are beyond the scope of the Sunrise Powerlink EIR/EIS.

The commenter's concern for the biological species along the Modified Route D Alternative is acknowledged. Impact B-7 in Section E.4.2.2 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes direct or indirect loss of listed or sensitive wildlife or a direct loss of habitat for listed or sensitive wildlife and concludes this would be a significant impact (Class I for construction impacts to sensitive species; Other impact classes depend on species; see individual discussions).

The commenter's concern regarding electrical shocks by transmission lines to birds is acknowledged. As stated in Section D.2. 14 in Volume 1 of the Draft EIR/EIS large, aerial perching birds, such as hawks and eagles, are most susceptible to electrocution because of their large size, distribution, and behavior (APLIC, 2006). Because raptors and other large aerial perching birds often perch on tall structures that offer views of potential prey, the design of transmission poles or towers appears to be a major factor in raptor electrocution (APLIC, 2006). Electrocution occurs when a perching bird simultaneously contacts two energized phase conductors or an energized conductor and grounded hardware. Electrocution can occur when horizontal separation is less than the wrist-to-wrist (flesh-to-flesh) distance of a bird's wingspan or where vertical separation is less than a bird's length from head-to-foot (APLIC, 2006). Electrocution can also occur when birds perched side-by-side span the distance between these elements (APLIC, 2006). Golden eagles wintering in Idaho have been observed to roost communally on power line structures (APLIC, 2006); turkey vultures have been observed doing the same (Helix, 2006). Recent extrapolations from various databases indicate that tens to hundreds of thousands of birds die each year in North American from power line electrocutions (Manville II, 2005). The majority of raptor electrocutions are caused by lines that are energized at voltage levels less than 69 kV (APLIC, 2006; Manville II², 2005). The Proposed Project's voltage levels are 230 kV and 500 kV. BIO-APM-21 requires that structures be constructed to conform to "Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines" (Raptor Research Foundation, Inc., 1981). Because of its voltage and conformance with BIO-APM-21 the Proposed Project would not present an electrocution risk to birds.

Nancy Parinetto

- C0238-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project is acknowledged. The commenter's concern with increased fire danger, global warming and increased carbon emissions, preservation of the park lands and new green technology is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding wildfire risk. Air quality and emissions are addressed in Section D.11 in Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impacts to the ABDSP are analyzed in Section D.5.6 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

David Lewis

- C0239-1 The commenter's concern about the grading involved in the access roads and required culverts are acknowledged. Please see the responses to Comment Set D0190 (Moretti Family). Specifically, Response D0190-5 addresses concerns about erosion caused by the development of access roads. The Draft EIR/EIS analyzed impacts to water quality and sedimentation caused by construction of access roads under impact H-1. The Draft EIR/EIS determined that, with implementation of Applicant Proposed Measures, impact H-1 would be less than significant.

Craig Maxwell

- C0240-1 The commenter's concern for impacts to the ABDSP and opposition to the Proposed Project are acknowledged. Section D.5.6 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes impacts to wilderness and recreation within the ABDSP. Please note, Impact WR-4 in Section D.5 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the impact that the presence of a transmission line in a designated wilderness or wilderness study area would result in loss of wilderness land and concludes this would be significant and that no mitigation exists that would reduce this impact to a less than significant impact.

Gordon and Janet Gastil

- C0241-1 The commenter's support for moving large energy users to the source of power rather than transporting the energy to the user and concern with the dangerous and unsightly transmission lines are acknowledged. The commenter's opposition to the transmission lines is acknowledged.

- C0241-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the visual and environmental impacts of the Proposed Project and support for an underground alternative are acknowledged. Visual and environmental impacts are fully disclosed in the Draft EIR/EIS. Visual impacts are analyzed in Section D.3 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Section 4.9.26 of Appendix 1 (Alternatives Screening Report) in Volume 6 of the Draft EIR/EIS discusses the reasons that an All Underground 230 kV or 500 kV Alternative was not carried forward for full analysis in the EIR/EIS. The commenter's views and concerns regarding impacts to property values are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-11 regarding property values.

Skip Miller

- C0242-1 The commenter's suggests that people chose to live in the backcountry for the natural surroundings, the views, and the absence of development. The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and suggestion that the transmission towers would destroy his home are acknowledged.

Franklin Barnes

- C0243-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the length of the EIR/EIS and support for the finding of the EIR/EIS are acknowledged. The commenter suggests the upgrades to the Encino and South Bay Power Plants should be considered more seriously.

- C0243-2 The commenter's support for nuclear power is acknowledged. Please see Response to Comment D0014-2.

- C0243-3 The commenter suggests that should fossil fuels be used for electric generation the emissions and wastes should be dealt with in the area that benefits from this generation and not in a remote region. Please note emissions and waste from fossil fuel generation is considered in the design plan of the plant. While some emissions are localized, others are more global in nature and will impact greater physical regions.

C0243-4 The commenter's views and concerns with the New In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative and the transmission line required to bring the energy generated by the renewable wind and solar energy from point of origin to the user are acknowledged. Please note, in the alternative, the solar energy would be rooftop solar PV, and would not require large transmission lines. The impacts of the transmission line required for the wind energy component are fully disclosed in both Section E.5 in Volume 4 and Section E.6 in Volume 5 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

C0243-5 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the LEAPS Transmission-Only Alternative are acknowledged. Impacts of the Santa Rosa pump and storage component of the LEAPS project are not considered part of the LEAPS Transmission-Only Alternative and are fully disclosed in Section E.7.2, LEAPS Generation and Transmission Alternative in Volume 5 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Also, please see General Response GR-4 regarding the LEAPS alternatives.

C0243-6 The commenter's support for the Environmentally Superior Southern Route Alternative with the use of the Interstate 8 Alternative and the Campo North and West Buckman Spring Options is acknowledged.

C0243-7 The commenter's support for a combination of the Environmentally Superior Southern Route Alternative with a combination of the New In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative is acknowledged.

Ms. Faller

C0244-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the impacts of the Proposed Project to wildlife species are acknowledged. Impact B-7 in Section D.2.11 in Volume 1 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes direct or indirect loss of listed or sensitive wildlife or a direct loss of habitat for listed or sensitive wildlife and concludes this would be a significant impact (Class I for construction impacts to sensitive species; Other impact classes depend on species; see individual discussions).

C0244-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding SDG&E's maintenance of its existing lines and concern regarding an increase in fire risk are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding wildfire risk. Please note Mitigation Measure F-2a, Establish and maintain adequate line clearances, in the fire sections of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses maintenance of the transmission lines.

C0244-3 The commenter's concern that the Proposed Project would impact property values is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-11 regarding property values.

C0244-4 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and support for alternatives to the project are acknowledged. Please note, the top two environmentally preferred alternatives would not require large transmission lines throughout the San Diego County.

Pam Nelson

C0245-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and support for the non-wires alternatives is acknowledged. The commenter's concern that the Proposed Project would compromise electrical security and support for small, local distributed generation is acknowl-

edged. Section 4.10.4 in Appendix 1 (Alternatives Screening Report) in Volume 6 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes a Non-Renewable Distributed Generation Alternative and the New In-Area Renewable Generation Alternative (Section 4.10.1) encompasses renewable energy facilities that are distributed. The Non-Renewable Distributed Generation Alternative would involve deployment of DG in the form of many small projects at a pace more aggressive than what SDG&E anticipates. While potentially feasible, the level of DG deployment under this alternative could not provide sufficient In-Area generation alone to satisfy the reliability objective and was therefore eliminated from full analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The commenter's views and concerns that the Proposed Project is dangerous, degrading, and does not provide protection for the San Diego County resident are acknowledged.

John Raifsnider

C0246-1 The commenter suggests there is a division between corporate will and the community. The commenter's support for a solution that brings together the many stakeholders within the project and opposition to the Proposed Project is acknowledged.

Betty Birdsell – Julian Chamber of Commerce

C0247-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project on behalf of the Julian Chamber of Commerce is acknowledged. The commenter's views and concerns regarding the impacts of the Proposed Project to the backcountry environment and to the tourism economy of Julian are acknowledged. Impacts to the tourism industry are not required to be analyzed in under CEQA or NEPA. CEQA requires analysis of economic impacts only to the extent such impacts would have physical, environmental consequences. Nevertheless, the proposed route would be located more than five miles from the Town of Julian and would not cause a significant change in tourism or associated revenues in Julian. Key Viewpoints for visual effects analysis were not established in the community of Julian because the community is spatially and geographically removed from the proposed transmission lines, and there would be no visual impacts to residents in Julian. It should be noted that the Draft EIR/EIS found the Santa Ysabel All Underground Alternative was the environmentally preferred route in the Mesa Grande and Santa Ysabel area, which is the closest segment of the project to Julian. The route would be installed underground in SR79 for the length of the Santa Ysabel Valley. If the Santa Ysabel All Underground Alternative is determined to be infeasible, the Mesa Grande Alternative with the northern portion only of SDG&E Santa Ysabel Partial Underground Revision (near the Santa Ysabel Mission) and the remainder of the Santa Ysabel Partial Underground Alternative would be constructed to replace the Santa Ysabel All Underground Alternative (see discussion in Section 3.2.2 of the RDEIR/SDEIS). Also see Response to Comment E0004-42.

C0247-2 The commenter's concerns regarding fire risk and the impacts of the Proposed Project on firefighting abilities are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding fire risk.

C0247-3 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the process of eminent domain and objection to eminent domain are acknowledged. If the project is approved by the

CPUC, SDG&E would have eminent domain rights in California. Therefore, if a parcel is required for the Proposed Project or for an alternative route that is approved, SDG&E would initiate negotiations with landowners and attempt to reach a mutually agreeable settlement. If an agreement cannot be reached, then SDG&E would be forced to initiate a condemnation action in which fair market value of the property required for the project would be determined by a court.

Mitigation Measure L-2b (Revise project elements to minimize land use conflicts) was designed to lessen any impacts of tower locations and access roads on property owners. Mitigation Measure L-2b states that at least 90 days prior to completing final transmission line design for the approved route, SDG&E shall notify landowners of parcels through which the alignment would pass regarding the specific location of the ROW, individual towers, staging areas, access roads, or other facilities associated with the project that would occur on the subject property. The notified parties shall be provided at least 30 days in which to identify conflicts with any planned development on the subject property and to work with SDG&E to identify potential reroutes of the alignment that would be mutually acceptable to SDG&E and the landowner. Property owners whose land may be divided into potentially uneconomic parcels shall be afforded this same opportunity, even if development plans have not been established. SDG&E shall endeavor to accommodate these reroutes only to the extent that they are reasonable and feasible, do not create a substantial increase in cost, and do not create adverse impacts to resources or to other properties that would be greater in magnitude than impacts that would occur from construction and operation of the alignment as originally planned.

The commenter's views and concerns regarding the development and maintenance of access roads are acknowledged. After project construction, existing and new permanent access roads would be used by maintenance crews and vehicles for inspection and maintenance activities. Temporary construction roads not required for future maintenance access would be removed and restored after project construction is complete. Gates would be installed as required to restrict unauthorized vehicular access to the ROW.

C0247-4

The commenter's views and concerns regarding the impacts that helicopters use for construction would have on ranchers near the Mesa Grande region and any potential loss of their livestock are acknowledged.

Please note, Mitigation Measure L-1a, Prepare Construction Notification Plan, has been modified to include reference to helicopter activities:

The notice shall state the type of construction activities that will be conducted, and the location and duration of construction, including all helicopter activities. SDG&E shall mail the notice to all residents or property owners within 1,000 feet of the right-of-way, any property owners or tenants that could be impacted by construction activities and specific public agencies with facilities that could be impacted by construction. If construction delays of more than seven days occur, an additional notice shall be prepared and distributed.

The commenter's views and concerns regarding erosion caused by access roads are acknowledged. Please see Response to Comment C0247-3 regarding access roads.

C0247-5 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and the impacts it will have on the environment are acknowledged.

Gidon Singer

C0248-1 The commenter's support for self-sufficient locally generated energy solutions is acknowledged. The New In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative and the New In-Area Renewable Generation Alternative include locally generated energy.

C0248-2 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and the impacts to the parklands, the CNF, and the ABDSP are acknowledged. Impacts to the CNF and to the ABDSP are fully disclosed in the D and E Sections of the Draft EIR/EIS.

April Kochur

C0249-1 The commenter suggests that solar panels can be installed for \$10,000 to \$15,000 rather than the approximately \$25,000 to \$35,000 that SDG&E estimates for installation of solar power. The cost of installing solar panels is varied and depends on multiple factors, including labor requirements, battery life, among others. The cost of an All Solar Alternatives is addressed in Section 4.10.7 of Appendix 1 (Alternatives Screening Report) in Volume 6 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Cost estimates used in the screening criteria come for a variety of sources including the San Diego Smart Energy 2020 plant, Jim Bell's report "Creating a Sustainable Economy and Future on Our Planet: The San Diego/Tijuana Region," and the SDG&E estimate. In addition, please see General Response GR-6.

C0249-2 The specific occupation of property owners along the routes of the Proposed Project is beyond the scope of the environmental analysis required by CEQA and NEPA. The CPUC accepts comments from all citizens and stakeholders.

C0249-3 The commenter's concerns regarding how the decision regarding the acceptance or denial of the Proposed Project is made are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding the CEQA and NEPA process.

Manya Traub

C0250-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and concern regarding fire risk of the Proposed Project are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding fire risk.

The commenter's views and concern regarding erosion due to access roads and visual and noise impacts are acknowledged. Measures to minimize erosion during construction are included in the EIR/EIS in Section D.12. Response to Comment D0190-5 addresses concerns about erosion caused by the development of access roads. The Draft EIR/EIS analyzed impacts to water quality and sedimentation caused by construction of access roads under impact H-1. The Draft EIR/EIS determined that, with implementation of Applicant Proposed Measures, impact H-1 would be less than significant.

Visual impacts in the Central Link are addressed in Section D.3.7 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impact V-21 analyzes increased structure contrast, industrial character,

view blockage, and skylining when viewing the Central East Substation site from Key Viewpoint 18 on BIA Road 51 (VS-VC) and concludes this impact would be significant and unmitigable. Noise impacts are addressed in Section D.8.7 in Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impact N-3 analyzes the permanent noise levels increase due to corona noise from operation of the transmission lines and noise from other project components and concludes this impact would be significant and unmitigable.

The commenter's concern regarding EMF is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-10 regarding EMF.

Lisa Traub

C0251-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and concern for the eagles and mountain lions who reside on her property are acknowledged. Impact B-7 in Section D.2.11 in Volume 1 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses impacts to of listed or sensitive wildlife or a direct loss of habitat for listed or sensitive wildlife and concludes this would be significant and unmitigable for sensitive species.

The commenter's concern regarding fire risk of the Proposed Project are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding fire risk.

The commenter's concern that SDG&E has placed equipment on the commenter's private property and that her property has been broken into is acknowledged. The CPUC and BLM is not able to verify the commenter's concerns about unauthorized entrances onto her property or property damage. The commenter is urged to bring her concerns to local authorities as this concern is beyond the scope of this EIR/EIS.

Renee Traub

C0252-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding hunting season and impacts of the Proposed Project on recreational activities are acknowledged. Impact WR-2 in Section D.5.7 analyzes the impact the presence of a transmission line or substation would have on the character of a recreation area, diminishing its recreational value, and concludes this would be significant and unmitigable.

The commenter's opposition to the location of the Proposed Central East Substation and concern with the impacts of the substation on wildlife and the increased fire risks are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding wildfire impacts.

Mr. Costanzo

C0253-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project along any of the route alternatives is acknowledged. The commenter's views and concerns regarding the safety of the gates that lead to access roads on private property are acknowledged. Please see Response C0251-1.

Daniel Beman

C0254-1 The commenter's views and concern regarding the cost of the Proposed Project are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding cost of the Proposed Proj-

ect. The commenter's support for rooftop solar PV is acknowledged. The New In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative and the New In-Area Renewable Generation Alternative include components of solar PV as energy generators.

C0254-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding impacts to cultural resources and Native American resources within the Santa Ysabel area are acknowledged. Section D.7.11 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses impacts to cultural and historical impacts within the Central Link. Impact C-3 in Section D.7.11 analyzes impacts the construction of the project would cause to unknown significant buried prehistoric and historical archaeological sites or buried Native American human remains and concludes these would be significant and unmitigable or significant but mitigable with the implementation of mitigation measures that would develop a Historic Properties Treatment Plan, conduct data recovery, train construction personnel, properly treat human remains, and monitor construction in areas of high sensitivity for buried resources. Impacts to cultural resources within the Santa Ysabel Valley are also addressed in Section 3 and 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.

C0254-3 The commenter suggests SDG&E took funds from the ratepayers to underground power lines in the City of San Diego but did not fulfill these obligations. The commenter suggests the public will need to act to oppose the project and one means of avoiding the Proposed Project would be to include rooftop solar PV on many of the buildings. Please see Response to Comment C0254-1 regarding rooftop solar PV.

Patty Reedy

C0255-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding an increased fire risk because of the Proposed Project is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding wildfire risks and impacts.

Terry Linthicome

C0256-1 The commenter's opposition to the all the routes of the Proposed Project and concern about the technology used in the Proposed Project are acknowledged. The commenter's views and concerns regarding the impacts of the proposed Stirling Energy Systems Concentrating Solar Power plant are acknowledged. Each of the D Sections in Volumes 1 through 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the impacts of the Stirling solar power plant as a connected action to the Proposed Project. Please also see General Response GR-5 regarding the status of renewable energy in Imperial Valley.

C0256-2 The commenter's concern that the energy that will be transmitted along the Proposed Project will be from Mexico or other states is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-7 regarding the Sunrise Powerlink Project Connection to Mexican generation.

C0256-3 The commenter's support for other locally produced power alternatives and other solar technology is acknowledged. The New In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative and the New In-Area Renewable Generation Alternative include locally generated energy.

The commenter's concern regarding potential eminent domain proceedings is acknowledged.

Christine Diadro

C0257-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the use of less energy and the fire risk are acknowledged. Section 4.10.5 in Appendix 1 (Alternatives Screening Report) in Volume 6 of the Draft EIR/EIS details the reasons an energy efficiency and energy reduction alternative was not considered for full analysis.

The commenter's concern about fire risk is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 regarding wildfire risk.

This page intentionally blank.