

**REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING
RE: SDG&E'S PROPOSED SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT
CPUC/BLM SECOND ROUND OF SCOPING MEETINGS
FOR PREPARATION OF DRAFT EIR/EIS**

Held 1:00 p.m. February 7, 2007
At Boulevard, California

Reported by:
Nicole R. Harnish, CSR No. 13101

STAFF PRESENTATION

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

Presentation: pages 3 to 10
Public Comments begin on page 10

PUBLIC COMMENTS, BY SPEAKER

Ms. Shackelford	11,20
Ms. Tisdale	12,20
Mr. Driscoll	12-13,21
Ms. Fuller	13
Mr. Maupin	14
Mr. Shepherd	14,23
Ms. Shoedfer	15
Ms. Davis	16-17,21
Mr. Hoyt	17
Ms. Ostrander	18
Mr. Trafecanty	18
Ms. Stewart	19
Mr. Denham	19
Ms. Shepherd	21
Mr. Smith	22

STAFF PRESENTATION

MR. MICHAELSON: Good afternoon. We are happy to be in Boulevard. My name is Lewis Michaelson. I am working with the EIS/EIR team, and you see a good portion of them here today. They were out there answering your questions and also up here on the panel. I have been asked to serve as the moderator for this series of scoping meetings. You will notice that it says second round of scoping meetings on alternatives. Many of you may not have participated in the first round. At the time, most of the public meetings were focused in different parts of San Diego and Imperial Counties. And we have specifically added two meetings today, one in Boulevard and one in Alpine to deal with how the alternatives have kind of evolved since the first round, since the first proposal.

So the first round back in October, we held seven meetings in five locations. And they really focused on the proposed application, the proposed routing that had been put out there by applicant which, as you all know, is San Diego Gas and Electric.

Once they do that, there is a team of regulators, agencies who then take over and start looking at that, and start looking at its impacts from the environmental standpoint, looking at its feasibility and looking at alternatives. And there was so much work done on developing and retaining and eliminating and modifying alternatives, that even though this round of scoping isn't normal, or it certainly isn't required by this process, both the California Public Utilities Commission and Bureau of Land Management really felt like it was necessary to come out and do another round to talk about the alternatives specifically, and also to go to some areas that really had been much less affected before, such as, potentially, Boulevard and Alpine.

So I want to make that really clear because usually when you get to the second set of meetings in an environmental impact review and an environmental impact statement process, it's because you have already done all the analysis, there is a draft document that has been considered, and this is literally a second round of scoping. The document has not been — and the analysis of the impacts has not been conducted yet. There is some preliminary that has been looked at, but — so that is why these people here don't have an answer about whether the impact is going to be this or that. We are not that far along in the process. So hopefully, for those of you who weren't part of the first round, that helps give you a better context for what we are doing and why we are here today. Okay.

Now, the agenda is pretty straightforward here. I have just covered the purpose of, really, the second round of scoping. Billie Blanchard, who's seated in the middle here is with the California Public Utilities Commission. She is going to talk about their process for processing the application, as well as the schedule has been updated since October, since we did the first round.

Then Linda Kastoll with the Bureau of Land Management. BLM lands are involved in the proposal, so she's going to talk about their review process and how it relates.

And then Susan Lee is with the Aspen Environmental Group. They are the consultant that has been hired by these two agencies, that has been hired to help them in the preparation of the EIR/EIS. She will talk first about some of the preliminary analysis of the impacts by link, focusing on the links around here.

Then Billie will talk about how the alternatives were selected — or screened for continuation to this second phase. And then finally Susan Lee will come back to talk about the specific ones, again, with the focus on the ones that we think you are going to be most interested in in the Boulevard area.

And then we get to really the most important part of the meeting, which will be your opportunity to provide oral comments to the panel who's here to hear those firsthand from you. All right.

So we are here to inform the public and responsible agencies about the alternatives that are being proposed for full analysis in the document that is going to be prepared, to inform you about the review process and schedule, to solicit input. And this is really the core purpose of this second round, is to solicit input regarding the alternatives to the proposed project by SDG&E that would be fully analyzed in the EIR/EIS second alternatives scoping report prepared since we are doing a second round of scoping.

Just to make it really clear — this sometimes is lost on people — San Diego Gas and Electric is not a part of this proceeding. It has kind of been handed off now to the third-party — to the independent agencies to look at it. So we do have the California Public Utility Commission, the person Billie Blanchard and some of her people are out there for their part of this — what is called the ##SECOR review, the state document; the Bureau of Land Management and the person Linda — and she's got some people out there too — for the EIS, which is the federal part of that review process; and then SDG&E is the applicant, but they are not a part of this proceeding; and as I mentioned, Aspen Environmental, their consultant.

So with that I would like to turn it over to Billie Blanchard to go first through the process and schedule.

MS. BLANCHARD: Good afternoon. I will just go over real briefly the process and the scheduling that we have for the EIR and the general proceeding. The CPUC has two power of review processes for the SDG&E application for the CPCN, the general proceeding part and the environmental review part, which we are involved in.

The general proceeding is being led by assigned commissioner Dian Grueneich, and the administrative law judge will be Steve Weissman.

The scope of the general proceeding is to find whether Public Utilities Code Section 1002 — and in that is listed the determination of need for the project, considering community values as well as historic and esthetic values, recreation and the environmental impacts.

Just some highlights on the general proceedings schedule that you also have as handouts. Basically we have already had a couple of prehearing conferences on this project. A scoping memo has gone out by the administrative law judge which outlines the issues that are going to be covered in this proceeding and also the schedule.

The schedule was slightly modified in January of 2007. Testimony in that proceeding starts in — started January 2007. And then evidentiary hearings will start in July of 2007. Administrative law judge's proposed decision is scheduled to be out December 2007, and a commission decision by January of 2008.

On the environmental review schedule — the first time that we came out we didn't have a defined schedule at that time. We now have one. We did a first round of scoping on this already, basically, a lot of people focusing on the issues of the project. We are now doing a second round of

scoping that is focusing on alternatives that we have developed from all the input we've received from everyone in San Diego.

We have a scoping report that will come out that will be available to everyone, that will highlight everything that everybody said about the second round of scoping and comments, and that will be in March of 2007.

Right now we are scheduling the release of the draft of EIR/EIS in July of 2007. There will be a 90-day comment period for the draft. And that will basically go from July 13th to October 12th, 2007. The final EIR/EIS is scheduled to be out November 20th, 2007, with a certification of January of 2008. So I will turn this over to Linda with BLM.

MS. KASTOLL: Hi. Good afternoon. BLM became involved in the project in 2005 when SDG&E submitted an application to BLM to cross federal lands for the purpose of constructing the Sunrise Powerlink. The proposed project crosses approximately 31 miles of BLM lands in Imperial County and 1.3 miles in San Diego County. These various alternatives will also cross some BLM lands. We will also be considering a plan amendment to our California desert conservation area plan because the project as proposed deviates from the designated utility quarters in that plan.

BLM is also — also manages the right-of-way across Anza Borrego Desert State Park. It is approximately 26 miles. The right-of-way was originally issued in 1955 as a continuance of a federal power project originally authorized in 1924. That right-of-way is 100 feet wide and contains a 69 kV line at this time.

The BLM is also responsible for the coordination with other federal agencies, such as the BIA, Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the DOD, and various Indian tribes with an interest in this project. This EIS/EIR will be used by BLM to make our decisions as to whether or not to amend our desert plan and whether or not to issue a right-of-way to San Diego Gas and Electric. It is expected that our decision will be issued in January of 2008. And now back to Susan.

MS. LEE: Thanks, Linda. I am Susan Lee. I am with Aspen Environmental Group. We are the consultants working for the CPUC and BLM to prepare this environmental report. I am going to describe what the project is that SDG&E has proposed, because the project that is proposed is what helps us decide how to look for alternatives.

I am going to use this map, but you have this in your package, as well, as Figure 1. So if you look at the first map that is in your package that is called the "Notice". See if I can do this without also being in your way. I am just going to stand way over here in the corner, and you will need to look at your notice as well because I know it is kind of hard to see. But if you look at Figure 1, the main components of this project is a 150-mile-long transmission line. And where you will see that is the blue line starting down in the far lower right-hand corner near El Centro, running up through Imperial County and into — past the county line into San Diego County, and then entering Anza Borrego Desert State Park. Now, Anza Borrego on this map is this entire green area running north/south, almost all the way down to Interstate 8. In fact, a tiny bit south of 8.

So the project as a 500 kV high voltage line would run through Anza Borrego, following in this area an existing 69 kV transmission line, which is the same kind you have here in Boulevard on wood poles, out of Anza Borrego, into private land to the northern part of the San Felipe area where there would be a new substation built. And this substation — the 500 kV line would convert to a 230 kV,

which would then as double circuit transmission line leave the substation to the west, come down through Santa Ysabel down south of the Ramona area into the more developed area of San Diego including substations on the north end of Miramar.

So that is the transmission line portion of the line. In addition to that there are other components of the project. Can I have the next slide? The one I mentioned already is the Central East Substation, which would be ultimately 40 acres of graded land, but would require about 100 acres of grading to get there because it is quite a hilly parcel.

Also, there would be a requirement to reconductor, which is to put new wires on an existing transmission line which runs through Miramar and south into San Diego, and modifications within two existing SDG&E substations that are further out to the west.

Another part of the project that we are going to be discussing in EIR/EIS is what we are calling "Future Phases." And this is the reasonably foreseeable development of additional transmission lines coming out of this new Central East Substation. And when we look at alternatives, anywhere where this major 500/230 kV substation would be — would be a point at which at some point in the future — and at this point we don't know when that would be, but possibly within ten years, depending on development in the rest of San Diego County, possibly two additional double circuit 230 kV lines would come out of this substation or the alternative substations which we will talk about in a minute.

I will go through this part pretty quickly because I know the impacts of the proposed project are not so directly related to you here except as to the way that they had driven how we have selected alternatives. So in the Imperial Valley link, which is, again, the desert part, a lot of BLM desert. The effects out there that are of most concern are agricultural impacts because the first 20 miles of the project goes around the edge of agricultural lands. There are some species impacts and dairy farm effects out there.

The next link is Anza Borrego. And this is the one that I am sure you have all heard about. The project itself would have direct and indirect effects on state designated wilderness. There are a lot of sensitive species, big horn sheep, recreational opportunities. The line would be highly visible through the park. So the avoidance of Anza Borrego has really been key, and we will talk about that later as we talk about why the alternatives are being considered in this area.

The central link is essentially the Santa Ysabel Valley area. Again, another very scenic area, lots of agricultural resources and some residential in here. The Central East Substation I already mentioned, quite a bit of grading. It is also on an extension of the earthquake valley fault, which may or may not pass through the substation. The Inland Valley link is the area around Ramona, which is basically where the residential development starts from here west. So a lot of the impacts relate to construction impacts, noise, residential development; and again, there are a series of preserves and park lands in here as well.

And then the Coastal Link is the most intensely developed. Most of the Coastal Link would be within existing SDG&E rights-of-way, but also passing through many densely developed residential communities. I am going to hand this back to Billie.

MR. MICHAELSON: Before you speak, Billy, I have a quick announcement that I wanted to make earlier. If anyone here speaks Spanish and needs assistance, if you could let us know, we have two translators in the back who can provide assistance. Thank you.

MS. BLANCHARD: Okay. Where we are in the process now, we are still in the scoping process and in the alternative screening process, as far as where we are. For screening of the alternatives we utilize the CECQA NEPA criteria. And basically looking at a reasonable range of alternatives that is determined by consistency with most or all of the project objectives. And then we used the three main objectives, reliability, access to renewables, and economic benefit of the cost of energy. The other main one is the ability to reduce or avoid significant impacts of the proposed project that have been identified through our team impact analysis process with agency consultations that we have been having, the applicant's PEA review, data requests, and scoping comments. And then the third one is feasibility. Is it technically feasible? Is it regulatory feasible? And is it legally feasible? And then the sources of our alternatives have included numerous alternatives that have been suggested in the scoping comments, reconsideration of some of SDG&E's PEA alternatives, and the reconsideration of some of the alternatives that SDG&E eliminated and alternatives from the CPUC proceeding filings and the ISO's alternative process.

There has been a number of types of alternatives that have been considered by us, link and route segment alternatives, substation alternatives, Southwest Powerlink alternatives, and full project route and system alternatives, as well as generation and nonwires alternatives. And all of the discussion I have just — there is a great deal of detail in the notice about this methodology for screening alternatives and also for the alternatives that we are proposing to eliminate and to carry forward. So now I will turn it over to Susan to talk about that.

MS. LEE: Thanks. I will go stand by this map, again. Kelly, I am going to skip through these next five slides and go directly to the one that says "Southwest Powerlink Alternatives." The slides we just went through are the ones in which we talked about, as Billie described, the route alternatives for each little segment of the proposed project itself. We have looked for alternatives that might reduce or avoid impacts in small areas by creating small reroutes around each of these. But because we are now here today, down in the Boulevard area, what we really want to look at is the alternatives down here and why they are down here.

So let me put — if you will go to Figure 8 in your collection of maps there. Figure 8 is this map here which is called "Southwest Powerlink Alternatives." And let me go back to the discussion of Anza Borrego. The reason that we are here is that when we started this process we were directed by the commissioner, Commissioner Grueneich who is assigned to this process through the Public Utilities Commission to look at alternatives that did not affect Anza Borrego Desert State Park. And you know, if you live down here, that Anza Borrego goes all the way down to within just a few miles of the border. So in order to find an alternative that doesn't affect Anza Borrego you have to get through this little, small space where Interstate 8 and the gold line on here is, this existing Southwest Powerlink, which I know you have all seen. It runs just south of town here all the way along the border.

So the reason we are looking at these alternatives called Southwest Powerlink Alternatives is that there would be, basically, a second 500 kV line following the Southwest Powerlink all the way back to the Imperial Valley Substation, which isn't shown on this map. But these 500 kV alternatives would diverge from the Southwest Powerlink in two different places. One of them is here just southeast of Boulevard, and another one is down just south of Campo.

And let me talk through what these alternatives are, and I think a lot of you saw the more detailed maps out in the lobby. The first one is the pink line on this map, which would take off from the

Southwest Powerlink and angle up to Interstate 8 and then follow Interstate 8 pretty much all the way to Alpine.

And this alternative resulted from many, many comments that we got during scoping, that the two most common and most frequently heard comments we got at that point were that we should follow existing corridors rather than create a new, major high voltage corridor through the park where there is now a 69 kV, the smaller wood pole. The big suggestion was to look at Interstate 8. The second one was to look at following the existing Southwest Powerlink. So we have done both of those things. Interstate 8 through the — on the north side of I8 through the Boulevard area, through the Campo reservation, the La Posta reservation, then enters the national forest and would actually — would be within the national forest all the way until you get almost to Alpine. At that point the Interstate 8 alternative would have two options. It could turn straight north following what is called Route D — and I will talk about that in a minute — go up through the national forest, ending in the Santa Ysabel area and rejoining the rest of the proposed project in the west. Or it could convert to an underground line because there could be a substation at this location where it could be a 230 kV line underground in Alpine, Boulevard, all the way to the far end of Alpine and rejoin another alternative called the West of Forest that I will also talk about.

So that is the Interstate 8. The second one that starts down here near Boulevard is what is called the BCD alternative. And this is an alternative that we asked SDG&E to try and identify that would avoid impacts on residences. So this one would come up primarily through BLM land. It would cross into the national forest and essentially stay in the forest almost the entire rest of the route back to Santa Ysabel. It would cross the Interstate 8 in two places, one of them just east of here, the other one right about at the Border Patrol checkpoint just north of the valley down here. So the other two alternatives that we are looking at — and let me just say, every one of these we are looking for your feedback on. If you have suggestions for modifications of these alternatives or places where they could avoid resources or residences that you know, that is what we would love to hear from you today.

So following the Southwest Powerlink further east — to the west — I'm sorry, further west to the Campo area, the D alternative, which is the blue line on this map, would follow along the southern border of the forest and then turn straight north all the way up to the Santa Ysabel area. The last alternative we developed that would follow a good portion of Southwest Powerlink is called “West of Forest.” And this was developed because a lot of the comments we got the first time we were out here for scoping said it looked as though these transmission alternatives were being developed by following protected lands, either park lands or forest lands or any kind of preserve lands. There are quite a few county parks along here. So we wanted to see if it was possible to identify an alternative that was primarily on private land and not on protected lands. So that was our attempt to do that. This is a line that stays entirely west of forest. It crosses one about half mile segment of the forest. Okay. Next slide.

THE PUBLIC: Can I ask a question?

MS. LEE: If we could wait for the comment period then —

THE PUBLIC: I don't know what you are saying, is why I want to ask a question.

MS. LEE: Okay.

THE PUBLIC: Are you going to put those big, gray metal towers or are you going to put a big single tower that has wires going across it or —

MS. LEE: The type of — it —

THE PUBLIC: — or are you going to put wood?

MS. LEE: It would have to be metal, either the steel lattice towers or the single pole towers.

THE PUBLIC: Like the ones that are down at the border?

MS. LEE: Either — yeah. The ones that are down at the border are the 500 kV lattice style towers.

THE PUBLIC: Now I can relate to what you are saying.

MS. LEE: Okay.

THE PUBLIC: Now I understand.

MS. LEE: A high voltage transmission line like this can't be on wooden poles because it has to be higher off the ground, so —

THE PUBLIC: Okay.

MS. LEE: The last two categories of alternatives that I will talk about pretty briefly — and these are also illustrated on your Figures 9 and 10 in your package there. One of them is called “Transmission System Alternatives.” And these are alternatives we looked at in which SDG&E's objectives and the objectives of the agencies — we have decided will represent the way we look at alternatives could be met by other transmission improvements that are not connecting the Imperial Valley substation with the Sycamore or Peñasquitos Substation. There are other ways to import power into San Diego that also provide reliability benefits. The one that we have decided to retain here, one of them is Lake Elsinore Advanced Pump Storage Project, which is the LEAPS project in the Lake Elsinore area. That includes about a 30-mile 500 kV transmission line that would improve the transmission between the Edison and San Diego Gas and Electric territories. And then two other ones, Mexico Light is actually an alternative that could only be used in combination with other alternatives because it could provide a reliability benefit with a small transmission upgrade actually in Mexico. And the third one, Path 44 upgrades is one that is being evaluated right now by the California Independent System Operator to see what benefits it would provide to San Diego even though the upgrades actually would occur in Orange County in the Southern California Edison Territory. Next slide, please.

The other category of alternatives that we got the most comments on when we were out here in October and in a public comment period were that we should look at what is called nonwires alternatives. And these are alternatives that involved generation, for the most part, without large, new transmission lines, so that generation has to be closer to the city or closer to where people use the power. We are looking at an alternative that would be based entirely on renewable generation with a combination of solar wind, bio mass, and — what was the fourth one? Biogas. Well, geothermal. The geothermal resources are in Imperial County. So this one doesn't require

geothermal resources. But the alternatives we are looking at here in the nonwires alternatives essentially build on each other. So the first one is renewable generation only. The second one is renewable generation plus an in-basin power plant. The South Bay Power Plant is being proposed right now and in a process of review with the California Energy Commission. The third one is renewables plus the power plant, plus consideration of renewable energy certificates, which is a way that is being developed right now in terms of a regulatory process where Southern California — SDG&E could buy the rights to renewable power without building a transmission line to get it. So it is a trading system basically. The last one that we are considering as an alternative is the use of generation in the basin plus some transmission upgrades that might build up the system outside of San Diego. So that is something that we are investigating as a possibility. Back to Lewis. This goes here.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much for welcoming us to Boulevard today, and for sitting through the presentation. There is probably lots more details that you could ask about; and in this type of setting, unfortunately, it is not really set up easily for Q and A format. So what I am going to suggest is that we go ahead and go through the comment process like we have at all the other meetings. And then also, depending upon how many commenters we have, if it is a relatively small number, we could even go back like we did in El Centro and have people have a second helping if they would like that. But if it is primarily a question that you have, if you could ask it, keep going with your comments, and then at the end of the comments we will let the panel here answer all the questions that they can. Some of the questions you may have just may be good questions to which there has been no answer generated yet because they have not prepared the document. And they will let you know what those are as well. So again, this round is focused on the alternatives. And we are looking for not only agreement or disagreement with those proposed or retention or elimination, but why? Why do you think they are a good idea or not such a good idea? Also, you may have, as Susan said, further suggestions for additional alternatives to be looked at as well as modifications to the ones that she discussed. We also know quite well that the vast majority of Americans are deathly afraid of public speaking, and that is probably the majority of you in this room. Rest assured that written comments are an excellent way — in fact, they are given the same weight and consideration as any oral comments that you offer here today. So if you have thoughts that you want to share and you are not comfortable with public speaking, please take advantage either of the written comment sheets that were available out front. You can fill those in and hand those in today if you want and save yourself the postage. Or as it indicates up here, if you want to mail those in, you can certainly mail in longer comments if you want, more extensive comments if you want to. You can do that up until February 24th.

There is lot of information — we have come out here to meet with you today, but this certainly is not your only chance to become more informed. In the handouts you have there is a web site listed where there is just a ton of information about this proposal, and it will be updated throughout the process. It is a good way to be updated. For those of you who don't have Internet access, there are also

29 libraries and offices where we have hard copy information for most of this. And then if you have, beyond today, further questions or requests for information there is an e-mail address as well as a toll free number that you can call. and again, those are available for you out there. So in the back there, will you raise your hand for me, Daniel? If you want a written comment sheet, you may get one from him. Or you may have noticed when you first came in we asked everybody if they wanted a comment to go ahead and fill out a speaker registration card. This is how I am going to call people up to speak. So if you would like to speak and you didn't fill one of these out, would you raise your hand and Daniel will hand you one. All right. So with that, what I am going to do is — right now I have three cards and I am going to call your names in order that they were handed in. Again, just for consistency's sake among all of the meetings that we are holding all over Imperial and San Diego County each person is going to have three minutes to speak. And like I said, I think given the number that I have here there should be the opportunity for second helpings if people want it.

I joke about how I have a very sophisticated way of indicating times. When you have spoken for two minutes I will put up my index finger like this, indicating that you have one minute left to wrap up your comments. And then when three minutes are up I will put up my closed hand like this indicating that it is time for the next speaker. With that, let me read them in order just so that you will have an idea where you are coming up in the rotation. The first speaker will be Janis Shackelford, followed by Donna Tisdale, Jack Driscoll, Kelly Fuller — welcome back from Minnesota — Robert Maupin, Billy Shepherd, and Mary — I believe it says Shoedfer. All right. Janis, you are first. I don't need addresses or serial number or anything. All I need is just your name. Okay?

MS. SHACKELFORD: Janis Shackelford, the community of Lakeside. This is the closest meeting I could make.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you.

MS. SHACKELFORD: Regarding the alternatives, the question that all of these have been evaluated against is does it improve reliability? I would challenge that the alternatives that involve wires coming along the southern border and then crossing through some of or most fire prone areas — so that would be the I8, the D, and the WF alternatives do not meet that criteria simply because of the fire potential. And I don't know how you get around that in our county because a general — any given area of our county burns every 30 years.

Does an alternative reduce energy costs? That was another question — objective. I would argue that any of these alternatives that involve wires, new transmission lines, do not make that criteria simply because of their costs. The estimated costs of 1.4 billion of the Sunrise Line, we are going to be paying for that for a very long time.

And then the question of does the alternative reduce energy costs? When you look at your energy bills — and I have SDG&E's here. You will find that the energy cost locally is between 5 and \$.06 per kilowatt hour depending on what time of year the actual cost, however, has all these additional fees. There is the Public Purpose Program, the non-income, the Procurement Energy Efficient surcharge rate, all of these add up. And so when the criteria of reducing our energy costs — and SDG&E has claimed publicly that it will reduce 8 percent. Well, we are talking 8 percent of \$.06. Not much. Whereas the cost of the transmission line that will get added on to these rate components will be tremendous, and probably totally overwhelm the savings. And at the rate things are going, the way

SDG&E keeps recalculating every week — I don't know if the committee members know this — I don't trust a single one of their calculations or their numbers.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you very much. Donna Tisdale.

MS. TISDALE: Well, probably after I speak I won't get applause. I am really — I'm also one of these people that fears public speaking, but we recently had an election here in Boulevard, and those of us that ran for our local community planning group and opposing things like Sunrise Powerlink and landfills, et cetera, won our election over two to one margins. So we have got a few people here today who could come midday, but we actually, you know, represent the vast majority of the community here. I chair our Boulevard Planning Group. I do want to thank you for holding hearings here locally. I know I requested it when these alternatives came back up for review, and I think it is important that you are here to hear people.

I am speaking as an individual today, because we didn't vote on it recently at our meeting, how to go about this. But we sent a letter in in October with our objections, and those objections still stand today, and I don't see any improvements in the locations and routes. Because speaking personally, this is — I understand this is your job, and a lot of peoples' jobs count on this kind of stuff, but to us this is very personal, and we take it as a real slap in the face that we would be asked to host a second 500 kV line. We only have 1,600 people here in Boulevard, and we don't feel we need to be responsible for providing a corridor to support all those people who choose to live in an urban area. We make sacrifices to live here. It is not always easy, especially as we get older and need a little more help, but we love it here so we want to stay and we want to preserve it. And I8, I know that that corridor was not recommended by anybody locally. I know that came from people who want to protect Anza Borrego. I too want to protect Anza Borrego. I have enjoyed it since my youth. I was raised in Imperial Valley. I don't like the dumping of these type of projects in communities like the back country or Imperial Valley. I was in Imperial Valley yesterday. My family farm is actually a potential location for a geothermal. My family is seriously looking at this because there are impacts, and we don't know if we want to go there even though we could benefit financially. Also, the Southwest Powerlink was originally proposed to bring geothermal from the valley. But when oil prices fell, those geothermal wells — we had leases in those days. I got \$16,000 a year in the '80s for nothing. And you know what? I was actually glad when it went away, because I love our farm land. And now they are coming back and asking for it again because oil prices are up, so the lower heat pools are worth money again. There are impacts all over. It is environmental justice issues. So I am going to submit written comments. I wasn't really prepared to speak today. I object to all of this, and I think that our end basin generation renewables and reconductor. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Could I make a polite request? We are trying to get — I should have introduced to the right, Nic, she is making a verbal transcript of everything that is being said here so it will become a formal part of the proceeding and record. So when people make noises and — you know, during it, it is difficult for her to hear. So if you wouldn't mind saving your applause and your shows of support until our speaker finishes up, I would just appreciate it. Applause before and after. You should feel good about that. Okay. The next speaker is Jack Driscoll.

MR. DRISCOLL: Well, for one thing, I got one of your towers about as far as from here to the parking lot from my south fence line.

MR. MICHAELSON: The Southwest Powerlink. Okay. Thanks.

MR. DRISCOLL: And I know it comes out of New Mexico from a coal fired plant. Okay. Why did you turn down the power offered to you in the South Bay?

MR. MICHAELSON: When you say “you,” I want to clarify, again, that this is not —

MR. DRISCOLL: SDG&E then.

MR. MICHAELSON: Then you would have to ask San Diego Gas and Electric.

MR. DRISCOLL: Then the other question is: What are you going to do with the three power lines coming in from Mexico?

MR. MICHAELSON: Again, you would need to ask SDG&E.

MR. DRISCOLL: My third one and my last one is: You are passing up one of the best chances in the world when you try to bring your power in from the east to the west when you got all the potential sitting right on the coast. Tide comes in and the tide goes out, and you can set your watch by it. All you got to do is put it down deep enough on a flat surface, and divers work at 100 foot, no problem. And you could set your watch by it. And it gets it off of the surface. That is all I got to say.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

MR. DRISCOLL: I think you should start thinking about all that stuff, because you are going to run out of fuel one of these days unless you use the tides and stuff.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Kelly Fuller.

MS. FULLER: You'll forgive me. I hope my voice is not too ragged. I got in from Minnesota yesterday, and I am still trying to adjust to an 80 degree temperature difference. I want to thank all of you for being here today, both the team from the BLM and the PUC and Lewis and everyone here.

MR. MICHAELSON: Could you just say your name?

MS. FULLER: Kelly Fuller. Sorry. I appreciate your hard work. Thank you for being here. Also, thank you to the people who are here in this room. I know it can be hard for people in Boulevard to know what is going on, especially as the Union Tribune no longer does home delivery here anymore. Boulevard is often an area that is overlooked. But I want to tell you all that I was on an airplane yesterday full of Midwesterners, and as we came over this region they were craning their necks to see here. And they said, “Mountains. We didn't know there were mountains here. We thought we would just see the ocean.” They got the beauty of this area; not everyone in California does. And this area's beauty should be considered in this. What I want to say is thank you also for considering the nonwires alternatives. It seems common sense that any fossil fuel conventional power that is needed for San Diego should be generated in modern efficient power plants in San Diego. If it turns out that there is a need for renewable energy from Imperial County, if they are not able to get all of it in San Diego County, then why not use the existing powerline instead of building another one, especially as it appears from some of SDG&E's own numbers that that would be cheaper than building this damaging line?

I have some of the same concerns that Donna did about the history of the Southwest Powerlink, how it was used for geothermal not that long and is now bringing in power from out of state, a great deal of it. I want the BLM to look at the impacts on federal land in Arizona of additional power plant

construction that would be stimulated by this. And the reason that I say that is, if the proposed renewable energy that SDG&E says is going to be carried along this line is not built or it is not delivered in time in sufficient quantities, it seems highly likely that conventional energy will come across it. And I understand some folks in Arizona have been talking about additional nuclear power plants there.

One comment on the scoping notice that came out I didn't see anything in there about conservation. I appreciate all the comments on energy efficiency. And I was curious because it is my understanding that the state loading order does specify conservation is something to be considered with transmission lines. One very last thing, I sometimes send out information to people about this. If anybody would like me to send them information, come talk to me, and I will get your e-mail address and send you something. Thank you so much for being here today in Boulevard.

MR. MICHAELSON: Next speaker is Robert Maupin.

MR. MAUPIN: My name is Robert Maupin, and the Southwest Powerlink dissects my ranch, which is agriculture property, as they say. Down in the valley they have a problem with sorting agricultural property, but up here I don't have the political clout or the money that the farmers in the Imperial Valley do so it bisects by my property. Number two, when they fired it up, my wife came down with something called polycythemia rubra vera, which is a bone marrow problem. It is hinted that it comes from EMF, although nobody will say that it is — although it is prevalent in Europe around high tension wires. A lot of people get it, but I don't have the money to try to prove that it does. Last year during the power shortage that was hyped when all of the news media — oh, my goodness. “Cut down your use of power because we are not having enough come in.” The Southwest Powerlink was dead. It was not being used. When I brought this up to the SDG&E guy at the last meeting — well, it really wasn't a power shortage. The problem was failure of a lot of transformers down in San Diego, which obviously meant that the media was lying to us.

So my question for the group — obviously, to me, the power — the thing is for the shareholders from San Diego Gas and Electric. It has nothing to do with saving, with bringing in more power. It is just making more money for the shareholders. And it will go in the area with the least per capita income and the fewest number of attorneys.

Up the northern route there is a lot of people with money, and there is a lot of attorneys that live up there. So it ain't going up there; it is probably going to come down here again to — we are going to be stuck with it just because we are here and we can't afford to battle.

Now, I do understand this isn't a problem with you guys. You don't live here anyway. And the lady from the BLM, I was informed over in Arizona — I was informed by some rangers that you are not BLM. You are Bureau of Land Ownership. You are not managing the public land. We all own it and we public ain't supposed to be there. So that is probably why they don't allow land — the powerlink to go across the public land out there. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Billy Shepherd, next speaker.

MR. SHEPHERD: My name is Bill Shepherd and I got here because I wanted to retire. I don't want you coming here and putting all this stuff. Go up north. Hey, I love sheep. I got sheep at my home. I got dogs. I got rabbits. I got all kinds of animals. I don't want these high powered lines coming through my area. Bringing them up here — hey, if it bothers the sheep, it bothers the sheep. You say

you got the Big Horn Sheep up there. Run it up there; they will relocate. It ain't going to be no — you know, having all these animals that are going to go extinct and everything. They will still live.

And I just don't believe that we should have this thing in here. Most of my questions have been answered or asked, but I am tired of it. And it seems like every time you turn around somebody else is trying to come into Boulevard, the airport, this and that and the other. We are getting tired of this. We are just country people. Leave us alone. Just get out of here and just go. Okay. And I don't even want no more power lines in here. It won't benefit us at all. I mean, you going to give me money if you going to run this through here? Are you going to give me free electricity? You ain't going to give me nothing. We are going to have to put up with all this coming through here. All the maintenance and everything else that is going to be coming through here — we like the stick country. That is the reason we moved here. I retired to move here. I am tired of it. So just run it somewhere else. Just leave Boulevard alone. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Mary Shoedfer.

THE PUBLIC: Now you know what you got on your hands, guys.

MR. MICHAELSON: Mary, thank you very much for your hospitality, for making this available to us.

MS. SHOEDFER: No problem. I am the Chairman of Boulevard Fire. And I have some very serious concerns about what happens if and when a fire comes, serious concerns. We have not had a big brush burnout here in 70 years. That wall of flame can go up 150 feet, which is higher than your towers. What is it going to do? That should be looked at. All that is a biggy. I have a totally volunteer fire department. We don't have anybody covering today because all of the kids are working. What is going to happen with them? Are you going to bring the people in from downtown? We already saw what happened with the Cedar Fire. That was a grand fiasco.

Off of that subject; let's go to the next one. Is the need really that great? Next subject: If you put those MYI — those great big metal things, they are going to go across our land, our personal home. We are talking about 125 feet off of a 750-foot lot. The house is in the middle. I am going to have my home, where I live in my retirement, such as it is, going to be within 150 feet. What is that going to do to my health? You hear the things I am worried about?

Then we get down to what about the property? And now we put on the other hat. The Sun Country Real Estate hat. What is it going to do to the value of my property? I have one of the very few properties out here that has legally two homes on it. You cannot get that anymore. That is old, old zoning grandfathered in. I am not going to get it again. You want to replace my home, just as it is somewhere else, buy me another one like it, maybe. But then where are you going to get the location of privacy? Where are you going to get the location of climate? You think about it. We don't have that great of climate — and we have great water right now. These are some of the things, besides who wants to look at the tower. I'm sorry, I don't want to look at it. But firs should be consulted on this. It really should. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: If I note correctly, if you look on page 28 of this big handout of the maps that you got, you will see a rather long list of — in fact, all of the types of impacts and concerns that are being looked at in this process. And although Susan Lee didn't go over each and every one of them, in fact, Mary, everything that you referred to regarding fire and all those other issues are ones

that they will definitely be looking at in doing the analysis. So I just want to encourage people — if you want to know what the full range of impacts that are being considered, I would look at what is called “Attachment 1” pages 28 through 30. Those are the types of impacts that are being looked at in an EIR/EIS. I just wanted to assure you of that. Okay. Our next speaker after Mary is Shannon Davis and then Gary — I'm not sure if this says Hoft or Hoff? Okay. Shannon Davis.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you for coming here. I had already written a letter after the NLP process to Billie Blanchard, and I didn't put in all the information I needed to do. I just basically made a short notation of what some of my immediate concerns were. And I am, of course, in opposition. I am concerned about this from a number of aspects. One, at one time, five years ago, I represented a conservation organization, and I was their spokesperson on creating critical habitat for wildlife. And just about most of these places that you have these lines running through are running through our back country. They are running through our national forest. They are running through our state parks. Even if you go all the way over to — over by Salton Sea, you have got 400 species of birds there. The peninsula bighorn sheep. Yes, there is critical habitat established for them, and that is all mapped with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife. But when they gathered all their testimony to decide where they were going to put that U.S. Fish and Wildlife, they had agreements with the national forest and with other parks that because they were already protected they weren't going to have to establish critical habitat in some of those areas, some of those areas like Cleveland National Forest. And I brought to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife evidence of Bighorn Sheep, rams that are on the move going from ewe group to ewe group, from Palm Springs — from the Palm Springs area down to Anza Borrego and farther south. They go down from the southern mountains in Mexico. They go along the backside of the Mount Laguna range down through the desert. They go four days without water. That means they cross through lands right here in Boulevard. They get down to Mexico and they are found with radio collars on from Anza Borrego down there. It is documented. It is documented with U.S. Fish and Wildlife. And they cross through this country to procreate and to get to the other ewe groups. That is just one of the species. And if I could have one more moment, I will go down the other species of concern.

I have property on D Route. That's my concern, because it runs right through our property. It is going to take 300 feet right down the center of the property. In D Route it is taking all my neighbors' homes. “Taken,” the word put on the document by their attorney Mr. Barnes is “taken,” t-a-k-e-n. Eminent domain, folks. And some people are going to lose their homes. Some people are going to lose their lives, their lives' work. I spent 18 years clearing that land, keeping up with fire codes. I am supposed to be out there today. I have got my fire permit.

MR. MICHAELSON: Shannon, since we only have one other speaker signed up — rather than doing second helpings, why don't you just go ahead and finish up the list you were going to do.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Flame bush. I have down the copper — the rare Burmese copper Butterfly, the Quino Checkerspot Butterfly, the Gnatcatcher, the southwestern flycatcher, the rare Tecate cypress that is in the Cleveland National Forest. We are in the drainage to Barrett Lake, and you've got the arroyo toad in there — in the canyon areas. There are many species of special concerns. And interestingly enough you need to take into consideration Supervisor Tina Terrel's plan of the Cleveland National Forest, her five-year plan for this area, especially Pine Creek and Houser. Because this is not compliant with what her specifications are on the right-of-ways. And someone from San Diego Gas and Electric has told Tina Terrel you are not going to disturb the forest, you are going to maintain it with helicopters. Well, helicopters are hazardous and they have already started fires here in this area. We

have already had one up in Julian. And in order to have helicopters you are going to have to put lights on those towers — on those apparatuses that you put this line on.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay.

MS. DAVIS: So that is going to cause another hazard. We have got a military base here. We've got border patrol taking helicopters and running through this area. This could be an obstruction.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you, Shannon. And I know that you said earlier that you have more extensive comments that you are going to submit. So we appreciate that. Thank you very much. The next speaker is Gary Hoyt; is that correct? Hoyt? It's a Y. Sorry.

MR. HOYT: Gary Hoyt from Boulevard. I probably speak for a lot of people here that there is no one in this room that wants this thing to happen. Esthetically it is bad, and you have all the reasons from all the other communities why we don't want it, so I don't need to go into that.

Alternatives is something you are looking for. I can't understand —

MR. MICHAELSON: Could you just get a little closer to the mic so we can hear you?

MR. HOYT: I can't understand why the CPUC has not mandated to SDG&E that all of these 500 kV lines go underground? It is possible. It can be done. It is just very expensive. It is tough for SDG&E to maintain their lines if there is a power outage. They cannot just drive along the 500 kV lines and say, okay, there is a broken line. That is where we have to go to replace it. They've got underground they have got to deal with. But for people that have to deal with these lattice towers that affects health, property values, esthetics of areas, whether it be a park, driving Interstate 8, or anywhere else in our back country, it should just not be allowed. So undergrounding is something that has been done in Europe. It is mandated in Europe, from what I understand. It should be mandated here. And I think that would relieve a lot of tension for people that live in these communities, that, in essence, would have to put up with this line. Okay.

There is also — if you look at telecommunication industry there has been a lot of progress there with their transmission of telecommunications from point A to point B. There has been none with the electrical industry. Fiber optics is an example where telecommunications lines — people's communications are transmitted from point A to point B through light — through optic lights. Has SDG&E or CPUC looked into any of these options to get their towers that are existing reconducted — or reconducted with a better, more efficient way of running electricity from point A to point B?

If some reason these towers are allowed, wherever they may be — and I am sure that everyone in this room agrees — okay. I will wrap this up — that property values and esthetics are interrupted at companies — SDG&E's millions of dollars of profits that they will eventually get from this transmission from A to B, that money should be taken and right back — not all of it, but some of it should be given to the communities and property owners that have their homes and lands affected by the project, from the private company. So that is it for me. Thanks for coming here.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Actually we are getting more speaker cards as we go, so maybe we need to try to stick to the three minutes, at least for now. Lorrie Ostrander, then Dennis Trafecanty, and Mary Stewart are the next few speakers.

MS. OSTRANDER: Hi. My name is Lorrie Ostrander. I am a wife of a firefighter, and he was on that Cedar Fire. I am repeating a lot of concerns because — and everybody else feels the same way, but I think a lot of what is being neglected are the wildlife, our water. We are all on wells; we don't depend on the City. We've got the underground optic — those wires, we didn't benefit from it. We saw the land be torn up. We saw the big, heavy trucks come in ripping up our roads. Driving the — their speed limit and not ours by the schools. This is what you are going to bring to us. You are bringing ugly to beauty. We see the City. We go down to the City. We do our shopping. We give you money; you give us nothing. We pay the high price of the power bills. When San Diego went out, we paid for it tremendously. A lot of people up here, and my husband is one of them, are retired or going to retire. We are here for a reason. We don't want what you are not going to give us. And we are not going to benefit from any of this. Trust me, we are not. Our water — our well is going to get damaged. The wildlife that is already here — I watch the eagles, I watch the hawks. Where are they going to land on these high towers? You are going to zap them. Are you going to provide something for them to land on? It took you generations to think of the animals. And I agree with the woman who just talked. We have a lot of animals that come through here. Okay. And fire. Mary is right that these wires are tremendous. They are just going to cause a lot of fires.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Dennis Trafecanty.

MR. TRAFECANTY: Hello. My name is Dennis Trafecanty in case you didn't know. I don't believe we need undergrounding because we don't need the line at all. We in this back country — and I am in the back country. I am on the north side. I am not trying to drive a line down here. I have been here before; you have heard me talk here in Boulevard. We don't need the power up there, and you don't need it down here, because there is no growth. So if the San Diego County in the basin needs the power, that is where it should be generated, including solar energy and demand response and, you know, maybe the investor owned utility ought to think a little bit about what Jim Avery said the other day when he said: “We don't need South Bay.” Okay.

I have two concerns that I wanted to present to you. One of them is — you can get this on Internet. All you have to do is Google greenpath north. It is not on any of these maps, but it is called greenpath north. Michael Peavey from the CPU said, “If greenpath north is going in, you don't need the proposed Sunrise Powerlink.” So I think that possibly Aspen and the CPUC ought to consider that. Secondly I am a little bit concerned about a bait and switch that might be going. I know that there is a retired executive from our investor owned utility that is running this company called Sterling Systems. And they have got six of these Sterling System units somewhere in ##Sandia labs in New Mexico. And six of them — and they have not been proven yet. I think that we ought to delay this whole process until it is proven that they can build 12 to 36,000 of these units efficiently. You know that in business — and I'm in business — you don't get money for building a thing unless you can prove that it is buildable.

Okay. I have a couple more things. I'm in favor of the no-wires alternatives. We have — I passed this flyer out. The way to beat this line — we cannot just rely on all of our comments getting considered and approved by the CPUC. I think we need to fight it politically through the media and through justice if we have to. To do that, you have to join our communities, protect our communities. All of us. And then the other thing is I want you to sign a petition. We already — if you will consider doing it, you just put your name on it, your e-mail address, your phone number, and you can read what it says. But we are opposed to Sunrise Powerlink. I will be standing outside. I can't disturb this meeting, but I really think that you should all sign it if you want to help us because all these signatures

are going to the CPUC. On reliability, one last thing. Reliability, you don't get over 150-mile transmission line, and you don't get it with one Imperial Valley substation that has all this power going through it. The way you get it is by in-county generation. So there is no reliability. Someone can take out that IV, Imperial Valley Line in a minute.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Mary Stewart.

MS. STEWART: My name is Mary Stewart. And, you know, I get so tired about animals coming before human beings. Borrego Springs, we — my husband and I have camped on the desert and seen the animals for 54 years. And let me tell you that they have more than enough room to live in Borrego Springs over millions of acres. What is one little pole going to do to their whole habitat? Not one cotton-picking thing.

And if we happen to be unlucky enough to have our home taken away from us, how much are you going to pay us? Are you going to pay what it is worth or just what you want to give us? And that is not right. Poor Boulevard has suffered. They are trying to put everything that you can imagine in Boulevard. Our beautiful last area that is beautiful and not so crowded. You want to put the dump. You want to put wind machines. You want to put more poles — and are you going to quit with this powerlink or in a month or two are you going to bring in more? The first powerlink that you put in Boulevard, that was supposed to be the best thing since sliced bread. And we were going to have our bills lowered and, oh, it was just going to cure all for electricity. Well, why didn't it? If you want to put some stuff someplace, don't bring it to Boulevard. We are damn tired of it. And we want our community to be what it should be. I didn't move up here to have all of this crap. Thank you so much.

MR. MICHAELSON: Vern Denham.

MR. DENHAM: Thanks for being here. I am Vern Denham and I live in Pine Valley. I just have a couple comments and then one question.

Whenever you have a tie-line going into a foreign country — now think of this. We are getting ready to build a 700-mile fence along the Mexican border. That probably does not make some of them very happy. And all the President has to do is sign a bill of notice. If you cannot take our people, you are not going to take our electricity, and they can shut off any tie-line whenever they want. That is the political reality of dealing with a foreign country.

Number two. I am not a terrorist, but when you have two tie-lines coming in to one substation, there are 500 on each, when you have all those towers out here in the back country, any junior terrorist taking anything off the Internet can blow a tower or two, whether it is the 500 or whether it is coming off San Onofre or wherever it might be coming out of. And when towers fall, they are like a pole. They take more than one tower with them. When you blow one tower, you take two or three more with you. They have a domino effect. Probably the lights will dim in San Diego. So you have to ask yourself whether or not — what are we doing — how are we looking at this if there is any kind of terrorism? Out here in the back country there is nothing to stop anybody from doing anything.

Secondly on the 69 kV lines that are already in existence on the right-of-way. And below that there will be some underbuilt which is distribution lines. Are they going to leave them within that right-of-way? Or are you going to find a new right-of-way, or what are you going to do with the existing wooden poles that you already have? Are you going to put underbuilt on the 69 — I mean, on the 500? Probably not. It is not feasible. So that was just my comment.

Have you ever been — my final little tidbit here. Have you ever had any meetings yet where somebody said, “You know what? I really like this concept of eminent domain. I really do like the fact that I can look out and see these beautiful towers. They really do have kind of an esthetic appeal. I love the sound of fog and hissing on the lines in the morning.” When you have that happen, would you tell me? Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Daniel, have anyone — no one else? Is there anyone else who would like to speak who hasn't already? If not we can go to second helpings. Well, actually, you got your second helping already. I am going to — you have already — I just want to make sure that — is there anybody else who hasn't spoken who wants to? Okay. Why don't you go ahead and come up. All I need is your name again.

MS. TISDALE: Donna Tisdale. I did forget to mention a couple things, and when you mentioned the summary of potential impacts I looked on the hydrology and water quality. And one thing that we mentioned in our October 9th letter is not on here. I don't know how deep they have to drill to put footings for these towers, but there are — our groundwater runs in fractures. We don't have the typical aquifer that many people are used to. We have fractured rock aquifers. And any blasting or that kind of work has the potential to reroute the underground water away from people's wells who are accessing it now. And it costs between 20 and \$50,000 to drill a new well if you can find a spot that has water. So that was not noticed.

MR. MICHAELSON: I do remember you mentioning that the first round. Thanks.

MS. TISDALE: It was in our letter as well. And also I forgot to note on the — we do have people that want to come here and build, not that they want them here. But I notice on your very southeast corner there that crosses the property that a man just paid \$1.85 million for. And it is very near another parcel that he paid over \$7 million for to develop.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks. I think you were going to come up again. Thank you. I just need your name again.

MS. SHACKELFORD: Janis Shackelford. Regarding the alternatives, I would request that on the nonwire alternatives, which have been bundled into various subsets, that they also be considered in combination with one or more of these system alternatives; that hopefully those are not — there's nonwire and there's system; that if some combination of those, particularly the LEAPS project along with some of the nonwire alternatives makes sense and will no doubt be much more economically feasible for the region that those be — that option of combination be considered. When I read that SDG&E has presented the following eight objectives, which is on page 7 — it talks about the cost associated with the inefficient generators such as South Bay and Encina. When the SDG&E representatives stated that they had no intention of buying power from South Bay, that does not send the right message to the county, to the communities, to our residents, as to are they looking out for our best interest before their own. They also talk about Encina 5. If you look it up, it is comparatively very inefficient. Has there ever been a proposal for upgrading those plants to the combined cycle like is being proposed for the South Bay program? Upgrading Encina 5 would provide much more regional efficiency and reliability. Thank you.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thanks very much. Sir? I need you to come up to the mic, though, so everyone can hear you. Just need your name again. Thanks.

MR. DRISCOLL: I don't know whether you know it or not, but —

MR. MICHAELSON: Sir, would you just state your name for me. Sorry.

MR. DRISCOLL: I don't know whether you know it or not, but if you took and built you a little power line parallel to the high line about 12-foot poles and just put your line across there and put a few transformers in there you could power your whole — whatever you want picking up just nothing more than static electricity. And I am sure somebody will figure out some way to do that. The other thing you better think real, real solid about what I told you about using the tide. And that is not something on the surface. This is down below where it is not bothered by anything. I have got it all drawn up if you want to look at it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Was your name Billy Shepherd?

MR. DRISCOLL: Jack Driscoll.

MR. MICHAELSON: Jack Driscoll. Thank you very much. You wanted to say something again?

MS. DAVIS: Yes. Excuse me. There was one thing I have not heard too much about. And that is water drainage. Well, I have heard a little bit from Donna. But we do have the lines going by — on some of the alternative routes they are going by the Pine Creek/Houser part of the Cleveland National Forest; and there is other places that the other alternative routes go by, our reservoirs and our waterways; and there are a number of codes that protect the drainage into Barrett Lake, into Lake Morena and all of the other waterways that are along the path. And this needs to be taken into consideration. What are those proclamations that are made to protect the drainage and not disturb those areas that drain into those waterways? Those waterways are to — they are there in case we have a water shortage. They drain into one another and come inland to the west, and that needs to be looked at. That needs to be considered. Will there be impacts to the drainage of our water reservoirs and our lakes? I want to say this, and I know I am not going to be popular saying this here in Boulevard, but I have to. In all honesty, in regards to wildlife and to the peninsular bighorn sheep, it is endangered and there is a tremendous amount of study saying that if you disturb them, they will not return to that same location. So if you — you know, this isn't just in defense for Anza Borrego, but even for the migrating ones that have to pass through here. If you disturb them with regular routine maintenance on these lines it will diminish their numbers because they have very few places to keep relocating to. So they are a large mammal and that is one aspect that everyone needs to reconsider.

MR. MICHAELSON: Shannon Davis, right?

MS. DAVIS: Shannon Davis.

MR. MICHAELSON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SHEPHERD: Can I say something? I am not in the list.

MR. MICHAELSON: That is fine. We will get you to fill one out. Thanks.

MS. SHEPHERD: My name is Theresa Shepherd and I live in Boulevard. We bought here about a year and half ago and I love it. But the two things that we do have in Boulevard and the mountains and the desert are sun and wind. Why can't we do something with that? Why do we have to have the

power lines? I mean, should we be going backward to save ourselves this dependency on anything. It would just make sense to me to be more independent. That is why we moved up here, so we could have our independence and do what we want. That's all. Thanks.

MR. MICHAELSON: Thank you. Thanks very much. Daniel is going to get you to fill out one of those cards. Anyone else? And again this is just a step along the process. As you probably saw from that schedule, there is going to be a second alternative scoping report. There is going to be the draft document itself. So we hope that when you signed in, if you weren't already on the mailing list that you did sign in. That way you will be sure and get notices. We hope you take note of the web sites so that you can stay tuned in. Was there anything — any of the questions Susan or Linda or Billie that you wanted to respond to or answer at this point? You want to grab that mic.

MS. LEE: Okay. The one thing I would love is that the couple of you who mentioned that one of these alternatives passes over or near your property, I would love to talk to you after because we really do want to know where that is. We have been trying to avoid residences, and if we have not done it, we want to know. So afterwards if you just come up and we will look — we have some very detailed maps. That is the only thing I —

MR. MICHAELSON: Did you have a comment that you wanted to make? If you could just put that back up there, I think we have one more comment.

MR. SMITH: Hi. My name is Bob Smith and I am from Pine Valley. Where you are sitting right there I spent four days and three nights sleeping on a cot there because of the Cedar Fire. And, of course, Mary was very — she was our hostess and she was grand.

That line going through any part of the Cleveland National Forest, BLM, or whatever you want to call it, is going to be a threat. And if the line was on C going through Pine Valley, it is going to take out 50 houses. Now, 50 houses doesn't sound a whole lot to people who live in a big city; however, it is eight to ten percent of our entire population of residents. So if you were to take a place like Allied Gardens where it is 4,000 homes, you are talking 400 houses. So I think SDG&E has got to get greed out of their mind and start to think more out of the box. And I think that one of the people — that we have already mentioned that we should have more plants. Why aren't we thinking nuclear? It is proven safe at this point in time, so why doesn't SDG&E start to think more in the future and go this route? So everybody that is behind me that has spoken today has come up with some excellent, excellent questions and answers for what is going to happen out here. And if this does happen — and unfortunately money talks and you know what walks. So I think what one person said, it is going to have to go into legalities because I don't think that SDG&E are going to stop until they probably destroy the whole back country. At that point I would say good luck to all of us.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Thanks. Yes, sir. You want to add something? Sure.

MR. SHEPHERD: Well, my name is Bill Shepherd, again. I would like to know where you live? Where do you live, sir?

MR. MICHAELSON: Well, I live in San Diego.

MR. SHEPHERD: Where do you live, ma'am?

MS. KASTOLL: El Centro.

MR. SHEPHERD: Where do you live?

MS. BLANCHARD: Up in San Francisco.

MR. SHEPHERD: Where do you live?

MS. LEE: Same thing, up in San Francisco.

MR. SHEPHERD: Well, then you guys don't have to worry about this beautiful place, do you? What would you do if someone was going to build one of them damn towers back in your yard? You wouldn't like it, would you?

MR. MICHAELSON: No.

MR. SHEPHERD: You wouldn't like it either, would you?

MR. MICHAELSON: Sir, these are really kind of rhetorical questions and —

MR. SHEPHERD: But I am just saying — you are building it in my backyard, and I don't like it.

MR. MICHAELSON: Can I just clarify something?

MR. SHEPHERD: Sure.

MR. MICHAELSON: They are not building anything.

MR. SHEPHERD: But your company is.

MR. MICHAELSON: They are not the company. I tried to make this really, really clear at the beginning. Can I just make this clear again?

MR. SHEPHERD: Yeah.

MR. MICHAELSON: The people who are proposing to do this is San Diego Gas and Electric. They are not part of this proceeding.

MR. SHEPHERD: Okay.

MR. MICHAELSON: The people that are seated in front of you are with the California Public Utilities Commission and the Bureau of Land Management. And specifically these people are in charge of reviewing the proposal and looking at its environmental impact. So when you ask them questions about what they are proposing to do — I just want you to be clear those are really questions to ask SDG&E.

MR. SHEPHERD: But would you like it if it was in your backyard?

MR. MICHAELSON: Sir, do you have any other questions?

MR. SHEPHERD: No. That is all because none of you are going to answer.

MR. MICHAELSON: All right. Okay. So I think we've reached the end of this meeting. And what I would like to do is indicate, again, that oral comments are one way to offer your comments. Please either hand your written comments or mail them in by February 24th. And written comments are given the same weight and consideration as oral comments offered today. Thank you very much for your hospitality. We are adjourned.

[Proceedings concluded at 2:44 p.m.]