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I’m very encouraged that the DEIR confirmed that there are non-wires alternatives to meet our future energy needs, but I am disappointed that the report includes the LEAPS route, both the route with and without the dams.

I hike and camp in many of the areas that would be affected both by the LEAPS line and by the Route D alternatives. Because the Sunrise Powerlink is such a devastating line to the environment, you might think the LEAPS is a good solution. Don’t be fooled.

It has all the same problems that Sunrise Powerlink does.

It would ruin a pristine public land. Ninety-five percent of the route is on pristine public land in the Cleveland National Forest. It ties up our money in old technology while destroying our dwindling forests. It would require loss of spectacular views, increase fire risk, destroy habitats.

As a licensed mechanical engineer, I know the future is in distributed generation. I also know that SDG&E/Sempra does not make large profits on distributed generation. I also know that money spent on efficiency and conservation will gain you more power gains than putting it into power generation.

Don’t let SDG&E and Sempra lead you into a false choice. It’s not a choice of ruining a state park or national forest. It’s not whether to dump our energy problems on Riverside County or Imperial County. We can take care of our energy needs here in San Diego, and we can do it environmentally sensibly and reliably.

Thank you.

ALI WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. KILDOO

MR. KILDOO: Commissioner, Judge, my thanks for the opportunity to speak here this afternoon.

My name is Steve Kildoo, and I’m here today to speak in favor of the Sunrise Powerlink.

Please understand that as a lifetime resident in San Marcos and as a long-time community activist, I have seen the rural community of San Marcos reach near buildout and seen the impacts of regional infrastructure on our city.

I myself lived across the street from power lines similar to the ones planned for the Powerlink. The infrastructure additions to our city and every city in San Diego County are part of the larger regional responsibility we all share to make San Diego County as a whole a viable and stable region to live and grow in.

These power lines would be critical to the San Diego region, supplying renewable and environmentally sound energy to our region, creating an alternative power line in the event of regional catastrophe and creating a critical power backup that makes sure our economy stays working and strong.

There’s no greater challenge than to plan for the regional needs of San Diego, weighing the desires and needs of those immediately affected by infrastructure with the ongoing and growing needs of the entire region. Yet that is the challenge that needs to be considered for every major regional infrastructure necessary for San Diego, from the Poseidon Desalination Plant to the 231 toll-road extension.
While working hard to find the best route and alternatives for all involved, it is critical to move forward with this project. I ask that you embrace the greater regional good and support this needed piece to the San Diego power puzzle.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Kildoo.

STATEMENT OF MS. FELDMAN

MS. FELDMAN: Good afternoon, Commissioner Grueneich, Judge Weissman. My name is Sara Feldman. I’m the vice president for Southern California for the California State Parks Foundation, which opposes the Sunrise Powerlink Project.

My organization was founded in 1969 and represents over 90,000 members throughout California. It is our mission to protect, enhance and advocate for California’s 278 magnificent state parks, of which Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is a prime example.

The foundation was very impressed with the thorough and thoughtful analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS, and we are grateful for the very hard and challenging work that obviously went into it.

Reserving more detailed comments for our forthcoming comment letter, the foundation has one overarching observation to make, which is that we are very pleased with the hierarchy of environmental superior alternatives set forth in the executive summary of the Draft EIR/EIS. We urge the CPUC to pay very close attention to the recommendations found there and give them the weight they deserve.

As we struggle with threats to state parks throughout California, 125 at the last count statewide, 51 threats to 25 state parks in southern California alone, we strongly support alternatives that preserve our irreplaceable state parks for future generations, as they were meant to be.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Ms. Feldman.

STATEMENT OF MS. ROSS

MS. ROSS: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to present the views of my planning board. I’m representing today the Del Mar Mesa Planning Board.

By way of introduction, we represent the residents, property owners and businesses in the Del Mar Mesa planning area in the city of San Diego. We are elected by our community. We serve in an advisory capacity and at the pleasure of the City of San Diego Planning Department and the San Diego City Council.

I want to say that this is a very diverse board made up of property owners, residents, business owners and developers. And today my remarks represent the unanimous view of our board. We urge you to reject the Sunrise Powerlink in the present configuration.

I’d like to introduce our community. We are a unique community located adjacent to Carmel Valley, just west of Carmel Valley Neighborhood 10 and south of SR 56. It is a historic community that goes back hundreds of years, and it exists today in its present form by virtue of several ballot measures and extensive complex negotiations between environmentalists, community planners, city and county public officials, public utilities, small and large business owners and developers.

As a result of this 20-year process of planning, Del Mar Mesa property owners deemed large tracts of their property to the public as part of the city’s multiple species conservation program in trade for clustering homes on less environmentally sensitive lands.
As a result, Del Mar Mesa is home to approximately 1500 acres of coastal maritime habitat preserving over 17 species of listed and endangered plants and animals on land that went to Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve with the county’s open space system. This wildlife connection is essential for habitat preservation in San Diego.

We are also proud of ten miles of recreational trails that link to the county trail system. We are not a closed community. We welcome residents from all over San Diego County to hike, bike and ride their horses. It is indeed a unique community. And it is through this land that SDG&E proposes to construct the western portion of the Sunrise Powerlink.

We urge you strongly to honor all those people who worked so hard to make the MSCP work in San Diego and not allow this project to intrude on it.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

For the record and for the court reporters, that was Lisa Ross.

STATEMENT OF MS. HARVEY

MS. HARVEY: Good afternoon. My name is Anne Harvey. I’m here with Laura Copic from the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board. Carmel Valley is a community north of the 56 and 1-5 and also adjacent to Del Mar Mesa. Carmel Valley, our board is elected to represent 14,000 households, arguably the most giant office park in San Diego, and we have business and investment and residential representatives on our board. Our board also has overwhelmingly asked you to reconsider SDG&E’s preferred alternative for the Sunrise Powerlink.

I’ve been on the board since mid 1990s and we have negotiated with Pardee and other developers for our open space, part of which is now part of Peñasquitos Canyon and part of which is about 400 acres known as Carmel Valley Preserve. We have negotiated on an almost foot-by-foot basis at times. Each time we have been assured that in return for major entitlements, the open space that was preserved would be preserved in perpetuity.

We are also host to 400 acres which is the largest remaining standing southern maritime chaparral in the world. It’s the kind of planned community where all of our houses have been built since. We prize our open space. It lowers people’s blood pressure. It provides relief from urbanization. It makes all the difference to a lot of the people in our community and all the people who visit our open space. And we urge you not to let it be destroyed by this power line.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Ms. Harvey. Donald Lee and then Larry Hogue.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This gentleman claims to be No. 29.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Somehow I got missed and it could be my fault.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Actually, the name has been entirely scratched off.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ken Rupert.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Go right ahead. State your name for the court reporters.

STATEMENT OF MR. RUPERT

MR. RUPERT: Okay. I’m Ken Rupert. People call me Al. I am somewhat undistinguished resident and taxpayer, but I feel very strongly about the Sunrise Powerlink.

I’ve heard quite a few erudite discussions here on the environmental aspect, the technical aspect, the cost aspect, and I agree with all of these.
I would like to suggest two things. First, I would like to ask the commissioner to talk to Sempra Energy very closely about real purpose for this line because it is essentially a plant — a power line at Warner Springs and give Sempra access to the market in the Temecula and Riverside county and put them in a good competitive position to compete with Southern California Edison. I suspect that’s a large reason for doing this, because clearly the environmental issue is a false issue. Sempra Energy has managed to connect the two. But solar energy or wind energy will flow just fine on any electric line located anywhere.

And what I would like to talk about though is something that I don’t think has been emphasized enough, and that’s the visual importance of the — importance of the backcountry to the coastal residents of San Diego.

Now, people travel to Julian. I don’t think they’re really all that interested in visiting Julian. They just want a country visit. They travel to Lagunas for the same reason and to Borrego. Now, if you mar the landscape, you’ll ruin their visual experience.

Thank you very much for your time.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Rupert.

Mr. Lee.

STATEMENT OF MR. LEE

MR. LEE: I’m Donald Lee, speaking against the proposal as a citizen of San Diego and without any special interest.

I have three questions.

One: How does San Diego Gas & Electric plan to meet its state mandate to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 20 percent by 2010 if its parent company Sempra Energy is planning to use imported liquefied natural gas since counting processing, liquefying, transportation, and regasification, the greenhouse gas burden of imported liquefied natural gas will be about 25 percent greater than that created by the current use of domestic gas.

Two: Why is San Diego Gas & Electric planning to use natural gas with its greenhouse gas burden when the price of natural gas is rapidly increasing and likely to continue to increase while local renewable energy resources are becoming more competitive and in some cases are already cheaper?

Three: Why use natural gas that makes us more dependent on the economic volatility and political manipulation of potentially hostile foreign powers like Indonesia and Russia when we can use locally renewable energy resources that will make us less dependent and enhance or independence and sovereignty.

Because the Powerlink will increase the threat to our national security, to the economic well-being and health of rate payers to the ecological viability of San Diego County’s fragile ecosystem both from global warming and increased fire danger, I urge the California Public Utilities Commission to reject the Sunrise Powerlink proposal.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

We need to give the court reporters a break, and so what I’d like to do is take a ten-minute recess.

For people who are outside listening, there about 25 or 30 seats available the main auditorium.
And when we come of back, I’ll ask people with numbers 41 through 50 to please be ready to go in ten minutes, and also ask you to start looking at your prepared statements, find that single most cogent remark, and be ready to make it. Because the reason that we’re concerned about keeping this moving not only because we don’t want to keep you all here through your dinner hour, we actually need to go to another meeting such as this out in Pine Valley, and fighting the rush hour traffic I know we’re going to be cutting it sort of slim. So I’ll try to ask you to get down to a minute to a person if we could have.

Thank you. We’ll be in recess for ten minutes.
(Recess taken)
ALJ WEISSMAN: On the record.
We’re ready to get started again. A couple of comments.
If I could please have it quiet in the room. People, please stop your conversations.
Thank you.
A couple of things before we move on. First of all, our compliments to the speakers.
Everybody’s clearly been very well prepared and had very interesting and useful things to say. I don’t want that to get lost in the shuffle as we try to make sure you all get your chance to speak.

Second of all, if people are concerned if they’re far down the list and have written statements and want to submit those to us, we’ll accept those statements and include them in the record.

COMMISSIONER GRUENEICH: And we’ll read them.
ALJ WEISSMAN: We’ll read them, yes.

And on that note, there’s a letter from Senator Christine Kehoe that was referred to earlier, we’re going to include that, copy that and include it in the transcript as well.

Now, so we’re ready to move on with those still here from the group of 41 through 50. So I think we’ll start with Mr. Guseman.

STATEMENT OF MR. GUSEMAN

MR. GUSEMAN: Good afternoon, Commissioner Grueneich and Judge Weissman. My name is Dennis Guseman. I’m the dean of the college administration of Cal State San Marcos, and I’m here to speak in favor of the Sunrise Powerlink.

I’m the first one to admit that finding an appropriate route for this transmission line is a real challenge. There is no middle nowhere anymore in San Diego. And anywhere you build this line, there will be impacts. However, route challenges should be no reason to back away from a needed project like the Sunrise Powerlink. Our economies and our lives depend on having reliable supply of electricity. And I think we can agree that given the growth rate in this area, we’ll need more power.

As I personally interact with business leaders across California, the issue of having sufficient infrastructure arises. And the question is will we have enough roads, enough power, enough energy to be able to support our future. I’m afraid to say answer is no unless we take steps.

We do have a choice when it comes to electricity. Do we have to continue building more power plants locally or can we take a more balanced approach and build some power plants and transmission lines like the Sunrise that can import renewable energy?
I am for supporting a cleaner energy future for San Diego. We need more solar, wind, geothermal power. But without new lines like Sunrise, our hopes for renewable resources are just that, hopes.

I encourage you to make the right choice for San Diego and support this project. Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Guseman.

STATEMENT OF MR. IBARRA

MR. IBARRA: Judge and Commissioners, good afternoon. My name is Efrain Ibarra representing the South County Economic Development Council. I'm here today to claim our support for the Sunrise Powerlink.

On April 4, 2006, the South County Economic Development Council voted to support the Sunrise Powerlink 500 kV transmission line to ensure a reliable supply of energy to the San Diego region. To access low-cost power and to access clean power from renewable generation resources, the South County Economic Development Council board members noted that Sunrise Powerlink is necessary to ensure the electric reliability for the region. The link also allows for a mix of adequate in-region power generation resources and additional transmission lines, enabling our businesses to obtain the least cost energy supply. This is a vital component to our economic development efforts.

South County Economic Development Council encourages the California Public Utilities Commissioners to approve the Sunrise Powerlink.

Thank you very much.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MR. CARLISLE

MR. CARLISLE: Good afternoon. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you. I'm representing Padre Dam Municipal Power. Padre dam operates a water reclamation facility in Santee Lakes Regional Lakes and Campground. We are opposed to one of the alternate sites in relation to this Sunrise Powerlink project; specifically, the San Diego community power plant or the ENPEX power plant which is located directly adjacent to Sycamore Creek. It's also directly adjacent to Santee Lakes Regional Park and Campground.

Santee Lakes Regional Park and Campground greets more than 600,000 visitors on an annual basis not only from San Diego, but from all over the state of California and all over the country. We have serious concerns about the power plant and its impact on the recreational preserve. Those include the visual and biological impacts, the potential negative economic impact that this could have, a power plant being so close to a regional park and campground. And then lastly, the wildlife corridor that is proposed as part of our natural community conservation plan, it's a plan that we've been working on for the last ten years at a cost of almost $500,000. That would include a wildlife corridor that would all but be eliminated if this alternative were to go forward and the power plant would be built in that location. So we are opposed to this.

Padre Dam will be providing a formal report in response to the EIR and the EIS.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MR. DOWDS
MR. DOWDS: Last name is Dowds. Curt Dowds. I'm a natural resource economist with a Ph.D. from Berkeley, but I rise in opposition to the Sunrise Powerlink as a citizen of Chula Vista and of San Diego County.

I have four quick points to make. The first one which is that I would ask you to remain suspicious of the claims of benefits that have been offered by SDG&E and CAISO in support of their project. They at various times claim that they can save $142 million of annualized savings over four decades by importing renewable energy to replace peaker plants. Anybody who knows anything about renewable energy today knows there's a storage problem. You cannot obviate the need to build storage plant — peaker plants in basin by importing renewable energy from out of basin. Therefore, there's a contradiction in their basic claim of benefits.

The second point I would like to make very quickly is to ask you to examine whether we are not, in discussing this project, contemplating an inversion of what has been the traditional paradigm of energy production and distribution in the United States. What we're talking about here is offshoring the production of energy and importing it instead of building baseload and peaker plants in-basin and using the transmission system as a double backup, the G-1/N-1 hypothesis.

It often goes unobserved, but if you plow through the pages of this defense of this project, we're talking about changing the paradigm.

The third point would be please look at the efficiency impacts on the growth of load over the last 20 years.

And lastly, I would say that if you're talking about secure transmission, the least transmission is the most secure transmission. So that's the argument for distributed generation in-basin. And I ask you to consider that in your deliberations.

Thank you very much for your time.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dowds.

STATEMENT OF MS. KRAJEWSKA


I would like to thank you for your common sense approach toward prioritizing alternatives. We support your choice and certainly hope that CPUC will not approve this project as proposed by SDG&E. However, if it did, then — okay, in your proposal you kind of redesigned the Coastal Link. Like you remove the Coastal Link and it stays on the original SDG&E proposal. If it stayed, then there are more impacts to Torrey Hills than it listed. Like Torrey Hills does have power lines and does have the towers. But adding more towers, that spoil our view. So I think visual resources section should be mentioned there.

Now on the other subject, okay, I have here the summary of the impact. Figure ES1. And here in the very corner, okay, it says Connected Action: Stirling Energy Systems, Solar Two LLC Project. This project is a solar thermal project. You did not include solar thermal in your first few alternatives. In fact, you could include — like if you look at this picture, the yellow line going through the middle of this project, and this yellow line is Southwest Powerlink. So it does not seem like it's a big deal to connect the project to Southwest Powerlink. They need a separate line for that. The line is there.

Also, in the future, if more energy generated in the desert, then this energy can be connected to Southwest Powerlink. What would happen, it would just replace fossil fuel energy that is now imported from Mexico through the line. Thank you.
ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Ms. Krajewska.

STATEMENT OF ZAHN

MR. ZAHN: My name is Charles Zahn. I’m a citizen of San Diego, a retired professor, and lived here six years. I’m opposed to the Powerlink and I’d like to give you some reasons. Global climate change is one symptom of the damage to plant earth caused by human activities. The health of our planet and therefore the health of the human race is harmed by all the following. I jotted down these five: Number one, greenhouse gas emissions leading to global warming; two, loss of vegetation; three, loss of biodiversity; four, loss of wilderness nature experience; and five, reliance on fossil fuels.

Number 4 may receive strange, but there’s some evidence that folks who don’t get to realize nature experiences tend to be less sensitive to some of these issues involving damage to the planet.

According to the Draft EIR/EIS for the Sunrise Powerlink Project, it contributes to all five of these environmental damages which I’ve listed. Smarter energy policies would focus on these approaches, among others, using less energy, copying European nations which they actually use less. They are also more efficient.

We could use more efficient appliances, and we have made some moves in recent years for that.

Demand balancing: There are ways that the Europeans do that as well, by having people’s behavior change.

Local generation, which I think some people call distributed, is like roof solar panels is very interesting.

A recent update to the California Energy Action Plan, which I’ve seen more recently, seems more clearly in accord with these smarter approaches than with the Sunrise Powerlink, and therefore I’m opposed to it.

I have one question for the Commission. Has the CPUC considered American cities like Seattle, Washington, and Portland, Oregon, as models for forward-looking energy policies, including some tested solutions?

Thank you for listening.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. SANDERS

MR. SANDERS: Hi. My name is Ron Sanders. I live in San Diego, and I’m speaking against the power line. The Powerlink I should say.

The Sunrise Powerlink should not be constructed because it’s unnecessary and poses a great threat to what is left of our back country open spaces. Bringing power to San Diego by long distance transmission lines is using outdated technology to solve problems of the 21st century.

We were told originally that the Sunrise Powerlink would be carrying power from renewable geothermal and solar power. In truth, most of the power to be transmitted would come from un — excuse me, come from under-regulated Mexican power plants.

Sounds like bait and switch to me.

Sempra’s true plan is to run additional power lines straight ahead into the Los Angeles area where the really big energy markets are located. Los Angeles gets most of the power while our back country is permanently trampled.
By using more energy-efficient methods such as solar and wind power, using green building methods and building local power plants using fuel-efficient generators, we will be less dependent on long-distance power transmission and spend a lot less money.

California’s state parks — as my closing here, California’s state parks were designed to be preserved in perpetuity, not set aside for private companies to profit by building massive power lines over public land.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. VICKERMAN

MR. VICKERMAN: Good afternoon, Commissioner.

Reed Vickerman, from Amylin Pharmaceuticals. We’re a local company with about 2,000 employees representing, obviously, about 2,000 families in the community. We’re here in support of the project.

It was a very difficult choice. So I think this is more of a lesser of two evils if you look at what’s been discussed already today. But just a few things.

Amylin is a local company committed to sustainability. We have lead certifications for all of our new buildings. We’re actually putting in a million dollars’ worth of photovoltaics on the roof of our newest building, so we understand that there are ways of doing in-area generation. But the problem is that the alternatives which have been proposed at least in this report would be much less desirable than an older technology.

The other thing I just wanted to point out with the — there have been a couple of comments made by other speakers that maybe would be worthy to correct. I’ve heard a lot of people worried about the source of the energy that’s going to be coming across the lines.

I understand it from personal conversation with people at SDG&E that over 90 percent of the energy has already been contracted through renewable sources. So 90 percent of what’s being transmitted across that line is renewable. And also that it is not connected to the Mexicali power station, which has been alluded to by a few of the speakers already this afternoon.

So in closing, I thing the big thing for us is just that we believe that we have to have the capacity and reliability that the line would offer, and that we think that possibly with these renewable sources San Diego and Imperial County could become the world leader in this new technology. And that would be great for the local economy as well as the environment.

Thanks very much.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. SIGNOROTTI

MR. SIGNOROTTI: Good afternoon. My name is Vince Signorotti. I’m with CalEnergy Operating Corporation. I’m a vice president with CalEnergy.

CalEnergy is an independent power producer, and I wanted to underscore that we are not on SDG&E’s board, nor are they on ours. We are independent power producers.

For 26 years, CalEnergy has produced clean, indigenous, environmentally responsible, geothermal energy from plants at the Salton Sea. Today we operate ten facilities and generate 340
megawatts of baseload electricity. We are developing plans to build three new power-generating facilities, each of which would be capable of producing between 50 and 60 megawatts.

Recently, the Imperial Irrigation District has announced plans to build 35 miles of new transmission line that would interconnect these plants to an existing substation called Midway and a new substation called Bamster. However, as welcome as that announcement is, that simply is not sufficient to get the power from these plants to customers here in San Diego and other coastal communities. And for that reason, it is absolutely essential that we develop new transmission, specifically the Sunrise Powerlink.

And what I would like to leave you with — because there are some folks that might contradict that — this is proven technology from a proven resource. Again, we’ve operated these plants for 26 years. Experts believe that there are an additional 2,000 megawatts of energy development potential at the Salton Sea alone.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MS. CATHY EVANS-CALDERWOOD

MS. EVANS-CALDERWOOD: It’s a good thing I had lots of practice talking in front of City Council. They only give you a minute.

I am Kathy Evans-Calderwood. I have been an elected representative from my community in City Heights on the planning — local City Heights Area Planning Committee and was one year the vice chair of that body. I have seen a lot of environmental impact reports and learned a lot of the insider jargon here that we’re dealing with. Unfortunately, we don’t have a translator here for the people, the good people who have taken the time to come down here and the working people who have come in.

City Heights has a population now of 96,000 households. And we do use a lot of electricity, but we live in old, falling-apart buildings for the most part in this community that is revitalizing. And conservation of energy is where the future lies, not new power lines. And I want to emphasize to you that I oppose this. And anybody else that has spoken here against it and given all their good reasons, I include with mine.

I favor the alternative possibly undergrounding of all lines that might cause fires. I have relatives in Santa Ysabel and Julian who look like they’re going to have the Powerlink right over there heads and have been damaged by the fires.

But what I want to say here is that I worked for the City of San Diego and a research outfit called Center For Technical Services in 1979 out of Pete Wilson’s office, as he was the mayor. I have dealt with the PUC before because our project dealt with energy conservation, and I wrote a book that is in the public library under my maiden name, Evans, on senior citizens’ energy cost savings.

I was then appointed as the low-income representative to SDG&E on something called CEPAC back in those days, Community Energy Policy Advisory Commission. And I feel that the Powerlink is again going to charge money on the backs of the poor for the transportation of the energy that they might have conserved. And just as I was — I’m getting upset here.

My own personal experience as a low-income representative of people on low, fixed incomes and a disabled person is that we who do not have a voice are very rarely listened to. And yet, in all the shenanigans that have been going on for the last 20 years that I have witnessed with SDG&E now charging virtually a rental rate for the —

ALJ WEISSMAN: We really need you to stop. Please stop.
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MS. EVANS-CALDERWOOD: — charges more than the electricity itself.

ALJ WEISSMAN: I need to have you stop now. Thank you. I’ve given you more than a minute more than anybody else. We need to keep moving on.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. PETERSON

MR. PETERSON: Good afternoon. I’m John Peterson, vice president of Anza-Borrego Foundation and Institute. And I thank you for the opportunity to speak before you today.

I’d like to say that I’m opposed to the preferred project, that being the power lines going through Anza-Borrego State Park, which I was glad to see the EIR to be rated Number 6 out of the number 7 alternatives.

I’d start with a question: What is our heritage? Our forefathers in the formation of the United States gave us many treasures. Some of those most treasured gifts are the natural wonders contained within our park system.

I still remember with awe and wonder walking up to the edge of the Grand Canyon. I still remember with clear recollection driving into Yosemite Valley and seeing Bridal Veil Falls, El Capitan and Half Dome. I see and still remember driving out to the desert to see the wildflowers and driving out to Fonts Point and seeing the panoramic view of texture, shapes, colors and fabric. These feelings are now part of me and are part of who I am.

We have been gifted with these treasures, and it’s now our opportunity to either save or to desecrate these wonders. I could not imagine power lines in the Grand Canyon or Yosemite Valley, and I can’t imagine the sight of hundred-foot power poles as they march across the face and heart of the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

SDG&E is now before us, this generation, asking permission to do just that. I ask you and I ask us, our generation: Is this going to be a gift to the next generation, or are our natural treasures going to be desecrated with a-hundred-foot power poles as they march across our state parks?

It is our choice. It is our determination, and it is our legacy to the future generations. And I hope this generation makes that right choice.

We have this statement within the parks: Parks are forever. I hope this generation has not forgotten this statement and makes the right choice for this, in fact, is our heritage that I hope to be able to pass on.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

STATEMENT OF MR. HOLTSCLOW

MR. HOLTSCLOW: Good afternoon. Roger Holtsclow.

I am here in favor of the Powerlink. And although I can’t speak for all of my industry, I am a property manager and real estate broker here in San Diego County, have been in business here since the late sixties and, needless to say, as most of you in the room, have witnessed a tremendous amount of development.

And respecting the folks that are here who are opposed to it, I am also vehemently in favor as a result of seeing the need for housing. After all, I think it’s almost impossible to keep the area from expanding because we do have a beautiful area.
I think it’s important that we offer not only those who live here and have lived here, but those who are coming here in the future with power that’s a good source and viable. And I hope with that in mind that you take that into consideration.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Holtsclaw.

STATEMENT OF MR. O’BRIEN

MR. O’BRIEN: Hello. Thanks for the opportunity today. I’m Danny O’Brien, and I represent the Santee Chamber of Commerce. I’m the past president, I’m on the current board of directors, and I’m also a small business owner in Santee. And over the last few years, we have had the experience of — experienced energy shortages, so we know what that can be like.

And I had looked at the environmental impact report, and that’s one of the things we’re trying to do, is do good planning on this. And we would all love the alternative of it not going through the park, having maybe in-basin generation, those kinds of things; but the reality is it doesn’t work out economically. It takes too long to develop those resources. And when you look — there’s going to be 203 renewable energy produced in the alternatives versus a thousand under SDG&E’s plan. And that’s a lot more renewable energy.

They say they’re going to come up with other ways of doing it in-basin, but when you really look at renewable energy, it usually takes a large footprint. And you try to develop that in San Diego County — I’ve had the experience of trying to get projects done before, and it’s not going to happen very fast. And, unfortunately, the need that we have is pretty urgent.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MS. JOOSTEN

MS. JOOSTEN: Good afternoon. I’m Lorene Joosten, vice president of legislation for Ninth District PTA.

Ninth District PTA consists of nearly 80,000 volunteer members in San Diego and Imperial County, and we advocate for all children and youth in our communities.

Ninth District PTA has two major areas of concern with the Sunrise Powerlink proposal: The increased risk of fire, which we’ll address at the hearing in Ramona, and the impact this project may have on air quality in the Imperial Valley.

Ninth District PTA wholeheartedly supports the increased use of renewable energy, but we question if that is really what is at stake here. As an earlier speaker noted, the need to access renewables in Imperial Valley is the same argument made during the hearings for the Southwest Powerlink. While large solar facilities have been producing energy in other parts of the state for over a decade, the Stirling facility SDG&E has contracted for is dependent on technology that is not commercially viable. And the lengthy formal review process for this project has not been initiated.

SDG&E’s recent testimony that their RPS requirements can be met without the Sunrise Powerlink casts additional doubt on the renewable argument. Meanwhile, the crossborder transmission lines from the two U.S.-owned fossil-fuel plants in Mexicali are currently at half capacity, and they connect into the same Imperial Valley substation where the Sunrise Powerlink would originate.
Ninth District PTA is concerned that the Sunrise Powerlink will result in the construction of additional, unregulated, fossil-fuel power plants in Mexicali further degrading the air quality of the Imperial Valley.

The likelihood that these plants will burn imported LNG from the recently permitted Costa Azul plant, which may contain a higher concentration of pollutants, is cause for additional concern.

ALJ WEISSMAN: I'll have to ask you to wrap up.

MS. JOOSTEN: According to the Draft EIR, the Sunrise Powerlink will have 50 significant unmitigable impacts, and five of its six alternatives are environmentally superior. We have concluded that the Sunrise Powerlink Project is not the best choice to meet the energy needs of our community and it has the potential to significantly and negatively impact the health and well-being of our youngest and most vulnerable community members, our children and youth.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Ms. Joosten.

If anybody is listening from the room across the hall, there are now plenty of seats in here if you want to come over.

STATEMENT OF MR. VELTRI

MR. VELTRI: Good afternoon. My name is Sam Veltri. I'm with SunCal Companies, and my comments will be a little more focused than some of the others. So I'll read them to be expedient.

SunCal is developing Ketchum Ranch. It's submitted and consistent with the county's general plan. And Ketchum Ranch is in Jacumba, and it's necessary for the community revitalization. The Ketchum Ranch proposes sustainable components, including solar power and water conservation. And the southerly alternatives will adversely impact the ability to develop exactly what is needed and promoted for renewable resources.

While SunCal is broadly concerned about the construction of lengthy transmission lines in general and would prefer a no-wires alternative, we are mindful of the fact that the CPUC may select the wires alternative. We are concerned that the EIR is factually incorrect in several respects regarding the current condition of the Ketchum Ranch property and Jacumba, with the result that impacts are understated and appropriate mitigation is not applied.

For example, the EIR fails to address at all SunCal's proposed development, even though an application for a development, including school, public facilities and services are on file. The passage of an above-ground transmission line which crosses the ranch under each of the separate alternatives causes significant land-use, visual, noise and aesthetic impacts.

The EIR inaccurately characterizes the groundwater basin at Ketchum Ranch, which means that impacts to the community's drinking water are understated and not mitigated. And the EIR fails to properly address current agricultural uses on the land.

In addition, the EIR does not give proper weight to the social and environmental impacts on the human environment and specifically on Jacumba. As a result, the EIR concludes that all impacts on Jacumba, rural residents, farm land and future development are less significant than the alternatives. And this reasoning should not be allowed to stand. We'll submit detailed comments in the letter.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Veltri.

STATEMENT OF MS. SANFILIPPO
MS. SANFILIPPO: I’m Valerie Sanfilippo from the San Diego Sierra Club. We have 18,000 members in San Diego.

Sierra Club and I oppose the SDG&E Sunrise Powerlink. It’s a proposal for 150-foot towers that buzz from Mexico to L.A. through the Anza-Borrego State Park or the Cleveland National Forest or wherever. I understand it isn’t even power for us; we’re just an extension cord.

If it goes through the desert, it will destroy the wilderness and state park. It will no longer be a wild park. If it goes through the forest, it will cause more forest fires like the power lines did in the Witch Fire. The environmental impact scientists from the state and federal government say the power line is not necessary. It will cause air pollution, global warming, and I believe it will increase outsourcing of jobs in our national security.

I believe Powerlink is not about renewables but about the beginning of globalization of energy and jobs into Mexico with dirtier energy and cheaper jobs, cheaper labor.

My solution, I think it’s — we should require SDG&E to fund alternative clean energy jobs and technology in our country. I think they should have to build the solar roofs in our town.

The Sierra Club says we need to cut our carbon emissions 80 percent by 2050 to avoid global warming famine and drought. That’s threats to our food and water supply. We can cut 30 percent immediately with energy efficiency, which will pay for itself by energy savings.

Please require SDG&E to look forward to the future, not backward to the past or to a strange, insecure global future.

And I just want — my main point is please listen to the scientists and engineers. They’re telling the truth. Don’t listen to short-sighted business people with global ambitions. Please look forward to the future so we have a future.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MS. SUTTON

MS. SUTTON: I’m Tanya Sutton, a native southern Californian and Scripps Ranch resident. I’m strongly opposed to the outdated, damaging and expensive Sunrise Powerlink proposal.

Why would we agree to spend millions of our tax dollars on a project that would put hundreds of miles of unsightly power lines through our beautiful back country, coastal communities, parks and forests?

This project is especially unsatisfactory considering that, as the impact report indicates, there are far more cost-effective means of providing for California’s energy needs. These alternatives, unlike the Sunrise Powerlink proposal, would utilize local, renewable energy resources, which would increase our energy independence and decrease our collective carbon footprint.

Two minutes is not long enough to list the numerous shortcomings of the Sunrise Powerlink in detail, but I trust that you will review the facts and deny this proposal for the sake of Californians now and for generations to come.

Thank you.

ALJ WEISSMAN: Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF MR. PORTER