

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING

RE: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2008
JACUMBA, CALIFORNIA

REPORTED BY REGINA L. GARRISON, CSR NO. 12921

130517 - Public Meeting

1 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING,
2 commencing at the hour of 1:13 p.m., on Tuesday,
3 August 26, 2008, at 44681 Old Highway 80, Jacumba,
4 California, before Regina L. Garrison, Certified
5 Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California.

6
7
8

I N D E X

9	SCOPING MEETING (1:00 P.M.)	PAGE
10	Welcome to Scoping Meeting	
11	By: Ellen Russell	3
12	Staff Presentation	
13	By: Alberto Abreu	7
14	Public Comments	10
15		
16	SCOPING MEETING (5:00 P.M.)	PAGE
17	Welcome to Scoping Meeting	
18	By: Ellen Russell	65
19	Staff Presentation	
20	By: Alberto Abreu	68
21	Public Comments	72

22
23
24
25

□

1 (1:13 p.m.)

130517 - Public Meeting
WELCOME TO SCOPING MEETING

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to go ahead and start. My name is Ellen Russell. I'm with the United States Department of Energy, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability. And the reason DOE is here in cool Jacumba -- this is a lot like Washington, D.C. in August -- is that Sempra Generation is proposing to construct an international transmission line that, as of today, is going to be known to us as "Energia Sierra Juarez," formerly referred to by us as the "Baja Wind Project."

The entire project, as described in the presidential permit application that Sempra Generation filed with us in December and supplemented in March of -- today, is comprised of about 1250 megawatts of wind generation from -- it's constructed inside Mexico and either a 230,000-volt or 500,000-volt transmission line on about four towers inside the United States. It's about one mile, and the transmission line is to end at the San Diego Gas & Electric's proposed East County Substation.

Before any facility can be built across the border, Sempra Generation, or any entity proposing to

3

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1
2
3

build across the border, must obtain a presidential permit from the Department of Energy. A presidential permit authorizes a company to construct, operate,

4 maintain and connect facilities at the international
5 boundary.

6 Before the federal government, any part of
7 the federal government, can issue a license or permit
8 for any kind of activity, it is required to comply with
9 the National Environmental Policy Act. You guys have
10 all participated in other proceedings. You know NEPA,
11 so I don't need to go into that so much. But this is a
12 scoping meeting for an environmental assessment that
13 DOE is proposing to prepare for the -- it's hard not to
14 call it the "Baja Wind Project" -- the ESJ Project.

15 Right now, DOE is considering an EA to be the
16 appropriate level of environmental review. An EA
17 briefly provides sufficient evidence and analysis for
18 determining whether to prepare an EIS, and it aids in
19 agencies' compliance with NEPA when no EIS is
20 necessary. And it facilitates the completion of an EIS
21 if we need to go through that.

22 What this meeting is not: This meeting is
23 not about the Sunrise Project. And right now, there's
24 no action on the Energia Sierra Juarez Project before
25 the California Public Utility Commission. This meeting

4

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 is about a project that will connect East County
2 Substation, if it's built, and DOE will look at that
3 substation as a cumulative impact and not a connected
4 action, and that is our position at the present time.
5 That substation is intended to be built whether or not

6 the Baja Wind/Energia Sierra Project is constructed.

7 Now, before I begin calling on speakers, I'm
8 going to do some housekeeping. I'm going to introduce
9 you to some people I have with me. I have Brian Mills
10 with me. Brian Mills is from my office. He is our
11 office's NEPA compliance officer, and he's also a
12 project manager, like myself, on these transmission
13 projects.

14 I also have Elliot Nethercutt, who is in the
15 back of the room, who everyone signed in with. And
16 with the company, with the applicant, is Alberto Abreu
17 and Joan Heredia. And if you've signed in with Elliot
18 Nethercutt and you've done it legibly, you're going to
19 be receiving future information on this project and a
20 copy of whatever document that we produce.

21 what happens after we leave here: The public
22 record for this proceeding officially is open until the
23 3rd of September. However, that's not -- in NEPA,
24 that's not a hard and fast date. If you decide that
25 there's something that you want to let us know about in

5

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 the next month or two, send it in to me. My contact
2 information is on the federal register notice that
3 you've seen, or there are extra copies in the back.

4 NEPA -- we'll be considering those comments
5 as time permits. If you send us a comment a week
6 before we're going to be sending the document to the
7 printers, then it's less likely to be considered in

8 this go-around, but September 3rd isn't a hard and fast
9 date.

10 The court reporter is here to facilitate an
11 accurate record, make sure that we capture everything
12 you want us to know about the concerns you have for
13 this project. If you choose not to speak and leave and
14 then decide that there is something that you want us to
15 know about, as I said, drop me an e-mail. That's --
16 and it will make it into the record.

17 If you have specific questions about the
18 project itself, that's something that -- that I would
19 like you to talk to Alberto Abreu and Joan Heredia
20 about off the record. If we -- if we have a break,
21 whatever, it's most appropriate that you talk
22 specifically about the project with the applicant.

23 I'd like Alberto to give you a brief
24 overview -- brief overview of the project before we
25 start calling on anyone who would like to speak.

6

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 Alberto?

2

3

STAFF PRESENTATION

4

5

6

MR. ABREU: Good afternoon. Ellen covered
most of the aspects of the project, and so some of my
comments will be redundant to what she already
mentioned.

7

8

9

Sempra Generation currently has under control

10 under -- at least in Mexico, three-hundred -- about
11 314,000 acres of land specifically identified in the
12 leases for development of wind generation. Those
13 leaseholds are in Northern Baja California, just across
14 the border here, basically, along the Sierra Juarez --
15 Sierra Juarez Mountains, and hence the name change that
16 we made, which runs north to south from -- based up on
17 the border, 2- or 300 miles south, running through the
18 town of La Rumorosa. If you've ever been there,
19 La Rumorosa is about 35 miles east of Tecate.

20 Sempra will construct the wind energy project
21 in phases, the first phase being the closest to the
22 U.S./Mexico border and the one that's depicted in the
23 visuals up there. The subsequent phases on our
24 currently leased property will be approximately
25 50 miles further south from the lowest point at

7

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 La Rumorosa, so they're fairly far down in Mexico.

2 We expect the first phase to be something
3 like 150 or so megawatts. There's two variables to
4 determine the size of a project: One is the number of
5 turbines and the size of the turbines. And we're still
6 trying to pin both of those sort of aspects down so we
7 can know exactly how many megawatts we'll be able to
8 construct.

9 As Ellen mentioned, the presidential permit
10 application was submitted on December 18th of 2007. We
11 requested -- Baja Wind requested a permit for

12 construction of the generation tie line from Mexico to
13 the United States to allow connecting of the wind
14 projects in Mexico to the U.S. electrical grid to the
15 Southwest Powerlink. The application states that we
16 would interconnect 1250 megawatts of wind generation on
17 the U.S. grid.

18 On March the 19th of this year, in 2008, we
19 amended the application to make current changes to the
20 application, including providing additional information
21 on the size of the 230-kilovolt-option transmission
22 line that would interconnect. Our initial application
23 talked about both the 500 and 230. The amended scope
24 talks about the 500 and 230, but the amendment provided
25 additional information on the 230-interconnection

8

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 option, because we were able to get more details by
2 that point in time.

3 Today, we provided a second amendment to
4 change the name of the project -- and that's all that
5 amendment does -- from "Baja Wind U.S. Transmission,
6 LLC," to "Energia Sierra Juarez U.S. Transmission,
7 LLC," or probably more easily pronounced "ESJ," I
8 guess.

9 The central scope of the presidential permit
10 application is the construction in the United States of
11 a one-mile generation tie line, which will connect the
12 wind project to a substation to be built by SDG&E in
13 the area. The substation will interconnect to the

14 130517 - Public Meeting
Southwest Powerlink.

15 Our generation tie line will consist of
16 approximately four or five lattice towers over a
17 permanent right-of-way of approximately 130-foot wide
18 if it's a 230 or 214-foot wide if it's a 500kv.
19 Excluding any roads that may be needed, we estimate
20 that the permanent impact on the U.S. side of the
21 transmission line is approximately .25 to .3 acres for
22 the transmission line itself. Again, not counting any
23 roads.

24 As you've seen, we've set up a display.
25 We're happy to answer any questions that you may have

9

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 outside of the -- of the sort of gavel portion of the
2 proceedings, and there's Joan and I and a few others
3 here that can answer any questions that you might have.

4 Thank you.

5

6 PUBLIC COMMENTS

7

8 MS. RUSSELL: Was there anyone that
9 registered to speak, Elliot?

10 MR. NETHERCUTT: Yes.

11 MS. RUSSELL: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't know
12 you had a secret handoff.

13 Edie Harmon.

14 MS. HARMON: Can I wait?

15 MS. RUSSELL: Not a problem. I'll put you at

130517 - Public Meeting
16 the bottom of the pile.

17 Donna Tisdale. If you don't mind doing it
18 here, Ms. Tisdale, for the reporter.

19 MS. TISDALE: Donna Tisdale. I'm chair of
20 the Boulevard Planning Group in Boulevard. And the
21 change of the names from what's on the original
22 application or how it's referred to elsewhere is --
23 creates confusion. And people that will be looking for
24 it under the previous name will find -- will find
25 nothing, and so they'll think the project has gone by

10

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 the wayside when, in fact, it's moving forward under
2 another name.

3 On behalf of the Boulevard Planning Group,
4 I'm asking for a full environmental impact statement,
5 EIR, for this presidential permit application. I'm not
6 going to go into all the significant platforms of
7 environmental impacts the 1250-megawatt industrial wind
8 farm represents or the fact that they're going to need
9 more than the 7500 acres they are claiming. It's more
10 like 20- to 50,000 acres.

11 There's no guarantee that wind energy is all
12 that's going to be moved on this 500kv line. There are
13 no binding assurances the project was adequately
14 studied on the Baja side. I believe it has not been or
15 that its negative impacts will be mitigated.

16 Sempra's Gasoducto Bajanorte, their 30-inch
17 LNG line runs through the La Rumorosa lease area. A

18 new 30-inch or so waterline -- and I see Alberto
19 smirking back there -- a new 30-inch or so water
20 pipeline is currently being installed to the area.
21 when you have gas, water and transmission, it's a
22 reasonably foreseeable consequence that gas-fired power
23 plants could be built at La Rumorosa/Jacume to access
24 the U.S. grid via this new transmission line.

25 Sempra reps have said that their contracts

11

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 and agreements with the ejidos do not allow for
2 gas-fired power plants to be built. However, with the
3 proper incentives and enticements and coercements,
4 those documents can and most likely would be changed,
5 and I assume that's probably already in the works.

6 Both NEPA and CEQA require a full EIS to
7 discuss these foreseeable consequences. Sempra's
8 La Rumorosa wind project and the cross-border power
9 line are also a threat connected to actions and many
10 more projects, and they cannot be isolated or
11 piecemealed. Jacumba's impacts are huge and
12 far-reaching.

13 And those projects include: SDG&E's 500kV
14 Sunrise Powerlink, which Cal ISO has stated is needed
15 to move new energy from La Rumorosa or another line
16 just like it -- and there is no other line -- Iberdrola
17 renewables; 200-megawatt Tule wind project in McCain
18 valley; SDG&E has proposed an 80-acre ECO substation in
19 Jacumba to tap into the existing Southwest Powerlink; a

130517 - Public Meeting
20 demolition and increasing of the Boulevard Substation
21 from one acre to three-quarters acres; 14 to 25 miles
22 of new 69kV lines; and new and expanded easements
23 across public and private property that are needed to
24 connect Tule Wind, the expanded Boulevard Substation
25 and La Rumorosa Wind, whether that's gas or wind

12

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 energy, to the existing Southwest Powerlink.

2 More travel wind projects may also need to
3 tap into Southwest Powerlink at Jacumba. Bureau of
4 Land Management just caved in to pressure from
5 Iberdrola renewables and increased wind-energy-access
6 needs to San Diego County from a proposed 6900 acres to
7 over 30,000 acres, mostly in McCain valley. All of
8 those increased impacts tie into the Boulevard ECO
9 Substation, and that is tied into La Rumorosa and the
10 tapping of the Southwest Powerlink.

11 The PUC recirculated their 7500-page
12 environmental review document for Sunrise Powerlink.
13 This is a recirculated document. The main reason they
14 recirculated it was on the expand of size and scope of
15 La Rumorosa from 250 megawatts to over 1200 megawatts.
16 Public comments closed on that last night. Public
17 comments on the BLM increased wind energy access closes
18 tomorrow.

19 I also want to note that Southern California
20 Edison's power purchase agreement for the first --
21 Phase I of this La Rumorosa Energia, whatever it is

22 now, was withdrawn from the PUC approval process after
23 the Center for Biological Diversity Challenge saying it
24 would most likely violate an international treaty and
25 state and federal environmental laws.

13

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 And I could go on, but other people want to
2 talk, and this is much bigger than they're saying it
3 is. And there's no reason we should let them move this
4 forward, because it's going to change the face of our
5 community and these beautiful areas that so many people
6 enjoy far into the future.

7 So we're serious. We want a full
8 environmental impact statement, and we're not going to
9 accept anything else. I mean, if you're going to do
10 it, you better do it right. Thank you.

11 MS. RUSSELL: Bill Parsons.

12 MR. PARSONS: I don't have much to say,
13 except to second -- you're asking me to stand up here,
14 so you can hear me?

15 MS. RUSSELL: For the reporter.

16 MR. PARSONS: Oh, okay.

17 I don't have any new information to give you,
18 just an opinion that this is a scoping meeting. And
19 right now, it looks like the study of the entire area
20 is needed, but a microscope is going to be used, and I
21 don't think that's appropriate.

22 I think you need to study the entire impacts
23 of what will happen if this transmission corridor is

24 approved, because you're not going to just inject the
25 energy into the ground. It doesn't end at the Jacumba

14

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 Substation. It goes everywhere. It's part of a much
2 larger plan that's been presented by SDG&E in a
3 stealthy way.

4 And it's one little phase at a time, and
5 another little phase, and I think you ought to include
6 everything that is relevant in your study and make it a
7 full EIS.

8 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

9 MR. PARSONS: Uh-huh.

10 MS. RUSSELL: Just a second.

11 Anita Williams, please.

12 MS. WILLIAMS: Just to say -- Bill Parsons
13 said --

14 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you very much.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: There are incredible
16 archaeological sites. There is valuable and scarce
17 ground-walkers. All these things need to be taken into
18 account. And this project, which apparently is being
19 presented as an isolated thing, isn't isolated. It's
20 related to a whole bunch of other stuff and needs to be
21 so considered.

22 MS. RUSSELL: Gary Hoyt.

23 MR. HOYT: Hello. Gary Hoyt from Boulevard.

24 In the past few years, I've become very
25 skeptical of SDG&E and Sempra Energy. I and other

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

1 people in this room have fought with projects, and
2 maybe we're going to be successful, and maybe we're
3 not. But I want to address this project, and if I do
4 sound skeptical to SDG&E, there's a reason for it.
5 What I'm going to relate to is the 14-mile line from
6 SWPL line to Boulevard and the proposed expansion of
7 the Boulevard Substation.

8 We have dust problems and air pollution
9 problems here in East County. If we have another
10 14 miles of road that open up under a transmission
11 line, that's going to open up dust/air pollution,
12 off-road vehicle traffic, Border Patrol traffic,
13 smuggling of illegals and drugs from Mexico, plus other
14 activities affecting easements -- or residents along
15 the easement and other members of our community. Dust
16 flies for miles.

17 And in the case we do have a fire -- heaven
18 forbid -- there will be concerns with more electrical
19 cables that we have to deal with for those people. And
20 also, we have overhead Border Patrol and helicopters,
21 and we've got more lines to be careful. So their
22 enforcement activities are going to be harder.

23 To show more skepticism of SDG&E, the
24 69kV line that's existing here in Boulevard has a
25 30-foot-wide easement. Why does SDG&E need 100 feet

1 for this easement? I think SDG&E has got something in
2 their back pocket for future -- well, one of which
3 being either a 230kV line or a 500kV line, underground
4 gas-transmission lines, or whatever else they want to
5 run on that extra footage they have for an easement.

6 And like I said, there's a 69kV line on a
7 30-foot easement now. Why is a 100-foot-wide easement
8 needed? I, too, by the way --

9 (Court reporter interruption.)

10 MR. HOYT: Oh, should I be speaking your way?

11 Now, let's take, for example, your project is
12 approved, and you're running the electricity from the
13 SWPL line up to the Boulevard Substation, which
14 supposedly is going to be tripled in size. Now there's
15 health hazards for people that live in that area.
16 There's houses close by. There's elderly people that
17 live close by, and there's also a buzz that we go to
18 sleep with and we wake up with at the existing level of
19 that substation. If it's tripled in size, what's that
20 going to do for health potential and for our peace of
21 mind?

22 Also, and lastly, maybe this is something
23 that you want to consider. I haven't seen this line,
24 and I have been told this by people --

25 (Court reporter interruption.)

17

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MR. HOYT: I haven't seen this on a map, but
2 I've been told this by people supposedly in the know
3 that the area that the existing Boulevard Substation is
4 located is on or near the San Andreas Fault. Now, if
5 we're going to fill all that area with a larger
6 substation and more overhead electrical lines, what
7 could happen here in Boulevard to the residents and to
8 SDG&E's equipment if we have a major earthquake?

9 So I also request an EIS and would be most --
10 would be quite interested in it. Thank you.

11 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

12 Mr. Lutz. I assume you're Mr. Lutz. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. LUTZ: Hello. My name is Ray Lutz, and
15 I'm with citizenoversight.org. I'm also a candidate
16 for the 77th Assembly District, which is all of this
17 backcountry, all the East County, pretty much. You're
18 welcome to pick up my written comments.

19 I'm -- first of all, I'd like to say I object
20 to the notion that this meeting cannot discuss the
21 Sunrise Powerlink, because that document actually
22 referenced this project as the reason for the
23 recirculation. So I would request that you go back and
24 take a look at that -- these things, and don't come in
25 here and say we can't discuss something that's already

18

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 been found to be related.

2 That's been found to be related, and it had
Page 17

3 to be recirculated. So this -- this meeting,
4 therefore, is open to those discussions. So anybody
5 who wants to discuss Sunrise Powerlink, it's open. So
6 that notion -- let's just put it to bed, that it's
7 not -- you can't constrain a meeting to be only about
8 one thing when it's already been found to be in the
9 document.

10 The document is irrational. It doesn't
11 support itself. They talk about 7500 acres where
12 they're planning to put in 500 wind turbines. 500 wind
13 turbines, they say, are two megawatts in size. That
14 would make -- and some of them three megawatts, making
15 this 1250 megawatts, which would be the largest wind
16 farm on earth. No wind farm has ever been made this
17 big so far.

18 The big one out in the London Array outside
19 the gulf of -- of the Thames is a gigawatt. Okay. So
20 it's similar in size, but it's huge. So this is not
21 something that you can just say, "We're going to have
22 this 1250 megawatts, and we're not sure where we're
23 going to put them on -- on the mountains." You have to
24 tell us where they're going to go.

25 Now they said they've changed it. They've

19

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 changed it -- not only the name, but now they're
2 shuffling the deck with different amounts of acres and
3 a different place. They moved it to a new mountain.

4 If you take what they say in the document,
Page 18

5 they state that for a 300-foot diameter -- rotor
6 diameter, that they need to space these wind turbines
7 about eight to ten rotor diameters apart. You notice
8 the one up on the hill at Campo, the reservation,
9 there's only one line of 20 or so wind turbines.
10 There's nothing behind them. If you put a wind turbine
11 right behind them, they don't do anything. They sit
12 there, still.

13 In the document by SDG&E, they state that
14 the -- that they expect eight to ten rotor diameters
15 apart. And other documents say that the normal
16 distance -- width is five rotor diameters. So you're
17 talking about around 100 acres per wind turbine.

18 Other projects support this. Biglow Canyon
19 wind Farm in Sherman County, Oregon, is designed for
20 450 megawatts. It has 225 turbines, and it uses
21 25,000 acres. Okay. That's 111 acres each.

22 Desert Sky Wind Farm has 160 megawatts and is
23 fairly small compared to this one. 107 turbines on
24 9600 acres, 90 acres each.

25 Fowler Ridge Wind Farm, very similar terrain

20

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 to this one, lots of uneven terrain with hills, is 750
2 megawatts. A pretty big one. They use smaller --
3 smaller wind turbines, one-and-a-half megawatts, but
4 they still use 38,400 acres and 173 acres apiece.
5 That's because you can't max -- even though their spec
6 says 58 to 74 acres apiece, because of the spacing,

7 they still take 173 acres.

8 Horse Hollow Wind Energy Center in Nolan
9 County, Texas, will be the largest wind farm in the
10 world when it's completed: 736 megawatts using 421
11 1.5-megawatt and 2.3-megawatt turbines, uses 47,000
12 acres or 111 acres each.

13 So here's various examples of actual wind
14 farms that have been put in wherein no case do they fit
15 them on under 90 to 100 acres apiece for these big wind
16 turbines. Meanwhile, SDG&E says -- oh, the London
17 Array, I mentioned. They use 169 acres apiece.
18 They're bigger wind turbines.

19 Well, it used to be called the "La Rumorosa
20 Wind Energy Project." I guess they changed the name
21 two times now. It became "Baja Wind," and now it's
22 this other name that no one can pronounce.

23 They said 7500 acres, which means that you
24 could put 75 turbines on it, not 500. So the
25 difference between reality and what they're saying is

21

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 like night and day. These people are either totally
2 inept and don't know what they're doing, and they're
3 coming to the table with figures that mean nothing, and
4 they think that the public is going to accept this.

5 We're not. We're not going to accept numbers
6 that are worthless. And we're not going to accept
7 shuffling a deck, coming back and forth with different
8 names, different figures and so forth. This group is

9 out of line.

10 So not only would it be the largest wind farm
11 on earth, they would be able to space the turbines
12 unlike no other wind farm: Six to ten times more
13 densely, which means if they did this, they would just
14 be totally wasting your money. The question is: Why
15 would this wind farm be different from all other wind
16 farms in the world?

17 And the reason for this -- this transmission
18 line, which is on the table for discussion, is because
19 they claim that they're going to have this 1250
20 megawatts. I say, "No. Prove it. Show me where the
21 1250 comes in. Let's see where the sliding of those
22 wind turbines is going to be," because as it stands,
23 they don't have any foundation.

24 Then on -- when we get done with this bogus
25 rationale, we come to find out that the natural gas

22

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 pipeline goes through the area, the same natural gas
2 pipeline that is being used for the Mexicali Power
3 Plants, which is the underlying real reason for the
4 Sunrise Powerlink.

5 I think this is not -- this doesn't even
6 deserve any further review. This project should just
7 be canned. If anybody comes to the table with a
8 project this bad with this many defects in it upfront,
9 I would say, "Just forget it. We're not going to
10 consider it." I guess we have to.

11 SDG&E has their ability and unlimited amount
12 of money. They can start as many projects as they
13 want, make all the residents and the citizens have to
14 scramble with different dates, which are really
15 discouraging for you guys to set all these different
16 dates, scramble the projects, do the thing like you did
17 here today where you say, "These things are not
18 connected," when they obviously are. It makes it
19 difficult to deal with this.

20 I'd say, yeah, we need a full environmental
21 impact statement. But more than that, we need a good
22 rationale for why they should be put on, because the
23 one that's on the table is bogus.

24 Thank you very much.

25 MS. RUSSELL: Edie Harmon.

23

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MS. HARMON: And I would agree.
2 I'm -- I'm not from rural San Diego County.
3 I live in Imperial County. And about a month ago,
4 Donna Tisdale and I were the only members of the public
5 that were present at a pre-application meeting for the
6 Solar Tube Project in Imperial County where they were
7 proposing -- the company, Sterling Energy, was
8 proposing to put in up to 30,000 big solar dishes on --
9 to generate solar electricity in an area south of
10 Plaster City -- between Plaster City and the
11 interstate, right next to an off-road-vehicle open area
12 and just due east of an area where there's so much

13 blowing sand that they periodically had to close the
14 interstate.

15 It really didn't make a whole lot of sense.
16 And one of the questions that we asked was whether
17 the -- that the energy produced would be grid-ready
18 electricity at the end. I asked, "If it's grid-ready
19 power, why wouldn't you want to be putting this kind of
20 installation in the parking lots for the hospitals and
21 schools, the big shopping centers, everywhere that
22 there's a large use of electricity?"

23 And there was, like, dead silence. And the
24 answer was: "It wouldn't be profitable." It wasn't
25 about producing energy where it's going to be used; it

24

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 was about profit. And that project was intended to be
2 put into, again, the Sunrise Powerlink or one of these
3 other big power links.

4 So I think when you're -- you need to do a
5 full EIS, but you really need to consider all of the
6 projects that are being proposed rather than
7 piecemealing each one and looking at partial impacts,
8 because we're talking about a transmission line. And
9 basically, San Diego Gas & Electric is saying that the
10 existing facility has not got the capacity to deal with
11 the electricity from all of the projects that are being
12 proposed.

13 And therefore, I think you need to look --
14 willing to look at more than just an isolated portion

15 of the project.

16 MS. RUSSELL: Dennis Berglund,
17 B-e-r-g-l-u-n-d.

18 MR. BERGLUND: I'm Dennis Berglund. I'm a
19 registered electrical engineer, and I'm a resident of
20 an area slightly west of here. And I wasn't going to
21 talk originally, but then I thought there's
22 something -- a lot of information that needs to be
23 imparted to the agency, such as yourselves, that live
24 in those hot, sweltering places in Washington, D.C.

25 First of all, you probably realize there's

25

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 been a significant history of deception, and this
2 deception has resulted in SDG&E putting these plans
3 together: First, the Rainbow Project and then the
4 Sunrise Powerlink Project. And now we're, of course,
5 dealing with power from Mexico and La Rumorosa.

6 It appears to me that the 1250 megawatts,
7 which has been in question, the project which was
8 proposed by SDG&E, was only proposed subsequent to all
9 the problems they're having with filling this line.
10 Because the first thing they said about the Sunrise
11 Powerlink was, "Well, we needed to run eco-friendly
12 power."

13 And we said, "Then why are you running it all
14 the way to L.A.? Don't you want to run your power that
15 you've already sold in Mexico to Los Angeles?"

16 "Oh, no, no. We don't need to do that.

17 That's already run. We need to get the eco power out
18 of the desert."

19 We said, "There is no eco power in the
20 desert, except for the geothermal plans, and they're
21 better attached to SDE."

22 They said, "Well, we have other projects in
23 mind. We have the Sterling Energy Project," which they
24 want to put out in the desert. Well, the Sterling
25 Energy Project relies on a technology that's never been

26

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 used in production anywhere in the world. Kind of
2 interesting.

3 So, all of a sudden, comes along the
4 1250-megawatt plant or power over in Mexico. It's also
5 known to me that it's in the same location as both the
6 water and the gas line that they ran from their other
7 plant in Ensenada, goes right through there, although
8 they said, "Well, we don't want to put anymore gas
9 lines."

10 In that regard, I think the board needs to
11 ask the question: Why do you have to go to Mexico at
12 all for power for America? So I don't know if you are
13 particularly aware of the vulnerability of an overhead
14 power line, but this is a very disruptive border, which
15 looks like it will be disruptive for many, many years
16 to come.

17 We've got problems with gangs and such, and
18 if this erupts into anything more formal or more

19 organized, all you have to do to take out this entire
20 power link is blow out one leg of one tower. That's
21 it. That tower takes itself down, all the other towers
22 fall, the line is down. It's not germane in this case,
23 but when you do that across the freeway, like
24 Highway 8, you not only take out the power line, you
25 take out the freeway.

27

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 So why don't they run it underground? well,
2 that costs too much money. Now let me tell you
3 something else. All you have to do is have one of
4 these gas cannons that shoots a battling ball and a
5 piece of galvanized wire -- all you have to do is shoot
6 it about 75 feet in the air, and you also take out a
7 power line.

8 Now, no one would do that in America. Of
9 course, no one would fly airplanes into skyscrapers
10 either. But it's so simple that we could build a
11 cannon -- these guys can build these little -- a
12 carbine cannon or the equivalent. You can essentially
13 use that technology to take down a whole power line.
14 It's never been done yet, not in these days.

15 But my big question about Mexico is: why do
16 we do it at all? we claim that we have all this power.
17 we have this huge desert, and there's very successful
18 geothermal and solar plants out there, but we don't
19 need to do that. We need to do La Rumorosa.

20 Now, when you combine that and use
Page 26

21 conventional wisdom, like in Newsweek, and you look at
22 where this power is and where they want to put the
23 power line and where they sold the power in the past,
24 it's very apparent. And any logistician will say,
25 "This is pretty obvious. You've got power down here

28

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 you want to develop. You have a power line you want to
2 run like this, and you have a market up here."

3 In fact, when I talked last year to a group
4 down in San Diego, we talked about the emergency -- the
5 necessity for power in San Diego County, when your own
6 map showed that there's no critical requirement for
7 energy in the future in San Diego County. It's all
8 Los Angeles.

9 Now let me continue on here just shortly.
10 You've all seen T. Boone Pickens, and you know he's an
11 honest, forthright American who only wants to do things
12 right for America. And so he's running these ads, and
13 he wants to put wind power all up through Northern
14 Texas and Oklahoma. Well, that's a good idea.

15 And then I talked to the people in Texas, and
16 they said, "Do you really know about T. Boone Pickens?"
17 He has an overt desire -- or request, and he has an
18 implicit covert desire. And it just so happens that
19 he's been trying for years to run a water pipeline down
20 from that area down to Houston, because he says, "You
21 know, they don't need the water now, but they're going
22 to need it one of these days." He needs and wants the

23 world or the states to give him a right-of-way, which
24 will work for his power -- I mean, for his waterline.

25 The reason I mention that is that SDG&E has a

29

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 history of similar activities, and they need to be
2 looked at with that in mind, because they have things
3 like we've talked about. They only want to put in a
4 69kV line, but they ask for an easement for a much
5 larger line, and that's the reason these things need to
6 be looked at.

7 But I would hope that someone would look at
8 the desire of America to have to rely on questionable
9 power from across an international border. Now, we're
10 going to be great friends with Mexico, I hope, because
11 1250 megawatts, if it's tied to the grid and then taken
12 off the grid, would cause horrendous disruption to a
13 normal and area power. Thank you.

14 MS. RUSSELL: You couldn't write better than
15 this, Elliot?

16 Mark --

17 MR. OSTRANDER: Ostrander.

18 MS. RUSSELL: -- Ostrander.

19 MR. OSTRANDER: I want to come out and talk
20 about the different projects. We're told we can't talk
21 about Sunrise, and I want to reiterate what Lutz said
22 when you hear that Sunrise -- recirculation of their
23 draft because they had to talk about the wind farm.

24 My other question is about that, too. Is

25 this subplant that they don't even have -- this power

30

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 station that they want to put in, what happens if it
2 doesn't go in? What happens then? We got this power
3 line sitting there. What's the question? Why is that
4 going in before the subplant? Is that going to be that
5 the power plant is going to go in because the line is
6 there already, and that makes it more a necessity for
7 it to go there?

8 The studies that they have on -- currently,
9 as to environmental dates on there -- and I was reading
10 on some of the archaeological reports -- they missed
11 the archaeological district. They didn't even talk
12 about it. Even in their own information they've
13 brought up to put into their environmental impact
14 statement, they didn't even address it. They didn't
15 even take their own work and put it in there. They
16 missed it.

17 So who's going to do these environmental
18 assessments? Who's going to do the assessments? All
19 these things should come into play, not just this one
20 place across the border. They're all a part of that.
21 There's -- I think you narrowed it down to three
22 different ways they're going to go over the line. It's
23 coming through this way, the most logical choice.

24 They're going to put the substation down
25 there. They're going to put the line out there. Why

31

1 aren't they buried? What assurances do we have about
2 fire protection? Let's look at legal litigation that's
3 happening right now about some of the wildfires we had
4 last year. What about previous years? We bring them
5 up above ground, we're still going to have those
6 issues.

7 How are you going to clear underneath the
8 power lines if they can't even clear under the existing
9 ones they have now?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

11 MR. OSTRANDER: What are they going to do?
12 So I'm for that you need to do a full environmental
13 statement on it. You can't just say it, and that's it.

14 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

15 LeAnn Carmichael.

16 MS. CARMICHAEL: I just wanted to say to the
17 County of San Diego that a full environmental impact
18 statement be completed so that the whole of the action
19 and not just the piecemeal -- not just the piecemeal
20 part that is being proposed in the EA.

21 There's several Class I and Class II impacts
22 that are discussed in the power link document
23 associated with Baja Wind, and those need to be
24 addressed in a full EIS. And direct impacts to the
25 United States from the project also need to be

32

1 reviewed. And finally, a need for the project needs to
2 be demonstrated.

3 And we'll be submitting our comments Friday.

4 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

5 Is there another speaker who would like to
6 speak now? Or we'll adjourn the record for half an
7 hour or so.

8 Yes, ma'am.

9 MS. TISDALE: One issue I forgot to
10 address -- Donna Tisdale again -- I forgot to address
11 the fact that part of my research and the research of a
12 lot of organizations that have started studying
13 industrial wind energy and the realities of it, what
14 they've come up with is that the industrial wind, on
15 average, meets -- they only produce between 10 and
16 30 percent of template value.

17 So if you have a 200-megawatt facility,
18 you've got about maybe, you know, 20 megawatts of wind.
19 And all that needs backup generation, and the typical
20 backup generation of that is natural gas. And that's
21 the connection I forgot to put between the proposed
22 wind project in La Rumorosa and the convenient access
23 to gas -- potential gas part of the border.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. RUSSELL: We're going to adjourn the

33

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 record for a half an hour. You guys can think of
2 anything else that we -- I'm sorry -- during that time,
3 if you have specific questions about the project, the
4 representatives from Sempra can answer your questions.

5 Thank you.

6 (Recess.)

7 MS. RUSSELL: Ms. Conklin?

8 MS. CONKLIN: Yes. Okay. Hi. Oh, good. I
9 get the podium. Are we on the record? Good.

10 My name is Diane Conklin. I come from
11 Ramona, and I am an intervener with the -- on behalf of
12 my neighborhood, the Mussey Grade Road lines in Ramona,
13 and I'm an intervener in the California Public Utility
14 Commission proceedings on Sunrise Powerlink. And as
15 you all know -- and we have some Sempra people here,
16 still? Yes.

17 As you all know, the project that is being
18 discussed today is directly related to the recirculated
19 draft environmental impact report. This document
20 comments upon -- which were due yesterday at the
21 CPUC -- all of this is about La Rumorosa or a majority
22 of it.

23 So I appreciate the opportunity to come all
24 the way to Jacumba -- it's a long haul from Ramona --
25 and I appreciate the opportunity to speak, and I

34

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 appreciate the opportunity to ask some questions. And
2 every time I come down here, they take a break, and

3 then I don't get to ask any questions. So now we've
4 reassembled, and I understand anyone can ask questions.

5 So I don't really want to stand at the podium
6 and ask questions that way, but they put me here, so
7 let me try it this way. I think that -- have the
8 Sempra people here identified themselves on the record?

9 MS. RUSSELL: Yes, they have.

10 MS. CONKLIN: Oh, okay. And who are they? I
11 don't know who they are.

12 MS. RUSSELL: In the blue shirt is Alberto
13 Abreu.

14 MS. CONKLIN: There's two blue shirts.

15 MS. RUSSELL: I'm Sorry. I meant --

16 MS. CONKLIN: There's three blue shirts.

17 There's four blue shirts.

18 MS. RUSSELL: The man who raised his hand.

19 MS. CONKLIN: Okay. Alberto, Diane, nice to
20 meet you.

21 MR. ABREU: Nice to meet you.

22 MR. LARSON: Art Larson, communications.

23 MS. CONKLIN: Art Larson, communications,
24 nice to meet you.

25 MR. ROWLEY: Joe Rowley, project development.

35

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MS. CONKLIN: Joe Rowley, project
2 development.

3 Okay. Fine. My quest- -- pardon me. I'm so
4 sorry.

5 MS. HEREDIA: I'm Joan Heredia. I'm the
6 permitting manager for Sempra.
7 MS. CONKLIN: Marketing?
8 MS. HEREDIA: Permitting.
9 MS. CONKLIN: Permitting. Oh, Joanne? Nice
10 to meet you, Joanne.
11 And --
12 MS. TURNER: Brandi Turner, community
13 partnership.
14 MS. CONKLIN: Brandi. Oh, hi.
15 MS. BRIGGS: Lisa Briggs, government affairs,
16 Sempra.
17 MS. CONKLIN: Thank you so much for
18 identifying yourselves. And I'm sure I will not
19 remember everyone's names, but I'll remember Joanne
20 because she's permitting. And you should all sit
21 together with the guys.
22 All right. My -- I have five questions here,
23 and then if anyone else wants to chime in with
24 questions, please do. But I wanted to know -- and I
25 apologize because I got here late. It's a long trip --

36

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 is this project -- and whoever wants to take it, please
2 take it -- is this project for wind alone, and how do
3 we know that?
4 MR. MILLS: Excuse me. They're not speaking.
5 You are.
6 MS. CONKLIN: No, I'm asking Sempra.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. RUSSELL: For purposes of this

document --

MS. CONKLIN: No. I'm asking Sempra to be on the record with regard to my question.

MS. RUSSELL: And at the -- the presidential permit application, the application for our office --

MS. CONKLIN: Yes.

MS. RUSSELL: -- indicates that the project is a wind project.

MS. CONKLIN: Okay. what I would like to do is have Sempra tell me that themselves. Can they do that?

MS. RUSSELL: They can do that once we close the record. Yes, ma'am.

MS. CONKLIN: Well, are they allowed to do it on the record?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They should be on the record.

MS. CONKLIN: Is there anything prohibiting

37

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

them from speaking on the record?

MS. RUSSELL: When Mr. Abreu made his opening comments, he did indicate that it was a wind project.

MS. CONKLIN: Right. But I'm asking a question, and we were told we could ask questions, so I'm asking a question to be on the record. Sempra Generation is here. I'm sure they can answer the question.

9 Are you precluded from answering the question
10 by any rule or regulation?

11 MR. MILLS: Ah, go ahead.

12 MS. RUSSELL: If you choose to answer the
13 question, you may. But I am not --

14 MS. CONKLIN: Are you acting as their
15 counsel?

16 MS. RUSSELL: No. I am acting as the
17 chairperson of this meeting.

18 MS. CONKLIN: Okay. Then you do not
19 represent Sempra.

20 MS. RUSSELL: I do not represent Sempra. And
21 I had mentioned at the very beginning of this meeting
22 the questions of the applicant should be asked off the
23 record --

24 MS. CONKLIN: Right. And that's a very
25 strange --

38

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MS. RUSSELL: -- because they do not
2 contribute to the scoping.

3 MS. CONKLIN: That's a very strange request
4 in my mind, because this is a public meeting for a
5 public purpose in terms of the information to be passed
6 back and forth with a record. And I so appreciate you
7 allowing me to do this. I am not trying to cause any
8 problems. I simply want to ask Sempra Generation some
9 questions on the record.

10 So the question is: Is this for wind

11 Generation, La Rumorosa Project, despite it's name
12 change, and what -- how can we know that for sure?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, we got our
14 answer.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You can put your
16 questions in writing.

17 (Court reporter interruption.)

18 MS. CONKLIN: Well, I don't want to put my
19 questions in writing, and I would like to have the
20 person who suggested I put my questions in writing
21 identify himself for the record, who has just walked
22 over and spoken to you without identifying himself for
23 the record in terms of what he was saying and what was
24 the purpose of what he said to you.

25 So I think your name is --

39

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MR. ABREU: My name is Alberto Abreu, and
2 what I asked him -- what I had mentioned to him was
3 we'd be happy to answer any questions if you were to
4 put them in writing.

5 MS. CONKLIN: I appreciate that, and I
6 understand that you may want to have time to think
7 about the answers. But I would also think that if I
8 were to come up to you individually during the break
9 and ask you the same question, you would have been
10 willing to answer me. What is different now that I'm
11 asking you publicly?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Simple question. Is

13

it wind only or not?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ABREU: The difference is that this is DOE's hearing to receive comments from the public about what environmental -- what the environmental document that we're going to prepare should include. It's not really a question-and-answer session for that.

We proposed to DOE that, outside of this scoping hearing, we provide responses and that sort of thing and provide some pictures and visual simulations and whatnot, and that's what we've done.

MS. CONKLIN: I understand that, and I appreciate it, and I realize that this is for comments on the presidential permit. But my questions, I think,

40

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

are very germane to the presidential permit, and that is why I would like to ask them and have them answered.

Now, also in your material that you're showing here, you're not talking simply about environment. You're talking about the project as a whole. So if you can't answer "It's about wind," if that's an uncomfortable question for you -- and I will submit a question in writing -- can we go to the next question: who is the customer for the energy generated by La Rumorosa?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Once again, put it in writing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're putting together -- you keep sending signals --

15 MR. MILLS: It's -- it's a hearing.

16 (Court reporter interruption.)

17 MS. RUSSELL: Excuse me. The reporter can't
18 capture everyone's comments, but I will add that, in
19 the scoping notice that we did publish, it says -- and
20 I quote -- "The entire electrical output of the
21 La Rumorosa Project, 1250 megawatts, approximately 260
22 to 300 turbines, would be dedicated to the U.S. market
23 and delivered using the proposed international
24 transmission line."

25 MS. CONKLIN: Okay. Thank you for that.

41

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 And if you want the DOE to keep answering
2 questions, I guess maybe that's the best we can do.
3 But I think it does show that you have a reluctance to
4 answer the questions, which I think is kind of silly.

5 MS. RUSSELL: Ms. Carmichael [sic], earlier
6 in the meeting, there were several commentators who did
7 ask us to consider the concept of fossil fuel
8 generation inside Mexico.

9 MS. CONKLIN: Okay. Thank you so much for
10 that. I appreciate that.

11 where is my -- I'll just go through them
12 then. If they don't get answered, at least they get
13 into the record. Where is the backup energy for the
14 wind? Do we have an answer about that with regard to
15 the environmental statement?

16 MS. RUSSELL: No. We have not developed that

17

information.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CONKLIN: All right. So we're aware -- I was driving down 8 today, and they have these wind turbines on 8 -- well, by 8 -- with the -- I think it's the Campo Indian Reservation -- and hardly any of them were turning.

So somebody once told me that it's only about 30 percent efficiency, and I didn't believe it. But I know that wind doesn't blow all the time. So if you

42

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1

have a customer that wants a certain amount of

2

electricity and you don't have the wind, how is that

3

going to be made up?

4

5

6

7

8

Okay. Is this permit -- is this permit going to be conditioned for renewable energy only? I wish the DOE worked for me. That's what I wish. Is this permit going to be conditioned for renewable energy only? Does anybody know?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MS. RUSSELL: We won't be able to tell you that until we get closer to the end of the proceeding.

MS. CONKLIN: But you're talking about getting a permit for a line for a renewable project?

MS. RUSSELL: That is correct. That is correct.

MS. CONKLIN: But you don't know yet whether or not it will only be renewable?

MS. RUSSELL: I'm assuming that it is only renewable. We can only go from what's currently in the

19 record, and if they have to amend their application to
20 include a fossil fuel facility, then we would consider
21 it at that time.

22 MS. CONKLIN: Yeah, well, then what we're
23 saying is that if you have a kind of connected
24 action -- in other words, you get a permit, and then
25 you do something else, which you knew you were going to

43

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 do at the time that you got the permit. Under the CEQA
2 law, that wouldn't be right.

3 I don't know what the federal law is for the
4 federal presidential permit. I'm sure there's a mighty
5 big rush on this permit because of the potential change
6 in the administration, and I'm sure that there's a lot
7 of pressure on people to get this done.

8 But what I'm trying to say is: If you have a
9 wind energy project, which is renewable, can I ask
10 Sempra Generation to tell me if this is a permit that
11 is going to be conditioned, and would they be accepting
12 a permit conditioned for renewables only?

13 MS. RUSSELL: They can't know the content of
14 a permit that we issue.

15 MS. CONKLIN: Who does?

16 MS. RUSSELL: It will come at the end of the
17 proceeding.

18 MS. CONKLIN: Okay. Who issues the permit?

19 MS. RUSSELL: The permit is issued by the
20 Department of Energy.

21 MS. CONKLIN: Is it the secretary of the
22 Department of Energy?

23 MS. RUSSELL: No, it is not. It is Anthony
24 Como at the moment.

25 MS. CONKLIN: And that is what office?

44

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MS. RUSSELL: He is the director, office of
2 permitting and citing.

3 MS. CONKLIN: Thank you very much. I
4 appreciate that information.

5 And the final question I had was about
6 greenhouse gas emissions. We know that in California
7 we have a desire, at least under AB 32, which was
8 signed into law to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and
9 the question is: How does the -- how -- and, of
10 course, these questions can be seen as comments -- how
11 does the greenhouse gas emissions that might be
12 produced by this wind project feed into or do they have
13 any relationship to California standards when it is
14 produced in a foreign country?

15 MS. RUSSELL: That's an interesting question.
16 For the record, I do not know the answer to that.

17 MS. CONKLIN: Okay. Thank you very much.

18 I want to say that I did not come here to
19 cause consternation. I came here really to find out
20 these questions. I'm very sorry that Sempra is not
21 willing to answer them publicly. I think it's kind of
22 silly, because I think that you know what your project

130517 - Public Meeting
23 is all about. And I think that the Department of
24 Energy would not mind if you were answering questions.
25 On the other hand, I do understand that this

45

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 is a Department of Energy public hearing for scoping
2 comments on the environmental issues. So kind of a
3 weighing of the two, you know, I can understand your
4 position, but I also wish you had answered the
5 questions.

6 And for myself, I would like to state that
7 this project is large enough and the impacts are great
8 enough in terms of the unknowns that we have talked
9 about here, that I think a full environmental impact
10 statement should be done.

11 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

12 MS. CONKLIN: Thank you.

13 MS. RUSSELL: Is there anyone else who would
14 like to speak before we close the record for the day?

15 Mr. Lutz.

16 MR. LUTZ: Yes. I guess this brings up a
17 good question. In the federal register, it says that
18 interested parties could come here and, either by oral
19 or written, should ask questions. That implies that
20 we're going to get some answers. When do we get the
21 answers to the questions?

22 MR. MILLS: If the question is an
23 environmental issue, it will be addressed in the
24 document, whether it's an EA or EIS.

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 that question is out of the scope of the meeting?

2 MR. MILLS: Well, it could be, but it may not
3 be. That's a --

4 MR. LUTZ: But If -- but there would be at
5 least some answer to the question, right? Either the
6 question -- your answer might be it's out of the scope
7 of -- that "we can't answer that question because we're
8 not allowed to" or "we don't know" or --

9 MR. MILLS: NEPA doesn't require that the
10 agency answer the scoping questions, but address good
11 questions as prescoped analysis. So you will find out
12 if your -- if your -- you know, if you have a real good
13 question about an environmental issue that you think --
14 and we look at it and, "Oh, we need to do that," then
15 it will be in the document. Not necessarily the
16 question, but the issue in question.

17 MR. LUTZ: So people being here, they're
18 unwilling to answer questions --

19 MR. MILLS: Well, they're not the ones who
20 are going to answer your questions.

21 MR. LUTZ: Who does?

22 MR. MILLS: It will be answered -- your
23 environmental questions, if they're addressed as an
24 issue, will be addressed in the document itself.
25 That's the DOE's responsibility to produce the

□

1 document.

2 MR. LUTZ: Okay. So you're saying that the
3 questions might be answered in the document?

4 MR. MILLS: If they're pertinent to the
5 environmental issues being raised.

6 MR. LUTZ: Who decides which answers -- which
7 questions get answered? Who's going to make that -- is
8 it people who are paid by Sempra Energy and --

9 MR. MILLS: No. The Department of Energy
10 gets to decide.

11 MR. LUTZ: The Department of Energy decides
12 whose questions get answered?

13 MR. MILLS: In our document, yes, we do.

14 MR. LUTZ: So that's you guys?

15 MR. MILLS: Yeah.

16 MR. LUTZ: Okay. How do we go up a level?
17 Like, if we want to get past this level of Department
18 of Energy and go up a level, who's above you? Who's
19 the next layer up so we can get the questions answered,
20 because you guys say you're not going to answer the
21 questions.

22 MR. MILLS: That's not what I said. We can't
23 answer your questions today, because we haven't --

24 MR. LUTZ: I know, but what is the next level
25 up if we want to go above you?

48

□

1 MS. RUSSELL: The assistant secretary for
2 Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability is Kevin
3 Kolevar.

4 MR. LUTZ: Okay. I'll get that afterwards,
5 so I can have --

6 MR. ROWLEY: I'd like to interject, if I
7 could. My apologies.

8 MS. RUSSELL: You have to come to the --

9 MR. ROWLEY: Okay. Great.

10 I fully understand that --

11 THE COURT REPORTER: Your name, please.

12 MS. RUSSELL: You have to identify yourself
13 for the record.

14 MR. ROWLEY: I'm sorry. Joe Rowley with
15 Sempra Generation.

16 I fully understand that it is not the purpose
17 of your hearing to have question and answers with
18 Sempra Generation. And that's the only reason for our
19 reluctance to answer questions, is we didn't want to
20 disrupt the normal process of the hearing.

21 But there are very clear and direct answers
22 to the questions that have been posed. I'd be glad to
23 put those on the record if that is okay with the
24 Department of Energy.

25 MS. RUSSELL: If you choose.

49

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MR. ROWLEY: So your first question was: Is
Page 46

2 this renewable energy only? Is it restricted to that?
3 Our application clearly describes that this is for
4 renewable energy only. We have no plan, no intent for
5 any other energy to be delivered over this power line
6 that's proposed to cross the border between Mexico and
7 the U.S.

8 MS. CONKLIN: Thank you.

9 Can you answer the last four?

10 MR. ROWLEY: And the next question was --

11 MS. CONKLIN: Who is the customer?

12 MR. ROWLEY: The customer for the power is
13 yet to be determined. We have an agreement with
14 Southern California Edison for the first phase only.
15 The ultimate status of that agreement is uncertain at
16 this time. We fully intend on selling the power from
17 this renewable energy project into the California
18 market, but we do not know which specific customer.

19 MS. CONKLIN: Thank you.

20 The third question was: Where is the backup
21 energy?

22 MR. ROWLEY: The stability of the grid is the
23 responsibility of the California Independent System
24 Operator. We're just one generator that injects power
25 into the grid, so we see a very small slice of the

50

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 overall picture in terms of grid reliability.

2 The California Independent System Operator
3 sees the whole picture, and they're in a position and

4 they are charged with responsibility for doing things
5 like providing adequate backup power. So that would be
6 a question to pose to them.

7 MS. CONKLIN: Very good.

8 So my question is: If you're going to
9 generate 100 megawatts, let's say, and you sell
10 100 megawatts to someplace, if your -- this is a
11 hypothetical -- these figures are hypothetical -- if
12 you don't have the wind that day, what do you do in
13 terms of your customer?

14 MR. ROWLEY: Our responsibility in our wind
15 energy contract would be to deliver energy from the
16 wind generators when there's generation. So when
17 there's not, then our responsibility is to deliver --
18 well, it's to deliver whatever we can generate.

19 MS. CONKLIN: To deliver some other energy,
20 and that's with --

21 MR. ROWLEY: No, no, no. There's no backup
22 from our -- it would be just -- we deliver whatever
23 energy our wind generators can generate, period. So
24 when they're not generating, we're not delivering. And
25 we're not --

51

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MS. CONKLIN: On that contract?

2 MR. ROWLEY: And we're not delivering backup
3 power.

4 MS. CONKLIN: On that contract?

5 MR. ROWLEY: At all.

6 MS. CONKLIN: And the point being -- all I'm
7 trying to understand -- and I think you answered it --
8 is that if you have a contract with a delivery number
9 and the wind is not being generated, you don't have to
10 honor the contract in that instance?

11 MR. ROWLEY: We have to honor the contract
12 where they're written in such a way that we're
13 delivering energy --

14 MS. CONKLIN: From wind?

15 MR. ROWLEY: -- at -- not necessarily a
16 certain amount at a given point in time --

17 MS. CONKLIN: I see.

18 MR. ROWLEY: -- but a certain amount overall.

19 MS. CONKLIN: Okay. So it can be averaged?

20 MR. ROWLEY: Yes.

21 MS. CONKLIN: And then my fourth question is:
22 Is the present permit that you're going for, which
23 Ellen kindly read a description of, going to be -- or
24 are you asking for it to be conditioned for wind alone?

25 MR. ROWLEY: We proposed it for renewable

52

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 energy only, and what we're describing is wind. If the
2 Department of Energy takes that input and the other
3 input that they receive and decides to condition the
4 permit, that would be their decision. But we don't
5 write the permit; they do.

6 we've told them what we want, to build the
7 power line. The purpose of the power line, we made it

8 very clear about that and have been very clear with you
9 about the fact that it's renewable energy only. So it
10 will be up to the Department of Energy how they want to
11 write their permit.

12 MS. CONKLIN: And I want to ask a question of
13 the Department of Energy after we finish.

14 The final thing is the greenhouse gas
15 emissions and the RPS standards. Are you planning to
16 capitalize on the wind with regard to those?

17 MR. ROWLEY: If we sell into the California
18 market, which is our intent -- I mean, that's -- we
19 have no other plan other than to sell it in the
20 California marketplace -- in order to qualify for RPS,
21 the California Energy Commission has certain rules,
22 certain standards that we have to meet.

23 And I would invite you to look at their
24 website. It's fairly exhaustive, but they'll be
25 subjected to those standards, even though it's outside

53

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 of the state.

2 MS. CONKLIN: Well, I want to thank you,
3 truly -- Joe?

4 MR. ROWLEY: Joe.

5 MS. CONKLIN: Joe?

6 MR. ROWLEY: Yes.

7 MS. CONKLIN: Okay. That's my husband's
8 name. I want to thank you, Joe, for answering
9 questions. It shows that you're not afraid to answer

10 the questions on the record. I think it's very
11 important for people to see that.

12 And if I have any other questions, may I ask
13 you and the rest of the team here to --

14 MR. ROWLEY: Absolutely. And I really don't
15 want to disrupt your hearing. I've already done that,
16 and, really, that was our reluctance.

17 MS. CONKLIN: I could see that. And that's
18 why I --

19 MR. ROWLEY: I'd like to defer additional --

20 MS. CONKLIN: I understood.

21 MR. ROWLEY: -- time to outside the hearing
22 process, if that would be okay.

23 MS. CONKLIN: And the one question I would
24 have, following up on your answer, Joe, talking to the
25 DOE, is: Do you normally condition permits -- thank

54

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 you very much -- do you normally condition -- are --
2 right. Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MS. CONKLIN: Are presidential permits
5 normally conditioned?

6 MS. RUSSELL: Yes, they are.

7 MS. CONKLIN: So, for example, if a wind
8 energy project is stated as a wind energy project,
9 would you see it as a normal condition that the permit
10 be restricted to wind?

11 MS. RUSSELL: Normally, it would be. I can't
Page 51

12 speak to what's going to happen in the end.

13 MS. CONKLIN: Fine. Is that -- is that --
14 I'm just trying to understand. Is that a question on
15 the part of what the applicant wants, or is that a
16 question on the part of what the DOE decides?

17 MS. RUSSELL: It is what the DOE decides.

18 MS. CONKLIN: So if the applicant wanted it
19 to be conditioned, but the DOE doesn't want it to be
20 conditioned, then it would be unconditioned?

21 MS. RUSSELL: I don't recall us issuing in --
22 in the last 20 years, an unconditioned permit.

23 MS. CONKLIN: And are they normally following
24 the applicant's application?

25 MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

55

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MS. CONKLIN: Okay. Thank you very much. I
2 really appreciate it.

3 MR. HOYT: What about changes and amendments?

4 MS. RUSSELL: Could you identify yourself for
5 the record.

6 MR. HOYT: Gary Hoyt.

7 what about changes and amendments to what the
8 DOE permits? In other words, if SDG&E says, "We're
9 just going to use renewable power sources for this
10 permit," and two years later they come back to you and
11 they say, "well, you know, this just isn't going to
12 make it. We're going to have to put a gas power
13 generating plant on the U.S. side to make up for what

14 our wind power cannot produce."

15 MS. RUSSELL: The -- if we were to issue a
16 permit that required the transmission line to be
17 connected to a wind facility and a wind facility only,
18 and another company wished to build -- we're not
19 talking Sempra here. We're talking another company
20 wanted to build a fossil fuel facility in Mexico and
21 use that same transmission line to move fossil --
22 electric -- fired -- electricity into the United
23 States, an amendment to that presidential permit would
24 be required, yes, and a new NEPA analysis would be
25 required.

56

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 MR. HOYT: Is that an involved process or
2 relatively easy for --

3 MS. RUSSELL: Oh, it would be a very involved
4 process.

5 MR. HOYT: If that power plant was built here
6 in the United States, would it be more complex?

7 MS. RUSSELL: I can't answer that question
8 because we would not have a role.

9 MR. HOYT: You would not have a role --

10 MS. RUSSELL: Our jurisdiction is
11 across-the-border transmission.

12 MR. HOYT: Thank you.

13 MS. RUSSELL: Ms. Tisdale.

14 MS. TISDALE: Donna Tisdale.

15 I had a couple questions. I -- I remember
Page 53

16 the cross-border power line presidential permit
17 application for Sempra Generation's power plant down in
18 Mexicali, and that was originally pushed through on
19 environmental assessment, not a full environmental
20 impact statement. So it seems kind of disingenuous to
21 say that.

22 But the question I have would be: Is this
23 involved in any way in the National -- NEI -- NIE --
24 the Transmission Corridor --

25 MS. CONKLIN: National Interest Electric

57

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 Transmission Corridor.

2 MS. RUSSELL: No, it is not.

3 MS. TISDALE: No, it is not?

4 MS. RUSSELL: No, it is not.

5 MS. CONKLIN: I'd like to follow up on that.

6 If it isn't specifically involved, is it true
7 that the administration is now pushing the NIETC
8 project? We have seven counties in California and two
9 in Arizona that are part of the Western NIETC. You
10 know, they also have the eastern one with many
11 different states.

12 My understanding is that -- and I spoke at
13 the May 17th, 2006 DOE hearing on that in San Diego.
14 My understanding is -- it's not a corridor; it's huge.
15 But my understanding is that that process is now
16 completed. Is it, in terms of the biological
17 assessments?

18 MS. RUSSELL: I'm sorry. I'm not close
19 enough to that to be able to answer your question.

20 MS. CONKLIN: The reason you're getting
21 questions about that, especially from me, is that this
22 county, San Diego County, is one of five southern
23 California counties and two western Arizona counties
24 that make up the NIETC corridor. It's a quarter of --
25 so the process for the NIETC is important to us,

58

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 because we live here.

2 MS. RUSSELL: Yeah, I'm not close enough to
3 the -- that process.

4 MS. CONKLIN: Fine. That should be directed
5 to other people in DOE. Thank you.

6 MS. TISDALE: well, that brought me back into
7 another thing, because this is the west-wide energy
8 corridor proposed, right here. I guess that's why I --
9 what I wanted to know. And is this involved in that?

10 MS. RUSSELL: The project proposed by Sempra
11 for a transmission line that connects to wind generated
12 inside Mexico and a transmission line to the proposed
13 ECO Substation is not part of the National Interest
14 Transmission Corridors.

15 MS. TISDALE: Okay. I will clarify, because
16 in the Sunrise Powerlink document and also the Bureau
17 of Land Management, for their easement in San Diego,
18 they conform to -- I think it's Section 368, as -- as
19 giving it credence. And so that's why I'm asking. And

20 it hasn't even been approved yet. It's a draft.

21 MR. MILLS: This is on private land, the

22 368 --

23 MS. TISDALE: It's on federal land.

24 MR. MILLS: None of this is on private land.

25 MS. TISDALE: Right, but the existing

59

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 Southwest Powerlink easement is part of that, and you
2 are connected to it.

3 MS. RUSSELL: You know, I'm not close enough
4 to it to be able to respond. I'm sorry.

5 MS. TISDALE: I understand. You have a
6 completely different perspective than we do. We have
7 to be on a defensive perspective, and I understand your
8 job is completely different.

9 And when you live in a place and you know
10 what's going on and you see all these things going on
11 and separated and being dealt with one at a time and
12 then you put them all together, you understand the
13 magnitude of it all and how overwhelming it all is for
14 a little community like this. Jacumba has 800 people.
15 Boulevard has 1600 people. And you see here, right
16 here, we're outnumbered by Sempra and SDG&E.

17 So -- and I also have to go on the record
18 that I -- it was very disheartening for me when I was
19 trying to get this hearing, and they kept changing.
20 And on the end of July, you sent me an e-mail saying
21 nothing had been confirmed.

22 And then three or four days later, my
23 supervisor hands me an e-mail saying that the federal
24 register, August the 4th, that this is the day that had
25 been set. So coming in here, it's very -- and I see

60

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 that -- I see the smirks on these faces, and it's
2 just -- it's so disheartening, you know.

3 MS. RUSSELL: Ms. Tisdale, I'm not smirking.
4 I did receive your e-mail. Until the signature is
5 placed on the federal register notice and it goes -- is
6 sent to the register for publication, I can't tell you
7 when the document is going to be printed. I'm sorry.

8 MS. TISDALE: Well, I'm sorry. I just can't
9 quite -- I can't quite believe that. Thank you.

10 MS. RUSSELL: If we have just general
11 questions about, you know, our project that are not
12 germane to scoping --

13 MR. YOPS: I have something germane, yes.

14 MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Then, please.

15 MR. YOPS: Gerald Yops, Y-o-p-s. I've lived
16 up here for 37 years. I was the former Highway Patrol
17 officer at --

18 (Court reporter interruption.)

19 MR. YOPS: I have a little credibility from
20 what I've done in the past. If I go to get a building
21 permit on my house -- this all boils down to an
22 environmental impact study. If I go to build a house,
23 remodel a house, I talk to Donny, put a power pole, one

24 single power pole on my property, I have to get an
25 environmental impact study.

61

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 And the crux of this whole meeting is
2 environmental impact study. You're trying to
3 circumvent an environmental impact study and just get
4 it bypassed through the Department of Energy and not
5 have to go through the paperwork.

6 As a taxpayer, I demand -- I demand that they
7 have to have an environmental impact study to do this
8 project on private land here in Jacumba. You demand it
9 of me. Everyone in this room demands it of me to get
10 an environmental impact study to be done to make sure
11 everything is square and the birds and the bees are all
12 going to be okay tomorrow.

13 So that's my point, is this hearing is for an
14 EIS report, and I demand, as a taxpayer and a citizen,
15 that it be done for this project for Sempra Energy.

16 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

17 It is -- one more.

18 MR. BERGLUND: I'm Dennis Berglund. I would
19 like to lodge a formal complaint. You are supposed to
20 be the Department of Energy. You're supposed to be
21 objective. And I sat next to that fellow back there in
22 the blue shirt from Sempra, and these two guys
23 obviously have a relationship and were continuously
24 communicating back and forth before Joe got up to talk.

25 I think it's improper. It shows that you

Peterson Reporting, Video & Litigation Services

□

1 have a relationship with Sempra that we do not have, or
2 with you, and I think you should not, any longer --
3 cease and desist in any kind of activity in that
4 manner. It's highly irregular.

5 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you for your comment.

6 Yes?

7 MS. MARSHALL: I'm sorry. I'm told that I --
8 I have just one question. It's really nothing.

9 MS. RUSSELL: You have to identify yourself
10 for the record.

11 MS. MARSHALL: Oh, My name is Laura Marshall.
12 And I just have one question. How long do we have now,
13 because, see, I was contacted -- well, I was in my
14 winter clothes the first time the Department of Energy
15 contacted me to reserve the hall, and we always have a
16 response time. How much time do we have left to
17 respond?

18 MS. RUSSELL: You have until we send the
19 document to the printer.

20 MS. TISDALE: You have until September 3rd.

21 MS. RUSSELL: The official closing date is
22 September 3rd.

23 MS. MARSHALL: September 3rd.

24 MS. RUSSELL: However --

25 MS. MARSHALL: Well, we would have had a lot

□

1 of time to respond if we -- you know, the first time
2 the meeting was scheduled. We would have had some time
3 to respond -- September 3rd is pretty close.

4 MS. RUSSELL: It will probably take --

5 MS. MARSHALL: The postal service won't even
6 get it in time.

7 MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Let me respond.

8 For NEPA, we will continue to receive and
9 consider comments until pretty much the document is
10 ready to go to the printers. I can't see this process
11 taking less than six to nine months, if it remains an
12 environmental assessment. So if you have a comment
13 next month or the following month, yes, it will be
14 considered.

15 MS. MARSHALL: Okay. Just what I wanted to
16 know, because --

17 MS. RUSSELL: Okay. It's a little bit after
18 3:00. We're going to close the record until 5:00 p.m.

19 (The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 p.m.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

□