

Comments and Responses

Document

CR.1 Introduction

Volume 3 provides the comments received on the draft EIS, and DOE's responses to those comments. All comments received were considered in the preparation of the final EIS. The remainder of this volume provides an overview of the public review process (Section CR.2), a summary of issues raised during the public comment period (Section CR.3), a summary of changes made to the draft EIS (Section CR.4), and a set of comments and responses to comments (Section CR.5).

CR.2 Public Review Process

The draft EIS was distributed to interested agencies, organizations, and the general public for review and comment in September 2010 (75 FR 57005; Notice of Availability issued September 17, 2010). The draft EIS and Notice of Availability are also available on the ESJ U.S. Transmission Line project website: <http://www.ESJProjectEIS.org/index.htm>. Notification of draft EIS availability was sent to those that have subscribed to the project website mailing list.

DOE held three public hearings on the draft EIS during the comment period (Jacumba, California on October 5, 2010; Boulevard, California on October 6, 2010; and San Diego, California on October 7, 2010), which closed on November 1, 2010. The dates and times of the hearings were announced on the project website and in local news media. The hearings provided interested parties with an additional opportunity to comment on the draft EIS and to participate in the decision-making process. The hearings included a presentation by DOE and an oral comment session in which attendees were invited to formally enter their comments on the draft EIS into the public record. Transcripts of the public hearings were recorded by a court reporter and are available both on the project website and in Section CR.5 of this Comment and Response Document.

DOE responded to written comments from 43 government officials, organizations, and individuals. DOE continued to consider comments received since the close of the public comment period up until September 2011. All comments that DOE responded to are presented below in Section CR.5 of this EIS Comments and Responses Document, together with DOE's responses. Note that the project website provides copies of certain letters that were received well after the close of the comment period for which DOE does not provide a written response. DOE has reviewed these recent comments and found them to be similar to comments received previously that have been addressed in this EIS Comments and Responses Document. (DOE will continue to post such comments as they arrive for a while as a public service.)

CR.3 Summary of Issues Raised During the Public Comment Period

The following are some of the major topics of comments submitted during the public comment period. These major issues include topics that appeared frequently in the comment documents or are of broad interest or concern. The reader may find this section useful as an executive summary of the comments and responses found in Section CR.5 of this CRD.

Transmission of Non-renewable Energy. Commenters questioned the project's purpose and need, and asserted that the cross-border transmission line could eventually become available for fossil-fueled generation. As discussed in Section 1.5.1, ESJ has assured DOE that the proposed electrical transmission line is intended to be used only for renewable generation. Accordingly, any alternative future use of the transmission corridor would require a new or revised Presidential permit application to be filed with DOE and would be subject to a new and separate NEPA review. Therefore, the possible use of the line for non-renewable energy is not deemed reasonably foreseeable at this time and is outside the scope of this EIS.

Distributed Electricity Generation as an Alternative. As noted in Section 1.5.1.2, commenters asked for consideration of distributed small-scale electricity generation, such as solar panels in urban settings, as an alternative to large-scale wind energy development and associated long-distance transmission lines. Alternative approaches for energy generation are outside the scope of the EIS because they do not respond to DOE's purpose and need, which (as discussed in Section 1.2) is to respond to the ESJ request for a Presidential permit.

Additional Project Alternatives. Commenters asked for consideration of the use of existing transmission lines in Mexico (e.g., the Western Energy Coordinating Council Path 45 transmission line in northern Baja California, which crosses the U.S.-Mexico border near San Diego). The EIS has been revised to include consideration of the potential use of the existing Western Energy Coordinating Council (WECC) transmission corridor as an alternative to the applicant's proposed project. A new subsection, Section 2.8.1, discusses why the potential of a direct interconnection to Mexican transmission lines using the WECC transmission corridor was considered but dismissed from detailed analysis.

Commenters requested additional analysis of the alternative of installing the transmission line underground. Revised discussion of this alternative is provided in Section 2.8.3 of this final EIS, but DOE has not altered its conclusion that this is not a reasonable alternative.

Connected Actions. Several comments asserted that the Sunrise Powerlink transmission line is a connected action because the existing Southwest Powerlink has insufficient electrical capacity to support the full buildout of the ESJ Wind project, and thus the ESJ U.S. Transmission Line project could not proceed without the additional capacity that Sunrise would provide.

Commenters also asked that the whole of the SDG&E ECO Substation project be considered a connected action. As discussed in Section 1.5.1.2, DOE considers only the first points of interconnection with the electrical transmission grid (i.e., SDG&E's ECO Substation switchyard facility and SWPL loop-in) to be connected actions. The additional SDG&E ECO Substation Project components beyond the switchyards and loop-in are not considered connected actions to the ESJ U.S. Transmission Line project.

Cumulative Projects. Several comments indicated additional projects that should be addressed in the cumulative impact assessment, including several renewable energy development projects in the border region, as well as land use developments in Boulevard and other nearby communities. Certain projects were added to the list of cumulative projects and these projects were considered in the cumulative impacts assessment. Some projects could not be included due to the lack of sufficient information for assessment.

Cross-Border Biological Resource Impacts and Mitigations. Several comments asked for additional information about potential cross-border impacts of the ESJ Wind project on birds (particularly golden eagles) protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. DOE has incorporated additional information and analysis into Section 3.1 of the final EIS regarding potential impacts from ESJ Wind project activities in Mexico on the San Diego County golden eagle population whose daily range spans the border between Mexico and the United States.

Commenters asked for additional analysis of potential cross-border impacts to Peninsular bighorn sheep and provided photographs of incidental sightings of bighorn sheep. The EIS is expanded in response to comments to include further discussion of potential impacts to bighorn sheep, including potential cross-border impacts.

Commenters asked that DOE impose mitigation on the ESJ Wind project. DOE is not in a position to require mitigation measures to be implemented in Mexico. The final EIS identifies some of the mitigations that are included in the Mexican permit for the ESJ Wind project.

Visual Resource Impacts. Commenters indicated that views of the transmission lines, combined with other planned developments, would diminish the visual character of the project area, including nighttime visual impacts if the transmission towers are lighted. The EIS has been revised to provide further discussion of cumulative visual impacts.

Fire Hazards. Several comments, including comments from the County of San Diego Rural Fire Protection District, expressed concern about the adequacy of existing fire response resources and applicant-proposed measures to address potential construction-related and long-term fire hazard risks. The EIS is revised to include information on developments since the draft EIS was published, including the applicant's agreement with the fire district, its commitment to several fire protection measures to address fire district concerns, and the district's response.

Several comments requested further analysis of the potential cumulative fire hazard impacts of the combined introduction of industrial wind turbines (including the ESJ Wind project in Mexico), new substations, and new transmission lines. These combined projects would increase fire hazards in the project area, which has a high fire hazard severity rating due to dry conditions and high winds. Several examples of wind turbine accidents and fires were presented, and some commenters suggested that increased fire hazards would also result in increased fire insurance rates, which would be a socioeconomic impact.

With respect to comments regarding potential fire hazards originating from the ESJ Wind project, the EIS is expanded to include information about design features that could be installed on individual wind turbines to reduce the probability of a fire, e.g., lightning arresters and

thermal monitoring systems that detect temperature increases and automatically shut off the generating system above a critical thermal threshold. Example measures from the Tule Wind project in southern San Diego County are listed and referenced. It is not known whether the ESJ Wind project, located as it is in Mexico, plans to incorporate these or other specific fire prevention and control measures. The final EIS identifies some of the mitigations that are included in the Mexican permit for the ESJ Wind project, including the requirement for a Fire Protection Plan.

Water Resources. The County of San Diego and other commenters asked for expanded discussion of potential impacts from the use of groundwater from a groundwater well for use during construction. The EIS is updated to include a description of the project's proposed use of an existing groundwater well, and an analysis of potential impacts to the local groundwater basin based on the County of San Diego's detailed analysis of potential groundwater impacts.

Socioeconomic Impacts. Some commenters asserted that the project would enable economic development and employment in the project region, while, on the other hand, other commenters expressed concerns that the project would facilitate the export of American jobs, increase the U.S. dependence on foreign energy, and undermine American environmental and labor laws. Impacts of the project on employment and economic conditions in the project area are considered in Section 3.13. However, the topics of labor policy and California energy policy are outside the scope of the NEPA process. DOE will consider comments on these topics as well as all other comments received in this proceeding in the course of evaluating the Presidential permit application.

Some comments expressed concern about potential impacts on property values and tourism income in the project area. These topics are discussed in Section 3.13, which has been expanded to include discussion of additional reviews of available research on potential impacts to property values and tourism income.

Environmental Justice. Several commenters expressed concern that local communities, which include low income and minority populations, would experience reduced property values, reduced tourism income, and be disproportionately impacted by the ESJ U.S. Transmission Line project, in combination with other proposed projects. The EIS discussions of environmental justice impacts have been expanded to include more information on this topic. Commenters also questioned statements in the draft EIS concerning the absence of low-income populations in the project area. Updated census data were added to the EIS, and it was determined that, with the addition of 2009 data, the data now indicate that one of the census tracts in the vicinity of the alternative corridors is considered low income, as compared to the County. Although the new data do change the EIS conclusion regarding the presence of low-income populations in the surrounding area, the data do not change the conclusion that minority and low-income populations, within the meaning of Executive Order 12898, would not experience disproportionately high and adverse impacts from the proposed action.

Backup Generation. Commenters asked that the impact assessment include potential impacts from the use of fossil-fueled generation that could be required for backup generation when the ESJ Wind turbines are idle. The EIS provides additional discussion on the topic of back-up

generation for renewable energy sources. The issue of grid reliability will, however, be considered by DOE external to the NEPA process.

Mitigation Measures. Commenters requested clarification as to how the potential mitigation measures identified in the EIS would be implemented. They also urged DOE to require mitigation for the ESJ Wind project in Mexico. DOE clarifies the role of the NEPA document to identify potential mitigation measures in a manner appropriate for evaluating their potential effectiveness in mitigating impacts. Should the Presidential permit be issued to ESJ, it could include mitigation measures as required conditions of the permit. As previously noted, DOE is not in a position to require mitigation measures to be implemented in Mexico.

CR.4 Overview of Changes to the Draft EIS

Table CR-1 lists the substantive revisions to the draft EIS as a result of public comments. These revisions are reflected in Volumes 1 and 2 of this final EIS.

Table CR-1 Summary of Revisions to the Draft EIS	
EIS Section	Substantive Revisions from Draft EIS to Final EIS
EIS Volume 1 Main EIS Volume	
Front matter	Updated cover sheet and table of contents; added this summary of substantive revisions from the draft EIS to the final EIS.
Summary	Updated the EIS Summary to be consistent with the final EIS analysis. Included updated summary of impacts and mitigations.
1.0 Introduction	Clarified DOE's purpose and need for the ESJ U.S. Transmission Line project.
	Added discussion of distributed electrical generation and use of existing transmission lines in Mexico as alternatives that are outside the scope of this NEPA document.
	Updated the EIS chronology and public review process.
	Added summary of issues raised during the EIS public comment period.
	Identified DOE's preferred alternative as the newly added Alternative 4A (Revised 230-kV Route).
2.0 Project Description	Added details of revised transmission line routes (Alternatives 4A and 4B), including new Figure 2-1b.
	Added details of the applicant's proposed groundwater well that would be used for construction water supply.
	Clarified that tower or pole lighting would not be required by the U.S. Border Patrol.
	Updated the applicant-proposed measures based on new information from the applicant regarding fire protection and traffic control measures.

Table CR-1 Summary of Revisions to the Draft EIS	
EIS Section	Substantive Revisions from Draft EIS to Final EIS
	Added discussion of the potential use of the existing transmission lines in Mexico as an alternative that is outside the scope of this NEPA document.
	Updated the status of the ECO Substation project environmental review process.
	Added description of the revised ECO Substation location, which is the basis for ESJ's description of revised transmission line routes (Alternatives 4A and 4B).
	Updated the comparison of impacts of alternatives based on updated analyses of each discipline.
	Updated the summary of impacts (Table 2-4).
	Identified DOE's preferred alternative as the 230-kV transmission line on lattice towers, in the revised alignment (Alternative 4A).
3.0 Affected Environment, Impacts and Mitigation	Clarified the extent to which DOE used the County of San Diego environmental review guidelines in the preparation of this EIS.
	Added discussion to all resource topics of potential impacts associated with the revised transmission line routes (Alternatives 4A and 4B).
	Added discussion to all resource topics of potential impacts associated with the proposed groundwater well use.
3.1 Biological Resources	Updated status of DOE's consultation with USFWS, which was concluded in March 2011.
	Updated discussion of baseline conditions for special status species, including Peninsular bighorn sheep and golden eagles.
	Added further discussion of potential impacts to large avian species from electrocution, and discussion of potential impacts from nighttime lighting of transmission towers or poles.
	Added discussion of potential impacts of helicopter use on biological resources during construction.
	Added further discussion of cross-border migration patterns and potential cross-border impacts to Peninsular bighorn sheep, golden eagles, and other species of concern.
	Revised Mitigation Biology-1 (Worker Training) to clarify that a qualified biologist would provide the biological resources training to contractor personnel both prior to construction and prior to major (non-routine) repair and maintenance during operations.

Table CR-1 Summary of Revisions to the Draft EIS	
EIS Section	Substantive Revisions from Draft EIS to Final EIS
3.2 Visual Resources	Added reference to the recent designation of segments of Old Highway 80 and I-8 as scenic highways in the County of San Diego General Plan.
	Clarified the location of nearby residences and corresponding key observation points.
	Added minor clarifications to discussion of transmission line visual impacts and potential cross-border visual impacts, including a change in the visual setting since the draft EIS was published due to the construction of several new wind turbines in the Sierra Juarez mountains in Mexico (unrelated to the ESJ Wind project), and their visibility from the U.S.
	Revised Mitigation VIS-2 to specify “dulled metal finish and nonspecular conductors.”
3.3 Land Use	Updated the County of San Diego General Plan status (plan update was approved August 3, 2011) and revised the project location General Plan land use designation (the site was re-designated to Rural Land, 80-acre parcels).
	Clarified the location of residences relative to the alternative corridors.
3.4 Recreation	No substantive changes were made to this section.
3.5 Cultural Resources	Added discussion of the historic status of Old Highway 80.
	Added discussion of the site-specific cultural resources analysis of the groundwater well construction site.
	Added Figure 3.5-2 to indicate the revised transmission line route alternatives (Alternatives 4A and 4B).
	Added mitigation Cultural-2 which would require subsurface cultural investigations for the proposed groundwater well access road.
	Added mitigation Cultural-3 which would require subsurface cultural investigations of the revised 500-kV Route (Alternative 4B), if constructed.
3.6 Noise	Added table listing the corona discharge sound level estimates for the revised transmission line routes (Alternatives 4A and 4B).
	Clarified the description and location of project area noise receptors.
3.7 Transportation and Traffic	Clarified and updated I-8 highway traffic statistics.
	Updated the discussion of wind turbine transportation scenarios based on applicant-provided information, which confirmed that turbines would be transported across the Otay Mesa border crossing.
	Added discussion of a Traffic Control Plan, which would be prepared in accordance with County Planning standard requirements.

Table CR-1 Summary of Revisions to the Draft EIS	
EIS Section	Substantive Revisions from Draft EIS to Final EIS
	Revised traffic-related mitigation measures to include a requirement to coordinate with CAL FIRE.
	Added discussion of potential limitations on aerial fire-fighting efforts due to the presence of the transmission lines.
3.8 Public Health	Clarified the types of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes that could be generated during construction, and added references to applicable laws and regulations.
	Updated mitigation Public Health-1 to include a provision to ensure that imported soil is free of contamination.
3.9 Fire and Fuels Management	Added discussion of the Development Agreement executed with the Rural Fire Protection District and revised fire protection mitigations specific to the ESJ U.S. Transmission Line project, as recommended by the RFPD.
	Corrected the local fire response capability statistics and response procedures for the project area based in input from the RFPD.
	Clarified discussion regarding the frequency of fuel management under the transmission lines.
	Added further discussion of potential impacts to the U.S. from wind turbine fires, failures and associated hazards from the ESJ Wind project in Mexico.
	Added further discussion of the project's potential to result in increased fire hazard and impacts to local fire fighting capabilities.
	Added discussion of potential limitations on aerial fire-fighting efforts due to the presence of the transmission lines.
	Added the applicant-proposed measure to prepare and implement a Construction Fire Plan.
	Added reference to fire-related documents and correspondence, provided in Appendix B of the EIS.
3.10 Air Quality and Climate Change	Updated construction emissions estimates based on the applicant's revised estimates of soil hauling requirements.
	Added discussion of the potential CO2 sequestration capacity of alkaline soils and related potential project impacts due to soil disturbance.
	Added discussion of potential air quality and greenhouse gas emissions due to wind turbine back-up generation.
3.11 Water Resources	Described the aquifer testing results conducted by the County of San Diego for the planned groundwater well usage during construction.
	Clarified discussion of surface water features to indicate that no surface water features traverse the U.S.-Mexico border in the project area.

Table CR-1 Summary of Revisions to the Draft EIS	
EIS Section	Substantive Revisions from Draft EIS to Final EIS
	Added discussion of groundwater quality and quantity at the planned construction groundwater well, based on County of San Diego reports.
3.12 Geology and Soils	Clarified certain soil descriptions and potential for erodibility.
3.13 Socioeconomics	Updated Census data with 2010 statistics, to the extent available.
	Added discussion of the potential for short-term, minor impacts to tourism in the project area.
	Added further discussion of the project's potential to result in decreased property values and increased fire insurance rates.
3.14 Environmental Justice	Updated the income and ethnicity data with 2010 statistics, as available. These new statistics indicated a change in the project area to "low-income."
3.15 Utilities and Services	Added discussion of the International Boundary and Water Commission permit requirement for monuments.
	Updated the mitigation to include coordination with CAL FIRE.
3.16 Unavoidable Impacts	Added description of potential unavoidable impacts on Transportation and Traffic.
4.0 Connected Actions	The analysis of potential impacts and recommended mitigations related to the ECO Substation switchyards and SWPL loop-in are revised to incorporate relevant information from the ECO Substation Draft EIR/EIS.
	Added description of the revised ECO Substation location, and discussion of potential impacts of this location in comparison to the original proposed site.
5.0 Cumulative Impacts	Added several projects to the cumulative impact analysis, including several wind energy projects; revised Figure 5-1 to show the location of these projects.
	Updated the status of several projects that were already included in the draft EIS cumulative impact analysis.
	Revised the cumulative impacts analysis to more clearly address the sum of impacts from past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions.
6.0 Irretrievable and Irreversible Commitment of Resources	No changes were made to this section.
7.0 Short-Term Use and Long-Term Productivity	No changes were made to this section.
8.0 Applicable Laws, Regulations, Permits, and DOE Orders	Added the International Boundary and Water Commission permit requirement to the list of required permits.

Table CR-1 Summary of Revisions to the Draft EIS	
EIS Section	Substantive Revisions from Draft EIS to Final EIS
9.0 Consultation and Coordination	Updated the record of consultations to include local agency contacts, including Rural Fire Protection District and other local agency offices.
10.0 References	Added references for correspondence and documents used to prepare the final EIS.
11.0 List of Preparers	Updated the list of preparers.
12.0 Conflict of Interest	No changes were made to this section.
Volume 2 Appendices	
Appendix A: Scoping Report	No changes were made to this appendix.
Appendix B: Project Details	Added plot plans and grading plans for the revised transmission line routes (Alternatives 4A and 4B). Added engineering design drawings for the transmission structures indicating dimensions of phase separation (relevant for potential impacts to large avian species from electrocution).
	Added documentation from ESJ and the County of San Diego Fire Authority and Rural Fire Protection District, indicating concurrence with the applicant's Fire Protection Plan, and concurrence on fire-related mitigation measures.
	Added a groundwater supply analysis prepared by the County San Diego geologist and a project water availability form signed by the Jacumba Community Services District. Added the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the project parcels.
Appendix C: Biological Resources Technical Report	Added excerpts from the applicant's 2010 biological resources technical reports prepared for the groundwater well access site (east of Jacumba) and for the revised alternative routes (Alternatives 4A and 4B).
	Added DOE's March 8, 2011 letter to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicating the outcome of consultation with the USFWS.
Appendix D: Cultural Resources	Added DOE's April 18, 2012 letter to the California State Historic Preservation Officer requesting concurrence on DOE's findings regarding Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
	Replaced the applicant's March 2010 cultural study for the transmission line alternative routes with the May 2010 cultural study for transmission line area; the May 2010 study includes both the original alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3) and the revised routes (Alternatives 4A and 4B).
	Added the applicant's 2010 cultural resources technical report prepared for the groundwater well access site.
Appendix E: Noise	Added the applicant's May 2010 noise analysis for the revised alternative routes (Alternatives 4A and 4B). Added vendor specifications of typical electrical conductor designs.

Table CR-1 Summary of Revisions to the Draft EIS	
EIS Section	Substantive Revisions from Draft EIS to Final EIS
Appendix F: Air Quality Calculations	Revised air quality emissions estimates based on further analysis of PM10 impacts since publication of the draft EIS, based on applicant's revised construction planning assumptions.
Appendix G: Agency Consultation	Added U.S. Dept. of Defense January 12, 2011 letter of non-objection to the project.
	Added U.S. Dept. of State's January 27, 2011 letter of non-objection to the project.
Appendix H: Conflict of Interest	No changes were made to this appendix.
Appendix I: Distribution List	Added the EIS distribution list.
Volume 3 Comments and Responses	
Volume 3 Comments and Responses	Added Volume 3 Comments and Responses. Section CR.5 of this volume provides reproductions of the written letters and oral comment transcripts on the draft EIS (left side of page), and DOE's response to the comments (right side of page).

CR.5 Comments and Responses

This section presents authentic reproductions of the comment documents received during the public comment process, including transcripts of oral comments given during the three public hearings on the draft EIS. Each comment document has been assigned a numerical designation, and each delineated comment within a comment document is marked by a bar in the margin and a unique comment number (e.g., 200-1). Responses to delineated comments are displayed to the right of the comment.

Comments are divided into separate categories, as follows:

- Public officials (100 series; 8 comment documents)
- Federal agencies (200 series; 4 comment documents)
- State and local agencies (300 series; 6 comment documents)
- Organizations and interest groups (400 series; 23 comment documents)
- Individuals (500 series; 8 comment documents)
- Oral transcripts from the October 2010 public hearings on the draft EIS (600 series; 3 transcript documents)

DOE responded to written comments from 43 government officials, organizations, and individuals (in some cases the same person or organization sent more than one letter, resulting in a total of 49 comment documents). DOE continued to consider comments received since the

close of the public comment period up until September 2011. All comments received are presented here, together with DOE’s responses. Note that the project website provides copies of certain letters that were received well after the close of the comment period for which DOE does not provide a written response. DOE has reviewed these recent comments and found them to be similar to comments received previously that have been addressed in this Comments and Responses Document. (DOE will continue to post such comments as they arrive for a while as a public service).

Table CR-2 provides a directory of the commenters and the corresponding comment document, with the page where the comment and response can be found. Comment letters are also available on the project website at http://www.esjprojecteis.org/deis_comments.htm.

The majority of the oral comments received during the draft EIS public hearings (600 series) were also contained in the written comments. Therefore, responses to most of the oral comments are addressed in the responses to the corresponding written comments, except where there was no corresponding written comment, or where the commenter did not provide written comments.

Table CR-2			
Directory of Commenters and Corresponding Comment Document			
Commenter	Organization/Affiliation	Comment Identifier	Page
Public Officials (100 series)			
Congressman Robert Filner	U.S. Congress, 51st District, California	101	100-1
Congressman Robert Filner	U.S. Congress, 51st District, California	102	100-10
Senator Harry Reid	U.S. Senator, Nevada	103	100-11
Assemblymember V. Manuel Perez	California Assembly, District 80	104	100-15
Mayor Jerry Sanders	Mayor of San Diego	105	100-17
Donna Tisdale	Boulevard Planning Group	106	100-19
Donna Tisdale	Boulevard Planning Group	107	100-60
Donna Tisdale	Boulevard Planning Group	108	100-83
Federal Agencies (200 series)			
Kathleen Goforth	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	201	200-1
Patricia Port	U.S. Department of the Interior	202	200-13

Table CR-2 Directory of Commenters and Corresponding Comment Document			
Commenter	Organization/Affiliation	Comment Identifier	Page
John Merino	International Boundary and Water Commission, U.S. Section	203	200-14
Jose Nunez	International Boundary and Water Commission, U.S. Section	204	200-15
State and Local Agencies (300 series)			
Scott Morgan	California Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit	301	300-1
Dan Otis	California Natural Resources Agency, Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection	302	300-3
Gerald Zimmerman	Colorado River Board of California	303	300-4
Greg Holmes	California Department of Toxic Substances Control	304	300-6
Eric Gibson	County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use	305	300-9
Cynthia Eldred	San Diego Rural Fire Protection District	306	300-30
Organizations and Interest Groups (400 series)			
Stephan Volker	Backcountry Against Dumps	401	400-1
Shannon Dougherty	San Diego Audubon Society	402	400-36
Nick Ervin	Desert Protective Council	403	400-43
Joseph Rowley	Sempra Generation	404	400-48
Robert Balgenorth	State Building and Construction Trades Council of California	405	400-50
Lorena Gonzalez	San Diego and Imperial Counties Labor Council	406	400-51

Table CR-2 Directory of Commenters and Corresponding Comment Document			
Commenter	Organization/Affiliation	Comment Identifier	Page
Jim Mahler	American Federation of Teachers Guild, Local 1931	407	400-53
Valentine Macedo	Laborer's International Union of North America Local 89, San Diego, California	408	400-55
Valentine Macedo	Laborer's International Union of North America Local 89, San Diego, California	409	400-56
Matt Kriz	Painters and Allied Trades District Council 36	410	400-57
Micah Mitrosky	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local 569	411	400-59
Cindy Chavez	South Bay AFL-CIO Labor Council	412	400-63
Tom Lemmon	San Diego County Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO	413	400-64
Nicole Capretz	Environmental Health Coalition	414	400-65
Corinne Wilson	Center on Policy Initiatives	415	400-68
Robyn Purchia	Adams Broadwell Joseph and Cardozo (for IBEW)	416	400-70
Robyn Purchia	Adams Broadwell Joseph and Cardozo (for IBEW)	417	400-155
Joseph Powell	San Diego and Imperial Counties Mechanical and Allied Crafts Council	418	400-215
Michael Langford	Utility Workers Union of America	419	400-217
Jose Luis Olmedo	Comite Civico Del Valle	420	400-219
Micah Mitrosky	IBEW Local 569	421	400-221
Elizabeth Klebaner	Adams Broadwell Joseph and Cardozo (for IBEW)	422	400-223
Alberto Abreu	Sempra Generation	423	400-424

Table CR-2 Directory of Commenters and Corresponding Comment Document			
Commenter	Organization/Affiliation	Comment Identifier	Page
Individuals (500 series)			
Mark Ostrander	Individual	501	500-1
Brendan Hughes	Individual	502	500-7
Derik Martin	Individual	503	500-8
Aaron Quintanar	Individual	504	500-17
Charles and Laurie Baker	Individual	505	500-19
David Paez-Ramirez	Individual	506	500-30
Jean Public	Individual	507	500-48
Barbara Broz	Individual	508	500-49
Public Hearing Transcripts (600 series)			
Various speakers	Transcript of the Jacumba public hearing, October 5, 2010	601	600-1
Various speakers	Transcript of the Boulevard public hearing, October 6, 2010	602	600-59
Various speakers	Transcript of the San Diego public hearing, October 7, 2010	603	600-129

This Page Intentionally Left Blank