

APPENDIX E

*Transcript from Scoping Meeting (Jacumba,
January 27, 2010)*

1 CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

2 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

3

4

5 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

6 for Preparation of the Environmental Impact

7 Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the San Diego

8 Gas & Electric East County Substation, Pacific Wind

9 Development Tule Wind, and Energia Sierra Juarez, LLC,

10 Energia Sierra Juarez Generation-Tie Projects

11

12

13

14 Wednesday, January 27, 2010

15 Jacumba Highlands Center

16 44681 Old Highway 80

17 Jacumba, California

18

19

20

21

22 Jane E. Wassel, CSR No. 2632, RMR, CRR

23

24

25

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 APPEARANCES:

2 Dudek
605 Third Street
3 Encinitas, California 92024
P (760) 479-4250
4 F (760) 632-0164
By: John Porteous, CEP

5
6 State of California
Public Utilities Commission
7 Energy Division
Transmission & Environmental Permitting
8 505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3298
9 P (415) 355-5580
F (415) 703-2200
10 By: Iain Fisher, Ph.D.
Project Manager

11
12 U.S. Bureau of Land Management
1661 South 4th Street
13 El Centro, California 92243
P (760) 337-4400
14 F (760) 337-4490
By: Thomas Zale,
15 Project Manager

16
County of San Diego
17 Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
18 San Diego, California 92123
P (858) 694-3011

19 F (858) 694-2592
By: Patrick Brown,
20 Project Manager

21
Rios & Company
22 402 West Broadway, Suite 400
San Diego, California 92101
23 P (619) 595-3105
F (619) 595-3165

24 By: Maria Nyffenegger,
Interpreter,
25 Certification No. 49313683

2

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 JACUMBA, CA, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2010, 7:10 P.M.

2

3 MR. PORTEOUS: Okay. Folks, we're going to get
4 started here. Welcome everyone. Tonight we are holding
5 the first Public Scoping Meeting for Preparation of the
6 Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact
7 Statement -- this is a mouthful -- for the San Diego
8 Gas & Electric East County Substation Project, Pacific
9 Wind Development, formerly Iberdrola, Tule Wind Project,
10 and Energia Sierra Juarez's ESJ Generation-Tie Project.

11 I'd like to make sure that all of you have
12 signed in. If you haven't, please do before you leave.
13 That will put you on our distribution list, and so
14 anytime we have notices going out you'll be sure to get
15 that, so that's a good thing to get on.

16 Also, we have a number of materials in the
17 back. We have an agenda, and on that agenda also are
18 Web sites to keep tracking the progress of these

19 projects. We also have a copy of the handout tonight,
20 which is about 26 slides, so what I'm going to do so I
21 don't bore you all, I'm going to be talking about most
22 of that so I'm going to go through those quickly. So
23 the handout has a lot more detail than our presentation
24 will have. That handout will also be up on our Web
25 site, so you can access it to there, as well.

3

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 Because we have so many people tonight, we'd
2 also like to request that you fill out a speaker card,
3 because after our presentation -- the main purpose of
4 our meeting tonight is to get some public comment on the
5 scope and content of our EIR/EIS. So we have speaker
6 cards there. So if you fill them out and put them in
7 the box right there, we'll collect them towards the end
8 of the presentation and then we'll just call on folks to
9 give us your comments. So we appreciate that.

10 And we're going to try to limit comments to
11 about approximately three minutes so that everyone has a
12 chance. We'll see how many speaker cards we get. If we
13 don't get that many, we can certainly go on.

14 So my name is John Porteous. I work for Dudek
15 who's the environmental consultant to the California
16 Public Utilities Commission and Bureau of Land
17 Management. With me tonight I have Iain Fisher,
18 representative of the Public Utilities Commission,

19 Tom Zale with the Bureau of Land Management, and

20 Patrick Brown with the County of San Diego.

21 The purpose of tonight is to give a brief

22 overview of the projects, information on the EIR and the

23 decision-making process, and then primarily to get your

24 input on the scope and content of the EIR/EIS.

25 The key players and their roles: We have

4

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 three applicants and three separate projects. We have
2 San Diego Gas & Electric who's proposing the East County
3 Substation Project; we have Pacific Wind Development,
4 formerly Iberdrola, who is proposing the Tule Wind
5 Project; and then we have Energia Sierra Juarez who is
6 proposing the ESJ Gen-Tie Project.

7 Those projects are -- we posted up three
8 different areas in here that kind of show those various
9 projects -- we have the ESJ Project over there. To the
10 right by the clock, we have an overview map that shows
11 how all the projects interconnect with each other. That
12 map's also in the presentation handout. Over by the
13 kitchen area there, we have the SDG&E ECO Substation
14 project laid out on aerials. And then by the entrance,
15 we have the Tule Wind Project. And I believe we have
16 representatives for all applicants.

17 So are SDG&E representatives here? If we can
18 see who you are.

19 (Indicating.)

20 MR. PORTEOUS: Pacific Wind Development?

21 (Indicating.)

22 MR. PORTEOUS: Energia Sierra Juarez?

23 (Indicating.)

24 MR. PORTEOUS: And we also have DOE folks here

25 too that are evaluating that. Thank you.

5

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 So for tonight and the purpose of our EIR/EIS,
2 the agencies, the key agencies, are the Public Utilities
3 Commission who will be the lead agency under the
4 California Environmental Quality Act for reviewing and
5 approving the East County Substation Project. We have
6 the Bureau of Land Management who's the lead agency
7 under the National Environmental Policy Act who will
8 have a reviewing role on both the ECO Substation and the
9 Tule Wind Projects. And we have the County of San Diego
10 being the responsible agency under CEQA and will have
11 permitting authority over both the Tule Wind and ESJ
12 Projects.

13 Other key agencies will involve a number of
14 resource agencies as well as two managers. The two
15 managers would be the BIA, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and
16 California State Lands Commission, and they would only
17 be involved on the Tule Wind Project.

18 We also have the Department of Energy who needs

19 to issue or would consider issuing a Presidential Permit
20 for the ESJ Gen-Tie Project. They have already
21 completed scoping for that project and are under way in
22 preparation of an EIS that will address the ESJ Project,
23 and their Web site's listed right here. There's also a
24 link on our PUC Web site that gets you to this, and that
25 way you can track the progress of DOE's process in their

6

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 EIS, in preparing the EIS for the ESJ Project.

2 To give a little bit of background, the PUC as
3 the CEQA lead agency and Bureau of Land Management as
4 the NEPA lead agency issued a Notice of Preparation and
5 a Notice of Intent in late December of 2009 that they
6 were going to prepare a joint EIR/EIS to address SDG&E's
7 ECO Substation Project.

8 At the same time and at issuance of the NOP and
9 NOI, both the PUC and the Bureau of Land Management also
10 determined that the Tule Wind Project and the ESJ
11 Project were connected actions under NEPA and under CEQA
12 represented whole of the action, meaning that all three
13 projects needed to be evaluated as one in the EIR/EIS.

14 So the EIR/EIS will be used to make a decision
15 on the ECO Substation Project by the PUC and the BLM; on
16 the Tule Wind Project by BLM, the County of San Diego,
17 the Bureau of Indian Affairs, State Lands Commission,
18 Army Corps of Engineers, as well as others; and on the

19 ESJ Project, the County will use that to make their
20 decisions on the ESJ Project.
21 Let's go through the project now. So the
22 project description that will be evaluated in the
23 EIR/EIS consists of San Diego Gas & Electric's
24 East County Substation Project as well as the connected
25 actions, Pacific Wind Development's Tule Wind Project

7

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 and the ESJ Gen-Tie Project.

2 To give you a quick summary on those -- again
3 there's an overview map there -- if you flip to Slide 12
4 in your handout, it shows you that as well, realizing
5 that that's hard to see from vantage points in the room,
6 but page 12 has a color printout of that. And again
7 after we have public comments, please feel free to go
8 talk to the applicants, and there's much more detailed
9 aerials that show these projects in the various areas
10 that I just mentioned.

11 Basically, the SDG&E project consists of a new
12 500/230/138-kV substation that's going to be located
13 south of I-8 about four miles east of Jacumba and it
14 would take up approximately 58 acres. It also consists
15 of a loop-in of the Southwest Powerlink to connect the
16 ECO Substation to the Powerlink. It also consists of a
17 rebuild of the Boulevard Substation. There's an
18 existing Boulevard Substation that would be removed and

19 rebuilt immediately east of the existing substation and

20 will take up approximately two acres.

21 The project also consists of an approximately

22 13.3-mile 138-kV transmission line that would hook the

23 rebuilt Boulevard to the ECO Substation as well as a

24 rebuild of the communication facility at White Star

25 which is located about two miles southeast of Boulevard.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 And the rebuild there only consists of approximately a
2 30-by-30-foot area where they would actually remove a
3 generator, put in a new generator, and some things like
4 that. So it's a small area in an existing facility.

5 Major elements of the Tule Wind Project which
6 consists of a 200-megawatt wind power generation project
7 is approximately 124 turbines. The nearest one is about
8 3.3 miles from Boulevard. The height of those turbines
9 range between 328 feet and 492 feet. There would be a
10 five-acre substation on the project as well as a
11 five-acre operations and maintenance facility, and there
12 would be 138-kV tie line to tie that project into the
13 Boulevard Substation.

14 Right now there's two alternatives proposed.
15 One is about 9.6 miles, the other one is 11 miles, again
16 all shown on the overview map and on the aerial by the
17 entrance. The project involves public lands, private
18 lands, state lands, and tribal lands so a lot of

19 landowners and jurisdictions for the Tule Wind Project.

20 Finally, the major elements of the ESJ Gen-Tie

21 which is basically an interconnect tie line that will

22 interconnect wind generation in Baja, northern Baja

23 California, to the ECO Substation, it consists of a

24 one-mile interconnect that will either be a 230-kV line

25 or a 500-kV line, so we're looking at two options,

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 two alternatives.

2 Now, our document will also look at the
3 potential impacts from wind development in northern Baja
4 to the United States. So as you'll see on the map over
5 here after the meeting -- you can't see it probably
6 right now -- and on the overview map, we know that the
7 first phase of the wind development project in northern
8 Baja consists of about between 100 and 130 megawatts of
9 wind generation, which represents about 45 to
10 50 turbines located at approximately 1.5 miles from the
11 border. So what we'll be looking at in the EIR/EIS is
12 impacts to the United States; i.e., visual impacts or
13 impacts for migratory birds and things like that.
14 Additional phases are going to take place to the south
15 of that, and they're not well defined so that they can
16 be evaluated in our document.

17 The applicants have come up with objectives for
18 each one of their projects. I'm not going to read

19 through this whole list, but basically the ECO
20 Substation is to facilitate interconnection of renewable
21 energy in southeast San Diego County and also to improve
22 reliability, Tule Wind is to develop renewable wind
23 energy within eastern San Diego County, and the ESJ
24 Project is to tie renewable wind generation that's going
25 to be produced in northern Baja to the ECO Substation.

10

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 So those are the primary objectives for the three

2 separate projects.

3 There's common objectives for all three, and

4 they're basically to accommodate delivery of renewable

5 energy to meet state and federal renewable energy goals

6 from wind and solar sources in San Diego County, and

7 there's a whole host of statutes and executive orders

8 that are listed here. So that's a common objective for

9 these three projects.

10 I'd like to now, and I need to take a glass of

11 water, turn this over to Iain Fisher to kind of go over

12 the PUC process.

13 MR. FISHER: Good evening. On there you'll

14 just see a flow diagram of the PUC process. What I

15 really want to get out of that is to tell you how many

16 opportunities you have to contribute to this process.

17 At the moment we are on the left-hand side in

18 the environmental review and public meeting phase.

19 We're in the first phase of this. We will produce the
20 environmental documents. You'll have a chance to
21 comment upon that.

22 It then moves into the evidentiary hearing
23 phase, which you'll have a chance to participate in that
24 before a proposed decision is written and again have a
25 chance to comment on that before a final decision's made

11

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 by our commissioners.

2 This particular permit is a Permit To
3 Construct. Under this permit, it is mostly about the
4 environmental impacts of the construction. I'd just
5 like to reiterate we are only responsible for permitting
6 the actual ECO Substation and the Boulevard Substation
7 and connecting the transmission line between the two.

8 We will also be looking at compliance with EMF,
9 electromagnetic frequency guidelines, and looking at
10 feasible alternatives and making findings on feasible
11 alternatives as well as any findings on overriding
12 considerations.

13 Again, the assigned commissioner is -- the
14 actual president of the Commission is Michael Peevey and
15 the administrative law judge is Melanie Darling.

16 And I'll just hand this over to BLM so they can
17 describe their process.

18 MR. ZALE: Thank you. For the BLM process, as

19 we've stated, BLM is the lead federal agency for
20 analyzing the proposed ECO Substation Project and also
21 for the proposed Tule Wind Project. At the end of the
22 process, BLM will be issuing two Records of Decision,
23 one responding to each of the two right-of-way
24 applications that these two project proponents have
25 submitted.

12

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 In addition to that, though, BLM is also going
2 to act as the lead federal agency for compliance with
3 section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, section 106 of
4 the National Historic Preservation Act, and then BLM
5 will also take the lead role in conducting
6 government-to-government consultations with Native
7 American tribes.

8 MR. BROWN: As previously stated, the County
9 only has portions of each of these projects. The ESJ
10 Project, the County actually has full jurisdictional
11 responsibility except for the portion that's covered by
12 DOE and the Presidential Permit.

13 The County also has responsibility on the Tule
14 Project but only about 12 turbines on the gen-tie lines
15 and possibly some facilities that might be located
16 within the County jurisdiction. The county's reviewing
17 these portions of the projects under County-established
18 guidelines and thresholds and we're participating in

19 this as the responsible agency providing our review into
20 the document for later use to take to decision-makers of
21 the County.

22 MR. PORTEOUS: So the goal for us, and we're
23 just beginning right now and need your comment during
24 the scoping process, is to produce an EIR/EIS that
25 accurately assesses the potential impacts of these

13

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 three projects, also identifies mitigation measures that
2 can possibly reduce those identified impacts and also
3 identifies impact alternatives that may reduce the
4 overall impacts of these three projects, and to address
5 the cumulative impacts of not only these three projects
6 but these three projects in combination with all past,
7 present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects,
8 which we know there are a number of other wind projects
9 that are in various stages of planning. So the goal of
10 our EIR/EIS is to do a rigorous cumulative analysis of
11 those as well and, finally, to address community
12 concerns and comments.

13 So we want to have a document that does all
14 that, and the purpose of that is to provide full
15 disclosure of significant effects and means to reduce,
16 avoid, or minimize those effects; consider a reasonable
17 range of alternatives to these projects; to provide
18 opportunity for you, the public, to scrutinize the

19 planning and decision-making process; and, finally, to
20 ensure that the decision makers, who we've said who are
21 those, and what decisions they need to make on these
22 three projects have a solid basis for making a decision.

23 As we get into that, the comments again
24 received during scoping will help us define what really
25 needs to go into that document, what are the issues that

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 need to be addressed, what are the alternatives that
2 need to be looked at.

3 Based on the preliminary findings that were in
4 the Notice of Preparation and the Notice of Intent, the
5 issue areas that came out that need to be addressed are
6 listed in this slide. Each one of these issue areas
7 will have baseline existing conditions, impact section
8 that describes whether the impacts are significant,
9 mitigation for impacts that have been identified to be
10 significant, and the level of significance after
11 mitigation. The EIR/EIS will also address cumulative
12 impacts in growth inducement and will look at
13 alternatives.

14 Under alternatives, we will look at the no
15 project/no action alternative and also address a
16 reasonable range of alternatives. So again this is
17 where we need help from you all to describe and decide
18 what alternatives need to be looked at.

19 But how we'll initially look at those
20 alternatives, do they meet most of the project
21 objectives? They don't have to meet all, but do they
22 meet most of the project objectives, which we have shown
23 what those objectives are in this handout. Do they have
24 the ability to reduce or avoid significant environmental
25 impacts and are they feasible? So those are things that

15

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 are important when we consider alternatives. They have
2 to meet those screening criteria.

3 Our first cut at the alternatives analysis,
4 we'll certainly be looking at these types of
5 alternatives, but this isn't all-inclusive. Again, we
6 are asking for your input in this. What other
7 alternatives should we be looking at?

8 We're certainly going to be looking at
9 substation site alternatives, routing alternatives,
10 different types of generation alternatives, project
11 design alternatives, operations alternatives,
12 alternatives to large-scale wind energy development,
13 energy efficiency, and again alternatives that are
14 suggested by the public and other interested agencies.

15 So where are we in the process and where are
16 the opportunities for comment and input into this
17 EIR/EIS? Well, right now we're in the scoping phase, so
18 we're in the initial phases of developing our document.

19 And so officially the NOI ends February 12th and, as
20 stated, the NOP ends February 10th. We are taking
21 comments through February 15th. And right now we have
22 actually written comment forms. If you'd like to fill
23 that out, you can put that in the box and turn it in
24 right now if you'd like.

25 At the end of scoping, we will prepare a

16
CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 scoping report that documents all the comments that we
2 got, that we heard, and we will post that on the Web
3 site and distribute that in the repositories which we
4 have listed on the back of this. So we will have a
5 conclusion to scoping and what we got out of that for
6 your review.

7 The next opportunity for public comment will be
8 when we issue a draft EIR/EIS that will go out for a
9 45-day public review period. Right now we're
10 anticipating that may come out in the July-September
11 time frame of 2010.

12 And then after the public comment period is
13 over for that document, we will prepare a response to
14 comments, and a final EIR will be issued to public
15 agencies for a ten-day review period, and that will
16 conclude the preparation of the EIR/EIS.

17 I'd like to now turn it back over to CPUC, BLM,
18 and the County to describe what happens after completion

19 of the document.

20 MR. FISHER: So from the CPUC perspective, the
21 environmental document becomes part of our
22 administrative record that goes before an administrative
23 law judge. They then assess it along with other factors
24 before issuing their decision. That decision is voted
25 on by our commissioners. The commissioners can issue

17

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 alternative decisions and vote on those, as well. So
2 there can be several decisions out there, and it's
3 obviously a majority vote that takes it.

4 MR. ZALE: From BLM's perspective, upon
5 completion of the final EIS/EIR, the processes actually
6 diverge just a bit; and BLM independently will, as I
7 mentioned before, issue two Records of Decision, one for
8 each of the two project proposals that involve the BLM
9 lands. And I think following that, I'll probably be
10 taking my daughter to Disneyland.

11 MR. BROWN: For the County, after the document
12 is certified by the PUC, the County would rely on that
13 document to prepare its environmental documentation
14 under CEQA section 15162, essentially taking that
15 document and preparing a Major Use Permit hearing report
16 to go to the planning commission; and at that point
17 there will be another public notice for the County
18 ten days prior to that hearing, and that will be your

19 opportunity after the PUC's done everything that they've
20 done and certified that document, that will be the
21 opportunity for the local community on the County Major
22 Use Permit applications to attend the planning
23 commission. So at that point that will be the county's
24 action.

25 MR. PORTEOUS: So that concludes an overview of

18

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 the project and the decision-making process on the
2 EIR/EIS.

3 We'd like to now focus this meeting on your
4 comments. Here's some -- and this is not all-inclusive.
5 This is just sort of a guideline that are useful
6 comments for us in preparing the document. Certainly,
7 any comments on the location and extent of impacts that
8 you know of that we need to address, any measures that
9 you may be aware of that may reduce those impacts, also
10 any alternatives that would avoid or reduce those
11 impacts, those are very useful comments for us in
12 helping us scope the content of our document.

13 So just wrapping up on getting comments to us,
14 you can hand them in tonight. Again, we do have a form
15 there you can fill out and put it in the box right
16 there. You can mail them to either Iain Fisher in care
17 of Dudek, which is the address listed on the Notice of
18 Preparation, or you can send them to the Bureau of Land

19 Management, which is the address on the Notice of

20 Intent.

21 Knowing that all those comments are going to

22 get funneled to Iain Fisher in care of Dudek, so if you

23 want to send them directly to that, that will expedite

24 it, but it doesn't matter. Not to confuse things, you

25 can send them to either address. They'll get

19

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 consolidated at Dudek. So you can mail them in, you can
2 fax them in, you can e-mail them in, and those addresses
3 are right here.

4 Again, the official close of public comment is
5 February 12th listed on the NOI, February 10th listed on
6 the NOP. We are accepting comments through
7 February 15th.

8 And then this last slide, we'll leave it up
9 there. You know, that's for more information when you
10 go through this process. That information is also in
11 the back of the agenda. So continue to check the Web
12 sites of both the PUC, BLM, and the Department of Energy
13 as we progress on this particular project. And as
14 materials become available, they'll be available in
15 these local libraries, as well.

16 So I'd like to now turn it over to public
17 comment. Again, please fill out a speaker form. Rica
18 is going to pick from those speaker forms and walk

19 around with the microphone so you don't have to come up

20 here and give us your comments.

21 Also, when you're giving your comment, if you

22 could state your name and affiliation. We have a court

23 reporter tonight. So to make it easier on her, if you

24 could, you know, speak a little slowly and if you have a

25 difficult name, maybe just say it slowly so she can get

20

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 that. We'd appreciate it. Thank you.

2 MS. NITKA: Vince Mudd.

3 MR. MUDD: Here. Hello. My name is

4 Vincent Mudd. I'm here today representing the San Diego

5 Regional Chamber of Commerce. I'm their public policy

6 chair or incoming chair for 2011.

7 As we look at our region and our region's

8 future and the energy independence, we realize that

9 we're not going to get any help from the federal

10 government but that we're going to have to build our own

11 infrastructure to benefit our own region.

12 This project is one of many that are going to

13 help us reach that level of independence, and it's

14 necessary that we do this project. I'm thankful that

15 you're doing the scoping meeting in this area, and I

16 hope that you'll take the input that you get from the

17 public and try to integrate it into your program to make

18 sure that it has the most beneficial impact to this

19 region, as well.

20 But the fact of the matter is that we need

21 projects like this. They do benefit the entire region,

22 and in San Diego County we're seeing projects like this

23 all over the region that help the entire region, so I

24 rise in support. Thank you.

25 MS. NITKA: Duane Roth.

21

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 MR. ROTH: Thank you. My name is Duane Roth.
2 I represent a nonprofit organization in San Diego called
3 CONNECT. CONNECT has helped start about 2,000
4 high-tech/biotech/security companies in the past
5 25 years. Most of that technology transferred from our
6 research institutes into commercial products. Most of
7 the effort in that area, including wireless, has been in
8 North County. That's where it all sort of grew up.

9 We started about four years ago thinking about
10 clean technology and about the environmental companies
11 that would be emerging, and it became apparent very
12 quickly that that was going to be in East County and
13 Imperial County where the wind blows, sun shines
14 reliably, and you can grow crops like algae that are --
15 you know, I can't tell you the importance of algae which
16 San Diego needs, but we have to have a way to transport
17 that energy to the higher population areas. So I'm here
18 really to encourage you to figure out the process to get

19 the right plan so that we can do that.

20 The last analogy I leave you with, if we can't

21 figure this out, it would be similar to the wireless

22 industry and then we refuse to put up towers because we

23 didn't like the way they look. That would have been

24 devastating to San Diego, but it has changed over.

25 So I rise in support, and it's your process. I

22

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 love what was laid out here tonight, and I hope you can
2 find a way to make it happen, because I can assure you
3 there's going to be a lot of job creation if we can
4 figure this out. Thank you.

5 MS. NITKA: Sorry about the last name, but
6 Tom Guminski (phonetics).

7 MR. GUMINSKI: Yes. My name is Tom Guminski.
8 That's spelled G -- my partner and I, we have some
9 property here in Jacumba and south of I-5 near the
10 Carrizo Creek Road, and it's very close to the Mexican
11 border and zoned residential.

12 And the way the Powerlink is cutting through,
13 it's nearly on top of our property. We have about
14 five acres, just over five acres, and it's pretty much
15 going to render that particular piece of property
16 useless, simply because it's sandwiched between I-5 and
17 the Powerlink -- or I-8, I'm sorry, and the Powerlink.

18 And even if we were to do something commercial,

19 because it is in a prime area of windmill generation,
20 because of the height restrictions on the property it's
21 going to pretty much render any kind of windmill
22 activity, unless they were to push the link further to
23 the south, it's pretty much going to render that land to
24 be useless.

25 So my concern is, and I imagine other property

23

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 owners too, is the way the way the link is going through
2 there squeezing properties in between natural boundaries
3 is going to have a devastating impact on property
4 values.

5 MS. NITKA: Mark "Astrander."

6 MR. OSTRANDER: Ostrander. I read your initial
7 report here. Going through several of the items here,
8 on your Aesthetics, there's no mention of even the wind
9 turbines going in. It only mentions the overhead lines,
10 and it says temporary degradation to the visual
11 character. I would think that would be more permanent.
12 If the lines are in, towers are in, that's going to be
13 permanent.

14 Also, there's no mention under Air Quality
15 about AB 32 or SB 97, which is the greenhouse gas. You
16 talked about it in your presentation about that's what
17 you're doing to reduce, but what is it they are going to
18 put in that mandates the 25 percent reduction to 1990

19 levels?

20 Going on down, you know, it talks about going

21 over a fault line, no mention of the wind turbines in

22 there and what kind of issues are going to be there. If

23 you have an earthquake of major magnitude, you got

24 collapses, you got some serious issues there.

25 Then you get into Hazards and Hazardous

24

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 Materials. Well, one thing in here to let you know,
2 there's no full-time fire departments out here. They're
3 volunteers. Sometimes they're unstaffed; sometimes
4 they're staffed. Also, there's no mention about what
5 we're going to do about training. This is going to
6 affect emergency responders right off the get-go, so we
7 got to get some training. If we do not get training
8 facilities, you're going to have to guarantee something.

9 Hydrology and Water: It talks about how
10 general release of hazardous materials during
11 construction may affect surface water and groundwater
12 quality. If we have no groundwater, you just cut the
13 whole community off. If the water gets contaminated,
14 we're done.

15 Population for proposed projects is to
16 encourage or accelerate growth. That's under Population
17 and Housing.

18 Under the Land Use and Planning, out here we

19 want to keep the rural aspect. That goes against what

20 the community wants.

21 Recreation, that's one of our main economies

22 out here. That's going to impact that service.

23 And then just getting down to kind of, you

24 know, your other issues, cumulative effects from EMF,

25 what studies are out there? Every time we ask this

25

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 question, we're told that there's no science on it, but
2 there is an effect. I see you got it in the plan.

3 Also, we got to look at all the projects that
4 happen out here -- you got the border fence, you got
5 several other projects coming in -- and all these
6 projects are going to have a cumulative effect on the
7 backcountry out here. It's going to take away the
8 historical aspects. It's going to impact all the
9 cultural, prehistoric. It's going to impact the
10 communities. It's going to impact recreational, the
11 visual.

12 You got to take all of them as a whole, not
13 keep looking at just several of these projects. It's a
14 good start. We're getting easier at putting them
15 together, but it's almost like it's being piecemeal.
16 There's several projects that have happened out here
17 already, so we've got to take a look at that.

18 Some alternatives that I came up with is why

19 not look at large commercial structures, warehouses and
20 such, for, you know, solar panel installations and get
21 some generation off that way? Homeowner's generation,
22 smaller wind turbines where you can put them in a
23 homeowner. The ground's already disturbed. There's
24 already been stuff there. There are some properties
25 where you can do that. You heard one landowner where

26

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 he's got five acres. He can do some small generation.

2 That will help. That's what I got to say at this point.

3 MS. NITKA: Aaron Quintanar.

4 MR. QUINTANAR: Here. A couple of items here.

5 I'm representing Border Power Plant Working Group. I

6 have over 15 years working in conservation issues in

7 Baja California in biodiversity hot spots, and I'm here

8 to express my concern over the impacts that the Sierra

9 Juarez received due to the project Energia Sierra

10 Juarez.

11 As you may know, the Manifest Impacto for the

12 Environmental Assessment is currently under

13 consideration in Mexico. That document is lacking in

14 certainty in a number of aspects; one, the project calls

15 for construction of over 600 miles of roads. No maps or

16 any roads have been identified as being for build-out.

17 Second, there is no certainty over the sites,

18 locations, of the turbines themselves. Without being

19 able to analyze the rates the turbines are going to be
20 laid out without the roads, you cannot adequately
21 analyze the impacts. Therefore, you cannot present
22 mitigation plans.

23 And also from a biodiversity standpoint, the
24 Sierra Juarez represents one of three remaining pristine
25 ecosystems in Baja California, the other two being

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 Sierra San Pedro Mártir and the other one being a
2 120-mile stretch of coastline on the Pacific between
3 San Carlos and Santa Rosalillita.

4 In terms of the Sierra Juarez, the
5 environmental assessment for the ESJ Project, there are
6 field survey teams that have only found less than
7 50 percent of fauna during their site surveys. What
8 that indicates to me is one of two things: First, that
9 the field survey teams are doing a horrible job; second,
10 that the Sierra Juarez and its ecosystems and
11 biodiversity of Sierra is under a lot of stress and,
12 therefore, cannot support an industrial project of this
13 magnitude.

14 Finally, the other thing I think is of concern
15 here is in the permitting, and Sempra as well has stated
16 that the turbines will be operating at 30 percent
17 capacity. The industry standard tends to be 35,
18 40 percent, and this raises issues of, one, economic

19 viability, sustainability long-term and second is will
20 we actually get a benefit on these significant impacts
21 to Sierra Juarez.

22 I urge that the Commission fully assess these
23 impacts and also look for alternatives to generate
24 energy in-basin, in the cities, in site. Thank you.

25 MS. NITKA: Ronald E. -- I can't read the last

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 name.

2 MR. DAHLGREN: Dahlgren. Thank you. I'm here
3 as a healthcare professional and also as a owner of land
4 in Potrero, about a 515-acre ranch that was there for
5 about 100 years, and also I have a residence in Jamul
6 where I live.

7 This project is really important to our
8 community. It's important for a number of reasons.
9 I've been a health professional for a period of 33 years
10 and living in this community and 15 of those years as
11 the chief executive officer for Grossmont District
12 Hospital. We find that there's a necessity for
13 two reliable sources of power. That's the reason that
14 we're talking about the second line now. It's not like
15 something we like to do. It's something that we have to
16 do.

17 And there are concerns, obviously legitimate,
18 but I'm also concerned about the legitimate concerns

19 that we not get carried away with the drill-baby-drill
20 mentality. That doesn't work. In fact, I buy my gas
21 preferably from sources of fuel that aren't U.S. I buy
22 it from sources that are coming outside of the U.S.
23 because maybe we'll need that resource in case we have
24 to protect our national defense some day.

25 Nuclear waste is a problem. It's a problem for

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 us as healthcare. We can't find some locations now for
2 our nuclear isotopes any longer. Iron Mountain is full.
3 There are other problems that we can't continue to
4 postpone, and this solution is free to us as far as the
5 wind, something we need to definitely support.

6 We also need to remember the air pollution that
7 we're dealing with here as having an impact on the
8 temperature levels. We talk about the Copenhagen Group
9 that's going to come up with a plan. It came out to be
10 a recommendation, and that recommendation was basically
11 to reduce the temperature 2 degrees from what the
12 progress is going right now. It's at 4 right now.
13 They're coming up with 2 degrees.

14 What's it doing in terms of its impact on our
15 communities? We all know the differences in our weather
16 pattern, our climate cycles right now. We also know the
17 endangered species that are being affected right now.
18 So it's important for us to look at that, including

19 people.

20 And the fossil fuels that we use, both in the
21 natural gas as well as in the coal area, are extremely
22 dangerous in terms of the amount they're polluting.
23 We're receiving currently pollution from China. It
24 comes across mostly in the Washington area right now,
25 but they're building on a weekly basis a new coal plant

30

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 every single week.

2 We need to begin to look at something that will
3 save us and achieve those objectives that the governor
4 and the legislature has agreed. We should be at
5 20 percent of our fuel source, I should say our energy
6 source from green sources. We're at 6 to 7 percent. We
7 have to be at 33 percent or should be at 33 percent by
8 2020. Can we make it? I don't know, but these projects
9 are critical to us achieving that.

10 We hear that there are complaints about the
11 fact that there's a health issue here in terms of wind
12 turbines, and that's legitimate, and I've done some
13 study and all of you can, too. Go to Wikipedia. Look
14 it up on your computers. You'll see a nice article
15 about explaining the problem we're facing. The problem
16 here is distance between residences and the wind
17 turbines.

18 Right now the World Health Organization's

19 recommendation for the largest units, 200s, 220s in
20 terms of megawatts, that we should be delivering
21 basically turbines that are at 1.33 miles from
22 residences because of the shade effect, in terms of the
23 blinking of the light on the people, and also because of
24 the decibel level that should be at 20 or below, which
25 is 40 percent of a refrigerator noise at 50. We also

31

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 need to recognize that the cost-benefit ratio is
2 significantly valuable for us. It's four times what its
3 cost is, a 75 percent savings for us.

4 And we also need to recognize that in terms of
5 our position with regard to the health impact, the
6 studies that Pierpoint has done, the studies that Harris
7 has done in Britain basically point to the fact that we
8 don't have a problem. We do. My son's a healthcare
9 professional. He specializes in pain management as a
10 board-certified anesthesiologist. He hasn't had any of
11 these cases. I asked him. But that does not mean
12 there's not a real issue here. Okay. So it is
13 important for us to deal with this, and we need to make
14 sure that the space is wide enough between the
15 residences and these turbines.

16 The last point I want to make is, let's not be
17 NIMBYs. Okay? Let's be IMBYs. Okay? We need to think
18 of it in that way. We need to not be against it. We

19 need to be for it. Okay?

20 MS. NITKA: Denis Trafecanty.

21 MR. TRAFECANTY: Right here. Hello. My name

22 is Denis Trafecanty. I'm the president of The Protect

23 Our Communities Foundation. We represent and we closely

24 connect with a lot of other groups like the Audubon

25 Society and other environmental groups and mainly the

32

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 backcountry, the residents, which are many of us here
2 today.

3 We understand about what you want to do. You
4 want to add wind, power lines, et cetera, out here in
5 the backcountry. I believe the ultimate NIMBYs are the
6 people that come here from San Diego and come out here
7 to explain to us why we need to industrialize our
8 backcountry and our deserts. That's the ultimate NIMBY,
9 because they're the ones that need the power.

10 We don't think any of this is necessary. In
11 fact, I've got a report here that we're going to
12 continually press on people that San Diego's Smart
13 Energy 2020 Plan that was prepared by Bill Powers, who's
14 on our board of directors, is the solution for
15 generating the electricity that the City of San Diego
16 and other large metropolitan areas need.

17 The gentleman over there stated that what's
18 wrong with those building rooftops in San Diego on the

- 19 parking lot structures? There's plenty of space to
- 20 build solar. No one's going to tell me and any of our
- 21 other groups that you could build wind and you could
- 22 build these eco stations out here and it's more
- 23 economical to provide that type of energy and move it
- 24 hundreds of miles into San Diego versus building rooftop
- 25 solars in San Diego which would create jobs in

33

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 San Diego, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce.

2 If we the people out here in the backcountry
3 have anything to say about this -- and we're going to
4 watch this closely. We're going to watch to make sure
5 the CPUC, the BLM, the County of San Diego all are
6 responding to what their needs are.

7 I know that you're going to have sleepless
8 nights, you developers, when you think about the word
9 ESA, CEQA, and NEPA, because those are organizations
10 that you're not going to get the fast track if we have
11 anything to do about it. I listened to President Obama,
12 most of his speech today. He didn't say anything about
13 fast-tracking all the rules. I think he'll be dreaming
14 about tortoises, bighorn sheep, California condors, and
15 the eagles and how the turbines are going to affect
16 them.

17 So when you do your studies to determine,
18 first, how much wind are you producing, what percentage

19 of efficiency is it, you also have to consider what does
20 it cost to build the transmission lines and towers.
21 You're going to put that all into your costs, because
22 that's what we're going to be talking to the CPUC, BLM,
23 and County of San Diego. Thank you.
24 We'll be critiquing the estimates of production
25 which we believe are exaggerated for wind energy. We

34

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 will be reviewing the estimates of impact on wildlife
2 which we believe are grossly understated.

3 Is Mexico really real? I know that gentleman
4 back there was talking about it. We're going to build
5 substations not knowing whether they're going to build
6 these wind turbines?

7 We have only a few wind turbines out here, and
8 there was 70-mile-per-hour winds just recently, and I
9 don't think blades are up right now. We've had
10 100-mile-an-hour winds in the backcountry. So what do
11 you think about that? We're going to make sure that
12 you're putting up something that's going to stay up.

13 And by the way, one last comment: When you
14 build these structures on our land, the BLM land is the
15 public land. When you build those structures, I think
16 that the CPUC and all of the agencies should require a
17 bond on these developing companies to take them all down
18 when we find out that they don't work and put the desert

19 and the mountains back into the original state that they
20 were in. There should be a bond required for that. Add
21 that to your cost.

22 MS. NITKA: Donna Tisdale.

23 MS. TISDALE: Hello. I'm representing myself
24 as an individual. I chair the Boulevard Planning Group.
25 I'm president of Backcountry Against Dumps, secretary

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 for The Protect Our Communities Foundation, and also
2 member of the East County Community Action Coalition,
3 and I want to thank you for holding the hearing and for
4 requiring this joint review, because the impacts are
5 significant and cumulative.

6 And I see lots of people here that don't live
7 here, and I'm sure they got a special invitation from
8 SDG&E, Sempra, Iberdrola to come and, you know, be their
9 cheerleading section, but we live here. We love it, and
10 that's why we live here, because it is beautiful. And
11 there are alternatives that don't require the
12 destruction here.

13 None of these projects are needed. And along
14 with the Sunrise Powerlink, which I don't see on any of
15 these maps, they represent a significant increase in
16 wildfire ignition sources. They are part of the overall
17 impact and if you don't show them on the maps, you know,
18 that's kind of like a misrepresentation of the facts.

19 Distributed point-of-use generation is faster,
20 cheaper, less destructive, and more reliable with less
21 line loss and less chance of loss during wildfires.
22 These projects all rely on Sunrise Powerlink which is
23 the subject of state and federal legal challenges for a
24 very good reason.
25 One year after approval, impact studies and

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 mitigation are still in the works. That's putting the
2 cart before the horse. We should have had an
3 opportunity to comment on all of that rather than it all
4 being done after the fact. The PUC has even closed the
5 hearing on it. So how does that make us feel? We feel
6 like an afterthought and people that can just be -- our
7 communities and our wildlands can just be discarded at
8 will.

9 I have a January 20th letter here with me from
10 San Diego County Supervisor Jacob asking the PUC to make
11 SDG&E's project modification report for Sunrise
12 available to the public for review. She also asked for
13 a detailed business impact study for Alpine where the
14 main road and business district will be torn up for up
15 to two years. The County's also asked for an amended
16 Sunrise EIR to address significant groundwater and
17 grading issues that were not fully covered or properly
18 covered in the Sunrise document.

19 I also have a November 6th letter from
20 Congressman Filner to the Department of Energy,
21 recommends denial of the ESJ Presidential Permit
22 application saying it is not in our best interest as
23 constituents. He says energy can be moved on Mexican
24 lines to San Diego if the turbines are actually built.
25 He goes on to note Sempra's history of

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 exploiting Baja and big fines of \$70 million for
2 violating their ten-year power supply contract and the
3 settlement of a lawsuit for 377 million for natural gas
4 price-fixing during the 2000-2001 energy crisis. He
5 expressed his concern of the cross-border line being
6 under exclusive control of Sempra instead of being open
7 access.

8 Then there's also the million dollar fine that
9 SDG&E -- I think that gentleman got more time; no? -- a
10 million dollar fine that SDG&E paid for misrepresenting
11 the southern route through our area, and none of that
12 fine went for mitigation in our community as far as I
13 know.

14 We also worry about the disparity between the
15 reported 400 to \$500 Baja property -- \$500 being offered
16 the property owners in Baja for each turbine on their
17 property when the average price in the U.S. is at least
18 4- to 5,000. These projects represent environmental

19 justice issues on both sides of the border.

20 Tule Wind is a disaster in the making as is

21 Energia Sierra Juarez. You don't need to install major

22 fire starters in a high-fire danger. There is wind and

23 sun in San Diego.

24 New studies show that turbines should be at

25 least 1.5 miles, if not more, away from residents and

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 property lines to avoid the worst of the wind turbine
2 syndrome. What will this do to our bighorn sheep, our
3 golden eagles, our falcons, our hawks, and our other
4 wildlife?

5 We also strongly oppose the industrialization
6 of our beautiful backcountry and the obscene profits the
7 companies will make at the expense of taxpayers,
8 ratepayers, our rural communities, our quality of life,
9 our property values, our public lands, and our diverse
10 wildlife.

11 We will do everything we can to stop these
12 projects because they are not the right direction, and
13 we will do everything we can to stop those from
14 promoting them.

15 I will be speaking at tomorrow night's hearing.
16 I will be submitting detailed comments, as will our
17 attorney. Thank you.

18 MS. NITKA: Brit Coupens.

19 MR. COUPENS: Hi. I'm Brit Coupens with
20 Invenergy. I hope wind people agree about tortoises and
21 bighorn sheep, but they're also maybe about people's
22 children and grandchildren.

23 I represent Invenergy. The National Renewable
24 Energy Lab has identified San Diego and Imperial
25 counties as important areas of natural resources

39

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 including wind, solar, and geothermal. Invenergy has a
2 proposed wind farm for the Campo Indian Reservation. We
3 feel that the infrastructure built out for the
4 construction of the ECO Substation is important to all
5 the projects that are out here, and we are in support of
6 it.

7 MS. NITKA: Laurie Baker.

8 MS. BAKER: Hi. My name is Laurie Baker. I
9 don't live here. I live in Santee. I come out here to
10 the campground, and we come out here, my husband and I,
11 to hike, and we've been hiking out here for decades.
12 And we've been hiking in the In-Ko-Pa's and Carrizo
13 Gorge and McCain Valley and the Jacumba Mountain, and
14 I'm concerned about a lot of the different aspects, but
15 my main concern is the visual impacts, because we come
16 out here to get away from the city.

17 And so I'm not a NIMBY. I'm a NIMBY in a
18 different sense, but I have a vested interest in the

19 area because we come out here to enjoy it, which is what
20 it's designated for. And I feel that any intrusion
21 would be significant and unmitigable because the wind
22 turbines have gigantic monstrous blades on them going
23 round and round, and that's not what I come out here
24 for. That would quench my desire to come out here. I
25 think that the area's special just as it is.

40

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 And let's see. I think you should study all
2 uses and all vantage points. We hike out here on trails
3 and cross-country. So when you have a handful of areas
4 that you're looking at from just in the daytime and from
5 special places, it doesn't apply as much to hiking
6 because you get close to things; you're up close. And
7 so, therefore, the whole area, you're not looking in one
8 direction just to the east, and it affects all public
9 and private lands in this area east of the Indian
10 reservation.

11 We usually come out here to have fun. This
12 isn't really fun. I think you're forsaking one resource
13 for another and I think they're incompatible.

14 This project, these projects, don't add
15 anything but they detract, and I think there's a
16 different mind-set than when these areas were set aside.
17 I think that they were special, and I don't see anything
18 that's really changed, though. I think that the

19 mind-set -- which is, in a way, exploitation of a

20 pristine area.

21 And I don't know if the ends justify the means,

22 and there's also tangibles and intangibles that are

23 subjective. We come out here for the beauty of the

24 land, and I just feel that it's going to be destroyed,

25 and I think this is a special area.

41

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 And people think there's nothing out here, but
2 there really is. You just have to take time to stop and
3 look at it, and yet it's because there's nothing
4 man-made out here that the things that are out here
5 actually still exist out here, like the bighorn sheep,
6 and it's undisturbed.

7 I live in Santee and we have solar power that
8 powers the Santee Lakes recreational area, and it's on
9 top of their awnings for the RVs, and that's online, and
10 it's at the urban site where it's produced and it's
11 neighbor friendly. Thank you.

12 MS. NITKA: Dennis Berglund.

13 MR. BERGLUND: Good evening. I'm
14 Dennis Berglund. I represent REAL, Rural Economic
15 Action League. I'm also an electrical engineer. And we
16 appreciate you being here and conducting these CEQA and
17 NEPA reviews.

18 At the same time we say that, we're concerned

19 because on the Sunrise Powerlink, two administrative
20 judges just said that the Powerlink was not needed now
21 and wasn't needed in the future, but unfortunately the
22 PUC voted for it anyway. And what's equally noteworthy
23 is the one commissioner who is involved with
24 transmission lines voted against it. The others that
25 weren't so nearly involved voted for it, so why does

42

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 that happen? Are we wasting our time here by talking to
2 you because someone else is going to overrule everything
3 we're trying to do?

4 While you think about that, we have a concern
5 because as we look at technology moving along, we would
6 encourage you to look at the other technologies and look
7 at them as an equal to what's being done with wind
8 energy, because I, as an engineer, have serious concerns
9 about something that the best they can do is 30 to
10 32 percent efficiency.

11 As I say that, I look out my window and I see a
12 bunch of sticks that used to be rotors. The rotors all
13 came off after a wind that was only about half what the
14 normal wind is out here under high-wind conditions. If
15 we're going to suffer those kind of losses, are these
16 turbines going to be cost-effective in the long run?

17 Furthermore, when I drive through Tehachapi and
18 I drive through the area where Tracy is near

19 San Francisco and I see the number of dilapidated,
20 still-standing, unused, old turbines, if this technology
21 is superseded in something like 10 to 12 years, are we
22 going to be stuck with a bunch of sticks out there that
23 there's no bond or no requirement to remove from the
24 environment once it's placed there? So I encourage you
25 to look at these things, because we think these are of

43

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 equal value.

2 And as you do, consider the fact that the
3 financing for these turbines is largely loaded towards
4 tax incentives and not based on performance. So people
5 are getting tax incentive and, you know, TARP-type
6 funds, you know, incentive-type funds, and that's maybe
7 the prime reason why there's money being developed here,
8 where, as the fellow from CONNECT said, there are a lot
9 of other technologies that are evolving including
10 transmission technologies which are involved.

11 And if Obama and all our friends in Congress
12 put money into those technologies the way they are, the
13 things that we're talking about today will be
14 automatically superseded. So please consider that and
15 if you want any of the community comments in this
16 regard, please contact us.

17 We are out here in the country. There's only
18 about 10,000 of us out here, as you know, in a

19 3.2-million-person county, and you can see people are
20 willing to drive out here to tell us how we should run
21 our lives. That shouldn't matter. So thank you for
22 allowing my comments.

23 MS. NITKA: That's all the cards I have.

24 MS. TISDALE: I just forgot to add that the
25 Brit Coupens/Invenergy Wind Project should have been

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 included in this, but they haven't provided enough
2 information. This blue area here, the Campo
3 Reservation, this is where the Kumeyaay Wind farm is,
4 but most virtually all of this area will be turbines, as
5 well. So we'll have turbines here, turbines here,
6 turbines here, and there's also plans for turbines here.
7 So you can understand our dismay at the position we're
8 in. Thank you.

9 MR. PORTEOUS: Well, thank you for your help.
10 The next opportunity to comment will be during the
11 issuance of the draft EIR/EIS which again we anticipate
12 to be the July-September time frame. We encourage you
13 to keep contact with our Web site for updates, to also
14 make sure you're on our distribution lists, so any
15 notices that we do send out you'll automatically get
16 them.

17 We're going to formally close the public
18 scoping meeting. However, Dudek as well as BLM, PUC,

19 and the County and the applicants and the Department of
20 Energy hopefully will stay after. We'll be grouping in
21 different areas where the projects are. So if you have
22 any specific questions you'd like to ask us, please come
23 up to us and feel free. Thank you all again. Have a
24 good night. Sorry.

25 MR. FISHER: Excuse me, ladies and gentlemen.

45

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 I'd just like to mention that there's going to be a
2 meeting in Boulevard tomorrow, and the comments are open
3 until the 15th of February. Thank you.

4 (At 8:14 p.m., the proceedings were concluded.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

46

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING 01/27/10

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3

4 I, Jane E. Wassel, CSR No. 2632, RMR, CRR, a
5 Certified Shorthand Reporter in the State of California,
6 do hereby certify:

7 That the foregoing proceedings were taken
8 before me at the time and place herein set forth; that
9 the proceedings were reported stenographically by me and
10 later transcribed by computer-aided transcription under
11 my direction; that the foregoing is a true record of the
12 proceedings taken at that time.

13 I further certify that I am a disinterested
14 person and that I am in no way interested in the outcome
15 of said action.

16 In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name
17 this _____ day of _____ 2010.

18

19

20

21



22

CSR No. 2632

23

24

25

47

CLEAVES & ASSOCIATES (619) 238-1415