

STAFF WORKSHOP
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
)
West-Wide Energy Corridor) Docket No.
Programmatic EIS)
)
_____)

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
HEARING ROOM A
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2006

10:08 A.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty
Contract No. 150-04-002

STAFF PRESENT

Terrence O'Brien

James Bartridge

ALSO PRESENT

Mark Chomyn
Sempra Energy Utilities

Manuel Alvarez
Southern California Edison Company

John Dutcher
Mountain Utilities

Donald M. Jardine
Alpine County Board of Supervisors

Susan C. Grijalva
Planning Department
County of Amador

Brent Schoradt
California Wilderness Coalition

John Moore
Sierra Club

Jane H. Turnbull
League of Women Voters of California

Patrick Christman
Office of Regional Environmental Coordinator
U.S. Marine Corps Installation West

Loren Loo
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Introductions	1
Overview	1
Project Background - Energy Commission's Role	5
Public Comments	12
M. Chomyn, San Diego Gas and Electric	12
M. Alvarez, Southern California Edison	16
J. Dutcher, Mountain Utilities	20
D. Jardine, Alpine County	23
S. Grijalva, Amador County	24
B. Schoradt, California Wilderness Coalition	26
J. Moore, Sierra Club	32
J. Turnbull, League of Women Voters	37
P. Christman, U.S. Marine Corps	41
L. Loo, Pacific Gas and Electric Company	46
Questions/Discussion	49
Adjournment	61
Certificate of Reporter	62

P R O C E E D I N G S

10:08 a.m.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Had a little bit of technical difficulty to start with, but thank you, everyone, for coming to the West-Wide Energy Corridors workshop the California Energy Commission is giving. We did one yesterday in Ontario and had a decent turnout, so we wanted to hold a second one here today. And want to thank you again for everyone coming.

There's a restroom out to the left. If you could avoid going through the doors on the end, they are alarmed. So I'm sure some of you heard that earlier.

Let me turn it over to Terry O'Brien for an introduction real quick.

MR. O'BRIEN: Good morning. My name is Terry O'Brien; I'm the Deputy Director for Systems Assessment Facility Siting here at the California Energy Commission. I would like to thank everybody today and welcome you to this workshop on the programmatic environmental impact statement that is going to be prepared on proposed energy corridors to be located in the 11 western states.

And the reason we're here today -- and

1 some of my comments will probably overlap with the
2 presentation Jim is going to give, but that's okay
3 because my comments will be fairly brief.

4 Last summer the Federal Energy
5 Commission passed the Federal Energy Act. This
6 was a massive energy bill. And one of the charges
7 to the government in the legislation was to
8 prepare a programmatic EIS for energy corridors
9 located in the 11 western states.

10 So this is a federal issue proceeding,
11 and the question becomes, well, why is the Energy
12 Commission therefore holding a workshop on the
13 PEIS. And the reason for that is that the Energy
14 Commission is responsible, through state law, to
15 insure that there is an adequate supply of energy
16 in the State of California, while at the same time
17 protecting the environment and public health and
18 safety.

19 In addition, we have a responsibility,
20 under state law, for approving large energy
21 infrastructure projects, including thermal power
22 plants greater than 50 megawatts and transmission
23 lines associated normally with those power plants.
24 Those are two of our charges.

25 And in addition, recent legislation has

1 tasked the Energy Commission with, every two
2 years, preparing a report to the Governor and the
3 Legislature -- we refer to it as the Integrated
4 Energy Policy Report -- to lay out policies that
5 the State of California should pursue in the area
6 of energy.

7 So, for all of those reasons we are very
8 interested and concerned about the work that will
9 be done on designating corridors in California.

10 In addition, there is currently a bill
11 pending in the California Legislature proposed by
12 Senator Escutia, Senate Bill 1059, that would give
13 the Energy Commission authority over designating
14 transmission corridors in the State of California.
15 And if that authority were to be granted to the
16 Commission, that would dovetail, in a way, with
17 the work that is being conducted here by the
18 federal agencies.

19 What we want to do is to help insure
20 that the energy corridors that are designated by
21 the federal agencies can provide energy where it
22 is needed in California, and that is predominately
23 in California's urban areas, which are located not
24 on federal lands. So therefore there needs to be
25 some obvious coordination that takes place to

1 insure that the corridors that are designated on
2 federal lands, predominately in rural areas, will
3 meet the needs of the State of California.

4 We are interested in hearing today from
5 a wide range of stakeholders, including any
6 municipal and investor-owned utilities who are
7 here, any energy companies, public interest
8 groups, environmental organizations and other
9 governmental agencies, including local government,
10 and members of the public.

11 It was our belief that this sort of
12 workshop, which Jim mentioned we also held a
13 workshop yesterday down in southern California,
14 would be a good idea because it would provide
15 parties with an additional opportunity to comment
16 on this proceeding and to provide input to the
17 federal agencies and to the Energy Commission.

18 I would note that we have been very
19 pleased with the cooperation and working
20 relationship that has been established with the
21 federal agencies, including representatives from
22 the Department of Defense, the Bureau of Land
23 Management, the U.S. Forest Service.

24 In addition, other state agencies have
25 been working with us and the federal agencies in

1 this working group, including the California
2 Public Utilities Commission, the State Lands
3 Commission, and also the State Department of Parks
4 and Recreation.

5 We're also making contact with the
6 United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the
7 California State Department of Fish and Game to
8 get their input and their concerns as we move
9 forward in our review process.

10 So, based upon the discussion today, we
11 will provide that input to the various federal
12 agencies we're working with, some of whom are in
13 attendance today, to make sure that your issues
14 and concerns are addressed as we move forward in
15 the process of designating corridors.

16 And with that I will turn it back over
17 to Jim.

18 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thanks, Terry. Okay,
19 can everybody see the PowerPoint? There's copies
20 in the back. Also the blue speaker cards; if
21 you're interested in speaking, please fill one of
22 those out and we have several already. I'll go
23 ahead and get started.

24 Today in the PowerPoint we're going to
25 look at the Energy Policy Act, section 368, which

1 requires designation of corridors on federal
2 lands. Talk briefly about the federal scoping
3 process, our outreach efforts; a little more
4 detail on the interagency cooperation; and a group
5 that we've put together; the purpose of today's
6 workshop; next steps; a little bit on the EIS; and
7 then additional contact information.

8 So the Energy Policy Act was signed into
9 law August 8, 2005. This is a very intensive Act;
10 there's a lot of layers to it. And so this is the
11 best website that I've found at FERC to get
12 information on the federal Energy Policy Act. I
13 think it's real worthwhile for folks to go to this
14 website and take a look.

15 The more we find out there's just more
16 and more layers and more and more sections; so I
17 think it's real important that everybody's aware.

18 The Energy Policy Act of 2005 states
19 that not later than two years after enactment
20 Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy and
21 Interior, in consultation with the states, will
22 designate energy corridors on federal lands in the
23 11 western states.

24 Those corridors are for oil, gas,
25 hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission

1 and distribution lines.

2 So that process has begun. They are
3 required to do programmatic environmental impact
4 statement by August 8, 2007; consult with the
5 FERC, tribes, other interested parties; it's part
6 of our outreach efforts, as well.

7 This requires the federal agencies, as
8 I've said, to designate corridors, perform any
9 environmental reviews and then incorporate
10 designated corridors into relevant land use plans.

11 It's my understanding that the PEIS will
12 actually incorporate, so that when it's completed,
13 the agencies move forward and the designation has
14 already occurred.

15 Ongoing responsibilities. They'll
16 insure additional corridors are promptly
17 identified; and then expedite applications to
18 construct or modify facilities. Part of that,
19 there is a focus here on transmission and
20 distribution to improve reliability, relieve
21 congestion and enhance capability of the national
22 grid.

23 Should note that over the last 25 years
24 Edison Electric Institute points out that
25 investment in transmission has declined at over

1 \$100 million a year for 25 years. In the same
2 period electricity sales have doubled.

3 And then the last point here, the energy
4 corridor designated shall, at a minimum, under
5 this Act, specify the centerline with and
6 compatible uses of the corridor.

7 The federal scoping process. They
8 published the notice of intent on September 28,
9 2005. They had two workshops in Sacramento that
10 were the California workshops. Comment period
11 then ended November 28th.

12 We requested an extension of the comment
13 period and noted the need for additional workshops
14 and the need for greater public involvement around
15 the state. At that point the California Resources
16 Agency asked that we become a cooperating agency
17 with the BLM and Department of Energy on this
18 PEIS.

19 Thereafter we began immediate
20 notification. This was late November, prior to
21 the close of the comment period. Through the
22 cooperation of the California League of Cities and
23 State Association of Counties, we reached out to
24 478 cities and the counties; sent letters to 48
25 independent and municipal utilities in the state,

1 the ISO and several other, Fish and Game,
2 Forestry, Fire Protection, Parks and Rec, Water
3 Resources and State Lands. So those were the
4 state agencies we reached out to.

5 Thereafter we began, in mid December,
6 late December and early January, extensive mapping
7 efforts. We reviewed the 200-and-something
8 comments that were submitted to the federal
9 government. And then tried to place those on the
10 maps that you see posted in the back of the room
11 and on our website, so that we could get word out.

12 We then set up our own website and
13 developed these workshops. And, again, notified
14 478 cities and the counties, working with Native
15 American Heritage Commission. Notices went out to
16 247 Native American Tribes or interested parties.
17 So if they were on the list, they got it. And
18 then also to several of our policy lists that went
19 out to most of the folks that have been involved
20 in various programs at the agency.

21 The BLM and the CEC, we formed a
22 interagency federal and state working group.
23 Participating federal agencies at this point are
24 the U.S. Forest Service -- we notice Mike Chapel
25 is here today, thank you, the Department of

1 Defense, National Park Service, U.S. Air Force and
2 Marines are participating because of the interest
3 in land uses in southern California in Imperial
4 and San Diego Counties.

5 State agencies participating are the
6 Department of Fish and Game, Parks and Recreation,
7 public utilities, State Lands and the State
8 Clearinghouse.

9 And what we're doing in our interagency
10 meetings is reviewing these proposals to the
11 federal government; and then we will meet with
12 Department of Energy to provide our input or our
13 feedback to them as California agencies for this
14 process.

15 The purpose of the workshop is plainly
16 just to get comments. If you have comments we
17 want to hear them. Again, the blue speaker cards;
18 I think we have seven or eight up here now. I
19 encourage everyone that's interested to fill one
20 out. If you'd like to give us other comments
21 please have your written comments in by February
22 16th.

23 We need to hear from you. And you can
24 see corridors proposed during the scoping period,
25 additional corridors or alternatives. Any

1 renewable resource development areas that may
2 require transmission facilities. A big one here,
3 environmental and land use issues of concerns. We
4 understand that there's a lot of concerns out
5 there and we'd like to relay that information to
6 the federal government.

7 The next steps for our group, we'll have
8 a meeting in late February to go over to refine
9 some of our mapping efforts and develop what we
10 think are areas that shouldn't be exposed to
11 energy corridor development, and provide that
12 information to the feds.

13 We will meet with the Department of
14 Energy in early March, providing any comments we
15 hear today and from yesterday's comments, and any
16 written information.

17 So the programmatic EIS is expected in
18 September or October. Department of Energy and
19 BLM are co-lead federal agencies. The Forest
20 Service and the Energy Commission are cooperating
21 agencies.

22 The contractor for the PEIS is Argonne
23 National Laboratory; they are a part of the
24 Department of Energy. And they've also set up a
25 webpage; it's corridoreis/anl.gov. And if you're

1 interested you can go on there and sign up on a
2 list-serve and be notified whenever something
3 occurs. They automatically send out email to
4 everybody.

5 And then the programmatic EIS for
6 purposes of preparing EIS, this is the definition
7 they're looking at for a corridor. It's being a
8 preferred location for existing and future utility
9 rights-of-ways and that is suitable for
10 accommodating one or more rights-of-ways that are
11 similar, identical or compatible.

12 And then, of course, contact
13 information. If you're interested and want
14 further information, please contact myself or
15 Duane Marti with the BLM.

16 And at that, we'll open it up to
17 comments.

18 The first speaker card I have, and if
19 you'll just come to the podium there, Mark Chomyn.

20 MR. CHOMYN: Good morning, Mark Chomyn,
21 San Diego Gas and Electric Company, San Diego,
22 California.

23 Sempra Energy supports the federal
24 government's efforts in designating energy
25 corridors on federal lands to meet the goals

1 established in the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

2 We appreciate the CEC's efforts as a
3 cooperating agency to engage stakeholders in
4 today's workshop supporting that federal goal. As
5 the economy and population expands so does our
6 need for energy, both nationally and statewide.

7 Energy industry efforts to more
8 effectively handle the demand side of the energy
9 equation do not preclude the need for additional
10 supplies of energy or the infrastructure necessary
11 to move that energy to customer load centers.
12 Conservation, alone, will not eliminate the need
13 for those additional supplies and infrastructure.

14 Our expanding economy and population
15 continues to diminish land available for utility
16 infrastructure. In the past several years
17 southern California has experienced substantial
18 residential growth. This growth, coupled with
19 increasing federal, state and local land
20 development restrictions, further limits the
21 availability of feasible and economical energy
22 facility sites.

23 The federal government is California's
24 largest single landowner. Much of this land
25 ownership serves at sites for numerous defense

1 facilities. These defense facilities add an
2 important element to national security and the
3 regional protection and security of energy
4 delivery systems.

5 However, these same beneficial defense
6 facilities, with their large expanses of land, can
7 present a challenge to the location of utility
8 corridors and infrastructure. So we're encouraged
9 by the participation of the Department of Defense
10 in this federal planning activity.

11 The State of California also has
12 substantial land holdings managed by various state
13 agencies. These state-managed lands may abut or
14 be in close proximity to federal lands considered
15 in the federal energy corridor program.

16 Potential synergies for corridor
17 planning between federal and state agencies should
18 be an important shared goal in the designation of
19 energy corridors addressing the utility needs of
20 California and other western states.

21 The development of an effective federal
22 energy corridor program is not limited to our
23 national boundaries. To be effective the corridor
24 study must look beyond those boundaries into
25 Mexico. Even though energy projects in Mexico are

1 outside the jurisdiction of the United States,
2 development of those projects in close proximity
3 to our border may create a need for energy
4 infrastructure facilitating delivery of that
5 energy into the regional energy grid.

6 We encourage the federal government,
7 where appropriate, to engage and work
8 cooperatively on any cross-border elements of the
9 corridor plan.

10 The DOE notice of intent compiled a
11 preliminary list of eight environmental issues
12 that may be analyzed in the PEIS. We believe that
13 the DOE has correctly identified those critical
14 environmental issue for corridor planning.

15 Since corridors for linear energy
16 facilities are relatively flexible in nature, we
17 feel that an effective corridor planning strategy,
18 as envisioned by the DOE, with the support of the
19 CEC, will include adjusting corridors as necessary
20 to mitigate any potential impacts associated with
21 those eight issues.

22 Sempra Energy thanks the CEC as a
23 cooperating agency in this federal energy corridor
24 planning program for its efforts in assembling the
25 various stakeholders and sponsoring the workshop.

1 We remain committed to working with the federal
2 government, state government, and all affected
3 stakeholders in seeing this innovative and
4 beneficial planning effort to a successful
5 completion.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you, Mark. Manuel
8 Alvarez.

9 MR. ALVAREZ: Good morning, Manuel
10 Alvarez, Southern California Edison. Before I
11 start there's a couple of questions I had in your
12 presentation. Do you want me to ask those at the
13 end or should I ask them --

14 MR. BARTRIDGE: Why don't we do that at
15 the end.

16 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. That'd be fine.
17 First of all, Edison appreciates the opportunity
18 to present its views. We did comment on the
19 earlier meeting and sent you some detailed
20 comments for those. We want you to incorporate
21 those.

22 There are four issues that I want to
23 raise to your attention today. We'll be following
24 up on those issues by the 16th of February with
25 detailed comments, and actually be providing you

1 some additional maps for your consideration. But
2 that'll come on the 16th in the written format.

3 The first issue I want to bring to your
4 attention is the retaining existing corridors. We
5 think that should be incorporated into any
6 analysis that needs to be undertaken.

7 The detailed maps we'll provide you will
8 give you those existing corridors. And we think
9 that part of your evaluation needs to incorporate
10 those.

11 The second item is the method by which
12 you evaluate existing corridors and new corridors
13 in the State of California, and in fact, in the
14 entire west. Some consideration needs to be made
15 in that particular area, how you go about doing
16 that.

17 The third item is the length of time and
18 duration in which the analysis is going to be
19 undertaken. We're suggesting that you take the
20 long-term perspective. In fact, our view is that
21 perhaps you should look out as far as 20 years
22 into the future and begin to look out in that
23 timeframe. I believe you're aware of the length
24 of time a permitting and construction project for
25 a transmission line is necessary, so this long-

1 term view is imperative for the state. And I know
2 it's a difficult task, but somebody's got to step
3 up to the plate and do that.

4 The fourth item is consideration of
5 local decisions, local land use plans and local
6 issues that come before this body or any
7 particular project. And as part of that, I think
8 the obligation for the incumbent utilities to
9 serve their existing load needs to be factored
10 into any type of analysis you have.

11 So those are the four issues I think you
12 need to focus on. And we'll be focusing those in
13 our written comments.

14 And finally, I guess the most difficult
15 thing, in this coordination of government, both
16 state, local and federal, we'd like the State of
17 California, the CEC in particular, in working with
18 the federal government, to kind of create a
19 seamless process by which this can be undertaken.

20 I know that sounds easy, but you know,
21 making the seams of government work is, in fact, a
22 very difficult task. So we appreciate your
23 effort.

24 The two questions I have that came up in
25 your presentation was the listing of participants

1 and stakeholders that you identified in one of
2 your slides, are those available for folks to get
3 the names and contact points of the various
4 cities, counties and other groups?

5 MR. BARTRIDGE: As far as who we reached
6 out to?

7 MR. ALVAREZ: Yes.

8 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah, we'll work that
9 out.

10 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. And then the other
11 question I had is at the end of the presentation
12 you mentioned that the Energy Commission or the
13 State of California would make areas that are off-
14 limits to the federal government.

15 Are you going to make those locations
16 and designations public before you hand them off
17 to the federal government?

18 MR. BARTRIDGE: Well, this is really the
19 federal government's process. So we're just
20 acting to give them information. I don't know
21 that -- as long as we can meet their schedule,
22 there will be a comment period with the PEIS at
23 that point --

24 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay, I guess that gets
25 into, you know, the weight that the federal

1 government will place on those designations and to
2 what extent they have been vented in California.

3 MR. BARTRIDGE: Sure.

4 MR. ALVAREZ: Okay, thank you.

5 MR. BARTRIDGE: Um-hum. John Dutcher.

6 MR. DUTCHER: Good morning. Wow, I'm
7 right after Edison and Southern California Edison
8 Company, two of the biggest electric utilities in
9 California. And here I am representing Mountain
10 Utilities, which is probably the smallest electric
11 utility in California.

12 And generally speaking, when I show up
13 at meetings and so forth, I have to provide at
14 least some sort of an introduction. My name is
15 John Dutcher. I work as the, if you'll excuse the
16 title, Vice President for Regulatory Affairs at
17 Mountain Utilities.

18 And Mountain Utilities is the electric
19 utility that serves the community of Kirkwood,
20 which for skiers is probably well known as a
21 location. For others, it's about 30 miles south
22 and west of Lake Tahoe.

23 That particular location, the Valley of
24 Kirkwood, is pretty much surrounded by federal
25 land, beautiful federal land I should add, and is

1 somewhat difficult to get to, but very rewarding
2 for skiers and other people that like their
3 vacation areas.

4 Now, the way that Mountain Utilities
5 supplies the electricity to the Kirkwood community
6 is through five diesel generators. These diesel
7 generators are maybe about twice the size of what
8 you'd see on the average truck rumbling down the
9 road. So, as you can imagine, we don't generate a
10 whole lot of electricity, but it's enough for the
11 ski lifts, the snow-making and the residents in
12 the area.

13 We do it with diesel fuel. And one of
14 the consequences of that is that our electric
15 utility rates are extremely high, probably higher
16 than just about anybody else, which is part of the
17 tradeoff problem between you want electricity but
18 you don't necessarily want to pay a whole lot for
19 it.

20 As I mentioned, the folks that live up
21 there are primarily vacationers and seekers of
22 recreation. We think about 10 percent of the
23 people have regular homes up there and the rest of
24 the time they are people that come up for
25 vacation, recreation, skiing, what-have-you. And

1 that constitutes about somewhere between 500 and
2 600 customers.

3 Okay. So with that as kind of a
4 background as to where we are and, you know, the
5 huge size of Mountain Utilities as a major
6 electric utility, what Mountain Utilities would
7 probably like to get for its customers is an
8 invisible, nonpolluting transmission line running
9 along highway 88, and also preferably free, as
10 opposed to having any cost.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. DUTCHER: What we would settle for,
13 however, is whatever public policy finds
14 appropriate. But we did want to mention and
15 present ourselves, and say here's where we are.
16 And, if, by any chance, you decide to put a
17 corridor through there, I think, assuming -- you
18 know, there are going to be people who are going
19 to say no way, no how. There are other people who
20 are going to say, well, maybe it would be all
21 right. And we recognize both of those things.

22 And so we're willing to settle for what
23 public policy dictates. But we're on highway 88.

24 And that pretty much completes my
25 statement. I have a few copies of a document that

1 shows where we're located and a brief description
2 of Mountain Utilities. And I can make those
3 available to you if you'd like.

4 MR. BARTRIDGE: Absolutely.

5 MR. DUTCHER: Okay. And that's it, no
6 questions, nothing else, thank you.

7 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you. Don Jardine.

8 MR. JARDINE: Well, good morning. I'm
9 on the Board of Supervisors for Alpine County.
10 And as things happen, we're entirely in support of
11 Kirkwood's request. And the PUD is also in
12 support of it. And you stole my thunder.

13 MR. DUTCHER: Oh, I'm sorry.

14 MR. JARDINE: But, anyway, we are the
15 smallest of the 58 counties, and we do endorse
16 Kirkwood's request, the PUD and the Mountain
17 Utilities.

18 And we'd also be interested in the list
19 of those folks you are contacting. We certainly
20 want to be involved in the process.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: Very good, thank you.

23 Susan Grijalva. Did I get that right?

24 MS. GRIJALVA: No.

25 MR. BARTRIDGE: No.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. GRIJALVA: It's Susan Grijalva. And
3 I know Mountain Utilities, and I know Don from
4 Alpine County because I'm the Amador County
5 Planning Director and we're all neighbors, and
6 Kirkwood is partially in our County.

7 I actually, I think I have more
8 questions than I have comments, or I should say I
9 have questions before I can decide what my
10 comments are.

11 The first question I have is I heard
12 earlier that this is only for routes that are on
13 federal land. So that means once they leave
14 federal land then the routes are not being
15 examined?

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: Correct.

17 MS. GRIJALVA: So what we see on the
18 maps are not totally, I won't say accurate,
19 they're not being evaluated, all the lines on the
20 maps are not being evaluated -- all the routes?

21 MR. BARTRIDGE: This effort is for
22 federal lands only, yes.

23 MS. GRIJALVA: For federal, okay. I
24 guess that makes my comments would be for visual
25 obviously. Some of these routes are going through

1 wilderness lands, and I don't know how that
2 affects the federal policies and rules, or
3 whatever, that affect wilderness lands.

4 You've already contacted the tribal
5 entities, so that was another comment I had. And
6 the only other real comment I have at this point
7 is that one of the routes, the Sierra Pacific
8 route, appears to be going down the Mokelumne
9 River Canyon. And I don't know if it's going down
10 the Mokelumne Canyon or on the ridge. And either
11 of those routes would have some significant
12 impacts and concerns at some of the roughest
13 terrain that I'm aware of in the Sierra Nevada, if
14 you're in that area.

15 So, you know, without knowing whether
16 these are electrical transmission lines or if
17 these are pipelines, the impacts from constructing
18 those kinds of facilities would vary from erosion
19 to, you know, how wide a swath would need to be
20 cut out of timberland. So all of those things
21 really kind of play into it.

22 I see in your format there's a question-
23 and-answer period, and then there's more comments
24 this afternoon, is that, if necessary?

25 MR. BARTRIDGE: Well, depending on how

1 many people show up, yeah.

2 MS. GRIJALVA: If necessary?

3 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah.

4 MS. GRIJALVA: Okay. And that's all I
5 have at this point, thank you.

6 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you. Brent
7 Schoradt. How'd I do on that one?

8 MR. SCHORADT: Close enough.

9 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.

10 MR. SCHORADT: Good morning; my name is
11 Brent Schoradt. I'm the Deputy Policy Director at
12 the California Wilderness Coalition. The
13 California Wilderness Coalition is a nonprofit
14 organization dedicated to protecting California's
15 last remaining wild places.

16 And really, after looking at the
17 corridors, we were extremely alarmed at the number
18 of corridors proposed to go through wilderness
19 areas, inventoried roadless areas, wilderness
20 study areas and perhaps most surprisingly,
21 national parks. But I guess we shouldn't be too
22 surprised at anything we see these days.

23 I think it's worth pointing out that the
24 construction of permanent structures within
25 wilderness areas is prohibited by the Wilderness

1 Act. And the 2005 Energy Policy Act did not
2 exempt any federal agency from the Wilderness Act,
3 so we don't see how it could be possible that we
4 could even be talking about corridors through
5 wilderness areas or wilderness study areas.

6 And I also think it's worth pointing out
7 that according to the Park Service they don't see
8 where they have the authority to designate any
9 corridors within national Park Service lands.

10 And, let's see, we're hoping that the
11 inaccurate scale or perhaps some sort of clerical
12 error leads us to misinterpret the corridors that
13 we see up on the map here. But just to give an
14 example, actually I have a three-page document
15 here that shows our most conservative estimate of
16 the wilderness areas and wilderness study areas
17 and inventoried roadless areas that are impacted
18 by the corridor.

19 And just as an example we heard that
20 PG&E, there's a proposal to go right through the
21 middle of Lassen National Park. Looks like
22 Southern California Edison is proposing through
23 the Cajon roadless area, and through Joshua Tree
24 National Park, through Fish Canyon roadless area,
25 Circle Mountain roadless area, Magic Mountain

1 roadless area, Mecca Hills wilderness, and the
2 Mojave National Preserve.

3 And then if we look at San Diego Gas and
4 Electric proposal, we see Anza-Borrego Desert
5 State Park, Carrizo Gorge wilderness, Coyote
6 Mountains wilderness, Fish Creek Mountains
7 wilderness, Sawtooth Mountains proposed wilderness
8 additions, Sawtooth Mountains wilderness and the
9 list goes on and on. So if anyone's interested I
10 can provide copies here, and I'll provide the CEC
11 some copies, as well.

12 But, basically we feel that inventoried
13 roadless areas, wilderness study areas, existing
14 wilderness areas and national parks are not only
15 inappropriate locations for corridors, but we
16 can't find anything in our laws that would
17 actually permit that. So we feel they're
18 inappropriate as well as being illegal.

19 So, that pretty much concludes it for
20 me. A couple questions I have is the Energy
21 Commission, itself, the actual Commissioners
22 planning on weighing in on this proposal?

23 MR. BARTRIDGE: They're aware of what's
24 going on; we're keeping them in the loop. But
25 again, I'd just like to state that these are

1 applicant-proposed corridors. We haven't seen
2 anything from the federal government Department of
3 Energy as far as what they're looking at for their
4 draft.

5 This is what was proposed in the comment
6 period. There were 34 comments from the State of
7 California, which is one of the reasons we're
8 holding these workshops.

9 Of those 34 comments, you know,
10 excluding the orange and sort of the brownish-
11 green area, which are existing corridors in the
12 state, the others you see in front of you are
13 applicant-proposed to the federal government.

14 So I just wanted to make that clear.

15 MR. SCHORADT: Yeah, we understand. We
16 definitely appreciate the CEC getting involved and
17 the state government, because I think there's
18 really a lot at stake if you look at California's
19 public lands.

20 And we have a long history in California
21 of protecting our wilderness areas. I think if
22 you look at the percentage of wilderness in
23 California, we're far and above the rest of the
24 country. So I think now is not the time for us to
25 start going back on that. I think it's good that

1 we're talking about it here.

2 But a couple other questions I have is
3 how wide are the corridors going to be? Has that
4 been determined yet?

5 MR. BARTRIDGE: We don't have that
6 information, no.

7 MR. SCHORADT: Okay. And then once the
8 EIS is completed will there be further NEPA
9 analysis within those corridors to look at site-
10 specific impacts?

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: As projects are proposed
12 I'm sure there will be the next level --

13 MR. SCHORADT: Um-hum.

14 MR. BARTRIDGE: -- of environmental
15 review per project when it's proposed. But I
16 don't have any information on that at this point.

17 MR. SCHORADT: Um-hum. And then for
18 this SB-1059 bill, if that is passed will the
19 State of California be able to designate exclusion
20 zones where corridors are not allowed?

21 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah, why don't you take
22 that one.

23 MR. O'BRIEN: No, that's not the intent
24 of the legislation. The intent of the legislation
25 is to allow the designation of corridors. And I

1 think what would be envisioned is determining
2 corridors, selecting widths as narrow as possible,
3 and indicating that those areas would be
4 appropriate for electric transmission lines.

5 This bill actually just targets electric
6 transmission lines, unlike this federal effort
7 which is talking about, you know, natural gas
8 pipelines, hydrogen lines, et cetera.

9 Going back to your question on the
10 Commissioners. The Commissioners were informed by
11 the staff and gave the go-ahead for the Energy
12 Commission to petition to be a cooperating agency.
13 And then we went to the California State Resources
14 Agency and asked that they make the petition to
15 the federal government. And that was granted by
16 the Bureau of Land Management.

17 At this point in time it's basically a
18 staff effort in terms of the staff cooperating
19 with the other state agencies at the staff level.
20 And then with the federal agencies.

21 At this -- I don't envision a Commission
22 action in terms of our work, that is if the
23 Commissioners would make some, take a vote on
24 anything. We obviously will keep them in the
25 loop. That could change, but at this point in

1 time, that's my feeling in terms of what
2 involvement might be on the part of the
3 Commissioners.

4 MR. SCHORADT: So these meetings here,
5 are these to shape the staff's comment letters
6 that will then go into the record for the NEPA
7 process, or just actually part of the NEPA scoping
8 process?

9 MR. O'BRIEN: Well, this information
10 will be shared obviously with the federal
11 agencies, with the state agencies, and will inform
12 the discussions and the work of the working group
13 that we formed in terms of recommendations to make
14 regarding corridor designation.

15 MR. SCHORADT: Okay, great. Thank you
16 very much.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: John Moore, Sierra Club.

18 MR. MOORE: Well, I'm John Moore; a
19 resident of Sacramento, representing the Sierra
20 Club. I had ambitious plans to point to things.
21 I guess it will work, except it's pretty hard to
22 tell what I'm pointing at at this distance. So
23 I'm not sure that I will take advantage of that.

24 I first wanted to thank the Energy
25 Commission for becoming involved in this process,

1 for providing the opportunity for comment, and for
2 making available maps of the proposed corridors.
3 Without those maps I'd be lost.

4 And I want to thank the California
5 Wilderness Coalition for the complete compilation
6 of affected areas which they have made available.

7 My comments are limited to large-scale
8 land use impacts of corridors in the central and
9 northern Sierra Nevada and southern Cascades. I
10 know these areas from some 30 years of hiking,
11 studying and working for wilderness designation
12 and sustainable national forest management.

13 Corridors may be expected to have
14 numerous types of smaller scale land use impacts,
15 many of which were mentioned in the scoping
16 sessions. I won't address smaller scale impacts.

17 Some astounding corridors are depicted
18 on the stakeholder needs map. Astounding because
19 the stakeholders proposed to cut swaths across
20 national parks and Congressionally designated
21 wilderness.

22 These splendid wildlands enjoy the most
23 stringent level of legal protection requiring that
24 they be managed to conserve their natural
25 resources and values. Allowing for energy

1 corridors is simply not in the legislation, as Mr.
2 Schoradt remarked.

3 For example, corridors are proposed --
4 apologize for the repetition -- through the middle
5 of Lassen Volcanic National Park, apparently
6 clipping the northwest corner of Lassen National
7 Park; through the Ishi wilderness; through the
8 Desolation wilderness; through the Mokelumne
9 wilderness. That corridor also crosses a
10 beautiful Mice Meadows area, a potential
11 wilderness area. Another corridor crosses through
12 the Carson, Iceberg and Mokelumne wildernesses.

13 Proposing corridors like these is
14 evidence that the stakeholders have not
15 responsibly informed themselves about the
16 constraints in corridor location. National parks
17 and designated wilderness are not the only
18 categories of public lands where utility
19 categories are not appropriate. Other such
20 categories include Bureau of Land Management and
21 Forest Service wilderness study areas, Forest
22 Service roadless areas, Bureau of Land Management
23 areas of critical environmental concern, units of
24 the Bureau of Land Management's national landscape
25 conservation system and potential wilderness areas

1 which citizens have proposed be designated. There
2 is, for example, a corridor crossing BLM
3 wilderness study areas east of Honey Lake.

4 Besides these strictly protected areas
5 there are areas with beautiful scenery and views
6 that would be seriously degraded by power lines.
7 For example, between highway 50 and Yosemite, the
8 only national forest lands near the Sierra Nevada
9 crest that are not wilderness are narrow corridors
10 along the TransSierra highways.

11 Powerlines would have to go through
12 these corridors. Views from these highways are
13 admired by millions of visitors every year,
14 including, of course, visitors to Kirkwood.

15 Part of the solution is to use existing
16 corridors to the maximum extent possible.

17 I do have a question. On the map there
18 are a very large number of lines or corridors with
19 a color indicating they refer to Redding. And
20 it's the bottom. I find this puzzling. I can't
21 imagine how the City of Redding is involved in all
22 those corridors, many of which go nowhere near
23 Redding. I'd also note there isn't any Redding
24 needs map among the series of individual needs
25 maps.

1 MR. BARTRIDGE: I think we may have a
2 mis-label on there, but this corridor here, you
3 can see the mouse-hand following, was proposed by
4 the City of Redding Electric District, which is
5 part of the Transmission Agency of Northern
6 California. So it's a cooperative group.

7 MR. MOORE: So that one, at least, is
8 correct. Now there seem to be quite a number of
9 other lines that are the same color, as far as my
10 eyesight can tell.

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: If they're labeled
12 Redding, they may have been needed to be labeled
13 TANC. I know that label is there, but I'll have
14 to clarify on that. I'll have to take a look at
15 the mapping.

16 MR. MOORE: Another point I might make,
17 this is a point of map. I appreciate these maps
18 very much. As I say, I would have been lost
19 without the depiction of federal land ownership.
20 I would have still have been lost because that's
21 the only way I could tell where the blasted
22 corridors are located.

23 My comment is that when one has a list
24 of colors in the legend, okay, and then the colors
25 on the map, it's often difficult to pair them up

1 if there are a lot of colors. So my idea, which
2 I've proposed in many situations, is that we get a
3 separate detachable thing with the colors on it
4 from the leg, which you could hold up to the map
5 and see which is which. I can't count the number
6 of maps in which I've been puzzled by the great
7 array of colors. So, something to keep in mind
8 for future efforts.

9 MR. BARTRIDGE: Sure, thank you.

10 MR. MOORE: Thank you.

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: Jane Turnbull.

12 MS. TURNBULL: Good morning. I'm Jane
13 Turnbull; I'm here on behalf of the League of
14 Women Voters of California.

15 The League recognizes the fact that
16 adequate transmission is necessary for the people
17 of California and for the economy of California.
18 therefore, we're very concerned about this
19 process.

20 We believe that the coordinated process,
21 comprehensive process that is being developed here
22 is a very good approach and hopefully it will
23 reduce some of the redundancies that have been in
24 the process over the past years.

25 We want very much for this federal

1 endeavor to mesh with the state planning process
2 at the same time.

3 We agree with Mr. Alvarez that we ought
4 to be taking a 20-year perspective in this arena.
5 Short-term planning has not done us well. It is
6 making the reliability of the system become really
7 quite questionable at times.

8 One of our concerns is that we don't
9 want to give up CEQA. CEQA has been a really
10 strong aspect of the environmental certainties,
11 the protection of our environment. NEPA is fine,
12 but somewhere along the line we would like to have
13 an understanding of where CEQA fits in. And to
14 make certain that there is no loss of the
15 certainty that goes with that.

16 One of the other concerns that the
17 League's had over the years, because we have very
18 strong positions in sustainable communities, is
19 the lack of long-term land use planning across the
20 state. As population pressures continue to grow,
21 the tendency for developers to move into areas and
22 develop massive, large-scale development without
23 adequate infrastructure has been an ongoing
24 process. And with the projected population growth
25 we don't see an end to that.

1 We're hoping that maybe this process
2 will identify to the state the need for thinking
3 in terms of infrastructure into the future, in a
4 general sense, not just for transmission lines.

5 Our fourth concern is that we would like
6 to see this process related to the coordinated
7 process that was announced in December between the
8 Energy Commission, the PUC and the ISO, which is
9 to have a far more integrated effort in terms of
10 facility and infrastructure siting at the state
11 level. We think that this effort is a good one,
12 but it needs to be attached and meshed with the
13 state effort.

14 Those are my comments.

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you.

16 MR. O'BRIEN: I just want to respond to
17 one of your comments, the points you were making
18 regarding CEQA.

19 There won't be any CEQA document
20 prepared on this because it is designation of
21 corridors on federal land. The federal agencies
22 obviously have the lead.

23 As we indicated earlier, we, along with
24 a number of other state agencies, are coordinating
25 with them and sharing ideas and providing input.

1 But this is a, you know, a NEPA, National
2 Environmental Policy Act issue. And so there
3 won't be any analysis per the California
4 Environmental Quality Act.

5 So I just wanted to make sure you
6 understood that.

7 MS. TURNBULL: Right, but when you leave
8 the federal land then you're on state land, and
9 somewhere along the line they do have to be
10 complementary with one another.

11 MR. O'BRIEN: Well, I agree, and to the
12 extent that projects are proposed. I mean what
13 we're looking at here are the designation of
14 corridors on federal land. And basically when
15 these corridors are designated, wherever they may
16 be, however many number they may be, that will
17 indicate a land use decision that it is compatible
18 to put energy corridors on those lands.

19 Then at some later point, if a developer
20 comes forward and says, I want to propose a
21 project and it goes in that corridor. And then it
22 leaves the corridor and goes on other land outside
23 of federal land, then a state agency presumably
24 will be involved, depending on the proponent of
25 the project, where the project is located, et

1 cetera.

2 So what you can probably anticipate at
3 that point in time is that there would be a joint
4 federal/state environmental document prepared per
5 CEQA and per NEPA.

6 MR. BARTRIDGE: Patrick Christman.

7 MR. CHRISTMAN: Good morning. My name
8 is Patrick Christman. I'm the Director of the
9 Marine Corps' Western Regional Environmental
10 Office. I work for Major General Lehnert, who is
11 the Commanding General of the Marine Corps
12 Installations West. And we'd like to make a few
13 comments this morning.

14 And I think those may find it a bit
15 unusual for the feds to be talking to the state,
16 but we have a long history of trying to work
17 cooperatively with the states in our region, and
18 we think this is a very important process.

19 There have been comments made this
20 morning about trying to look forward as a planning
21 tool into the future, and I think that's the way
22 we in the Marine Corps are looking at this
23 project. Not only in terms of the impacts on
24 federal lands, but the subsequent projects that
25 may follow from this.

1 We have some prepared remarks that we
2 will be providing to you.

3 Just a little bit of background. The
4 Marine Corps Installation of the West, commanded
5 by General Lehnert, consists of a lot of
6 installations here in California. The Mountain
7 Warfare Training Center in Bridgeport, the Marine
8 Corps Logistics Base at Barstow, Marine Corps Air
9 Station at Yuma, which is in charge of the
10 Chocolate Mountain area gunner range, Marine Corps
11 Air/Ground Task Force Training Center at 29 Palms,
12 Marine Corps Air Station at Camp Pendleton and so
13 on and so on and so on as you can well imagine.
14 The Marine Corps has a very significant presence
15 here in California.

16 We think that's also very important
17 because as our Marines from the First Marine
18 Expeditionary Force are currently deploying to
19 Iraq and Afghanistan, many for the second and
20 third time, it certainly underscores how important
21 California lands are to our national security
22 functions.

23 So, having said that, I have a letter
24 here from General Lehnert:

25 "As Commanding General, Marine Corps

1 Installations West, I'm writing to express
2 our vital interest in and deepest concerns
3 over establishing the location of new energy
4 corridors in California, and their potential
5 impacts on our military missions."

6 "As noted by the Governor's Office of
7 Planning and Research in their introduction
8 to the California Advisory Handbook for
9 Community and Military Planning, the State of
10 California, its cities and counties, and the
11 Department of Defense have a long and
12 successful history of working together to
13 build a stronger California and a more secure
14 nation."

15 "California has more military installations
16 and operational areas than any other state in
17 the union. The state's very climate, terrain
18 and coastline provide unique training and
19 testing opportunities for the Army, Marine
20 Corps, Navy and Air Force. In turn, the
21 benefits to the state are significant. In
22 2005 California had over 278,000 persons
23 directly employed by the military, active
24 duty, civilian, reserves and National Guard.
25 And the military expenditures in California

1 topping \$42 billion."

2 "The introduction goes on to point out,
3 however, as communities develop and expand in
4 response to growth and market demands, land
5 use decisions can push urban development
6 closer to military installations and
7 operational areas. The resulting land use
8 conflicts, referred to as encroachment, can
9 have negative effects on the community and
10 sustainment of military activities and
11 readiness. This threat to military readiness
12 is currently one of the military's greatest
13 concerns. The protection of installations
14 and operational areas is vital to the State
15 of California and to overall military
16 readiness."

17 "To us, the establishment of energy corridors
18 on federal lands, as well as on California
19 lands, is not only a critical operational
20 issue today, but will continue to be so in
21 the future. Many of our installations and
22 ranges, and special use, restricted use and
23 military training routes were established
24 before and following World War II when there
25 was little urban development in many remote

1 areas of California. Many of these same
2 areas have developed rapidly and urban areas
3 now surround our once-remote installations,
4 ranges and air space, and negatively impact
5 our mission functions. Projected growth in
6 California can only exacerbate the situation
7 if not carefully planned."

8 "The Marine Corps, along with our sister
9 services of the Army, Navy and Air Force,
10 have worked diligently with the Governor's
11 Office and the Legislature to address the
12 effects of encroachment on our military
13 missions in California. We have worked
14 cooperatively on legislation such as Senate
15 Bills 1099, 1462, 1468 and 1108 to establish
16 the Governor's Office of Military and
17 Aerospace Support, the California Defense,
18 Retention and Conversion Council, and to
19 include military mission requirements within
20 the framework of the California Environmental
21 Quality Act and the City and County General
22 Plans process."

23 "We are very pleased to be able to work with
24 the California Interagency Energy Corridor
25 Working Group, including staff from the

1 various California state agencies, such as
2 the Energy Commission, and from federal
3 agencies such as the Bureau of Land
4 Management, National Forests, National Park
5 Service and our sister services."

6 "As that group works to analyze the optimal
7 locations for siting energy corridors in
8 California, we ask that our national security
9 and military mission requirements be
10 considered as significant criteria in the
11 analysis and recommendation. We remain
12 willing to work with the Energy Commission
13 Staff and any other members of the
14 Administration to arrive at the optimal
15 solution of establishing workable energy
16 corridors in California, while avoiding
17 adverse impacts to our national security and
18 military mission requirements."

19 Thank you.

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thanks, Pat. Loren Loo.

21 MR. LOO: Hi, my name is Loren Loo with
22 PG&E. And just like to take a moment to provide
23 you with PG&E's comments regarding this current
24 process.

25 PG&E's concerns and comments regarding

1 the DOE energy corridor programmatic EIS have been
2 summarized in previous statements provided to the
3 DOE, which I believe you already have on your
4 website, but I'd like to take the opportunity to
5 just reiterate a couple of the key points that we
6 had proposed in those correspondences.

7 First of all, we're supportive of the
8 effort being performed by DOE, BLM and want to be
9 an active participant in --

10 (Alarm siren.)

11 MR. LOO: should I put up my hands or --

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. LOO: -- active participant in this
14 process, and really appreciate the CEC taking the
15 opportunity to bring everyone together to
16 coordinate comments.

17 We do hope that the CEC will, you know,
18 strive to insure that whatever comes out of all of
19 this, it's just not another line on a map in a
20 planning document that isn't really applicable,
21 doesn't have any value and is just really
22 essentially ignored by both, you know, public and
23 private entities, and public agencies.

24 And I think that the CEC's involvement
25 here can, you know, go a long way towards insuring

1 that that doesn't happen.

2 We also believe that in order for the
3 project to be successful, you know, stakeholders
4 that are interested in the nonfederal lands need
5 to be fully considered and integrated into this
6 effort because this will, you know, essentially
7 bridge, as many people have already indicated
8 earlier, that line between where the corridors
9 come in or out of federal lands and into private,
10 you know, privately held lands within the state.

11 And we also request that the existing
12 corridors be fully considered as feasible avenues
13 for enhancement or expansion of future uses,
14 although I believe that the maps that the Colonel
15 presented don't indicate -- they identify the
16 current facilities. I think that's something that
17 we feel is very key, even though we didn't stress,
18 you know, the fact that we have existing
19 facilities and corridors in our responses.

20 And so we believe that the existing
21 corridors should be given equal, you know, equal
22 consideration as, you know, as well as the new
23 corridors for -- throughout this process.

24 Couple questions that we'd like to
25 request the CEC can, you know, strive towards is

1 whether there will be a definition of the term of
2 these corridors once they're established on the
3 federal lands. And, you know, if it's going to be
4 five years, it's going to be ten years, or
5 coinciding with the terms of the various land
6 management plans that are federally enacted.

7 And then finally whether there would be
8 any prioritization of the actual entities that
9 could -- make use of those corridors, or would it
10 be sort of a first-come/first-serve basis. And
11 it's just whoever gets, you know, gets the project
12 in the queue first that would have priority over
13 all others.

14 Those would be items of interest for us
15 to hear about as this whole process goes forward.
16 So, thank you.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you. Anyone else,
18 for the record, want to make a statement or
19 comments? No? Okay.

20 Let's open it up for questions and
21 answers. Manny, did you want to -- we talk
22 offline, or did you want to --

23 MR. ALVAREZ: No, I think I asked my
24 questions.

25 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Anyone else for

1 questions and answers?

2 MS. GRIJALVA: Susan Grijalva again,
3 Amador County. When will the nonfederal land
4 routes be evaluated? I keep hearing, there's been
5 mention of state and DOE review. Is there
6 something underway already on the extension of
7 these corridors on the federal land into the
8 private lands? Or is that something down the
9 road?

10 MR. BARTRIDGE: That would be down the
11 road as individual projects. Again, Terry
12 mentioned --

13 MS. GRIJALVA: As, okay, individual --

14 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah, --

15 MS. GRIJALVA: -- nothing on a statewide
16 basis --

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: Nothing at this point.

18 MS. GRIJALVA: -- being worked on?

19 MR. BARTRIDGE: Right.

20 MS. GRIJALVA: Okay, thank you.

21 MS. TURNBULL: Jane Turnbull, again. I
22 have to think that this is a real problem.
23 Somewhere along the line we've got to start
24 thinking of how the two are going to be meshed,
25 one to the other.

1 And the process that was laid out in
2 December at the PUC by the Energy Commission and
3 the PUC and the ISO indicating how they were going
4 to work together and define the areas where
5 transmission is needed most dramatically in the
6 state, where the congestion problems are the
7 greatest, where the load growth is anticipated to
8 be is very very relevant.

9 And that has to be tied to this. And if
10 that's not part of the process at the front end
11 we've got problems.

12 MR. O'BRIEN: Let me respond to that.
13 You make a very good point because obviously if
14 you're going to designate corridors on federal
15 lands and then you can't transition to private
16 land, it raises issues in terms of how effective
17 this process is going to be.

18 A number of speakers today have talked
19 about using existing corridors. And obviously, if
20 you look at our map that contains a lot of
21 corridors. And one of the principles from the
22 state perspective, and I'm sure is shared by the
23 federal agencies, is you want to use existing
24 corridors to the extent feasible.

25 In fact, there is state legislation

1 going back to the early 1990s that was sponsored
2 by then-, I think, Senator Garamendi, and we refer
3 to those as the Garamendi principles regarding
4 electric transmission lines, where you want to use
5 those corridors to the extent feasible.

6 The issue is that once you leave federal
7 land the ownership, if it's private ownership,
8 there's no state agency that has authority then to
9 go ahead and designate a corridor on private land.
10 And state land, while the state owns a fair amount
11 of land in places like state parks and rec, where
12 you want to avoid energy corridors, state lands
13 has checkerboard lands. So that land would not be
14 conducive in terms of, most of it in terms of
15 corridor designation.

16 At this point in time what you'd have,
17 as I indicated earlier, if someone were to propose
18 a transmission line on federal land, it would
19 presumably be within a corridor, and then where it
20 entered private land that issue then would have to
21 be evaluated by the permitting agency.

22 But I agree in terms of what the Energy
23 Commission has been trying to do in conjunction
24 with the Public Utilities Commission and the ISO
25 is come up with an integrated transmission

1 planning process. We have been working with the
2 CPUC and the ISO to do that. We're continuing to
3 have discussions about the planning process.

4 And I agree that down the road more
5 thought needs to be given in terms of how that
6 would be integrated into corridor planning.

7 I indicated earlier that there's a bill
8 that would grant the Energy Commission the
9 authority to designate corridors. And we
10 certainly agree, as an agency, that there needs to
11 be long-term planning.

12 What we've seen in California is
13 explosive growth in a number of areas, making the
14 designation of corridors very difficult. I think
15 one of the prime examples would be pointing to the
16 Valley-Rainbow line. If you look at that area in
17 southern Riverside, southwest Riverside County,
18 the Temecula area probably in 1970 had a
19 population of 5000 people. Today the area
20 probably has 200,000 people.

21 So, when San Diego Gas and Electric
22 proposed a transmission line through that area
23 there was an awful lot of public concern,
24 opposition, et cetera.

25 And so I think there's a recognition on

1 the part of a number of state agencies, certainly
2 the California Energy Commission, that going
3 forward we need to be able to designate corridors
4 to account for future growth in the state, which
5 we're seeing at the pace of probably half a
6 million people a year.

7 And we're hopeful, we're certainly
8 supportive of that Escutia Bill, and would like to
9 see it pass.

10 But, I agree, there needs to be better
11 integration between the various agencies to insure
12 that we have coordinated long-term planning
13 because I agree we've run into problems when we
14 haven't done a good job with long-term planning.
15 And given where the state is, where we expect it
16 to be in the future, it's critical to make
17 decisions today that can be then implemented in
18 years to come.

19 MR. BARTRIDGE: Any other questions?
20 Come on up to the microphone.

21 MR. MOORE: This is more response to the
22 previous statement which may evoke a further
23 statement.

24 It would seem that you're going to have
25 to somehow involve cities and counties, the land

1 use permitting entities, in these discussions and
2 plans. Otherwise, their independent actions will
3 frustrate the goals you want to achieve.

4 MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, I would certainly
5 agree. We, in this process, as Jim indicated
6 earlier, we notified over 400 cities, the 58
7 counties. In terms of land use destination and
8 corridors we agree.

9 We have had discussions with
10 representatives of California cities and counties
11 on this proposed legislation. They have some
12 concerns over preemption of local land use
13 authority. But I agree that there needs to be
14 integration at the local level and at the state
15 level on land use decisions.

16 One of the reasons for holding these two
17 workshops, from our perspective, was to provide
18 additional opportunity for cities and counties to
19 provide input. One of our concerns was that many
20 governmental agencies, nonfederal agencies, don't
21 closely follow what's posted in the Federal
22 Register.

23 And so when the federal government
24 decided to go forward with this project, we were
25 concerned that a lot of the local agencies were

1 unaware of it, and we wanted to hold these
2 workshops to provide them with additional
3 opportunity, as well as public interest groups and
4 utilities, et cetera, all stakeholders. But we
5 had a particular concern about local agencies not
6 being in the loop.

7 MR. SCHORADT: Do you know if the State
8 Resources Agency has submitted comments in the
9 scoping process, or if they're planning on
10 submitting comments? Because I know you mentioned
11 that they actually submitted the formal request so
12 that the CEC could be a coordinating agency. But
13 I'm curious to know if they've actually submitted
14 their own comments.

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: To the federal
16 government, I didn't see that they had. And I
17 think that that's what they see us as working
18 towards.

19 MR. SCHORADT: Okay, so the CEC will do
20 that on --

21 MR. BARTRIDGE: We're under the
22 Resources Agency.

23 MR. SCHORADT: Okay.

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: So, you know, we're
25 acting as part of that.

1 MR. SCHORADT: And then will you guys be
2 preparing your own sort of state government
3 comments? Or will you just be passing along these
4 public comments from these hearings? Or both?

5 MR. O'BRIEN: First of all, going back
6 to your prior question. I think the Resources
7 Agency is expecting that the individual agencies
8 within that umbrella organization are going to be
9 providing input.

10 So, for example, Department of Parks and
11 Recreation has been part of this group, so they're
12 providing input. California Energy Commission is.
13 And then there are other state agencies that
14 aren't directly under Resources that are also
15 providing input. For example, you know, the
16 California Public Utilities Commission.

17 In terms of your second question was
18 what comments would be made to the federal
19 government on behalf of the state?

20 MR. SCHORADT: Yeah, or just in
21 particular the Energy Commission. Will you guys
22 be just passing along the public comments that
23 have been received at these hearings?

24 MR. O'BRIEN: Well, one of the purposes
25 of this workshop is to pass along those comments,

1 to review them, ourselves, along with the other
2 members of the working group. Look at that input
3 and then decide, yes, that's a good point, we want
4 to make sure that the people preparing the
5 programmatic EIS take note of that and use that
6 to, you know, in their decisionmaking process. So
7 that's one aspect in terms of taking comment here
8 today, as we did yesterday. And then the written
9 comments and passing that along and analyzing
10 that.

11 And then obviously the various agencies
12 have their own input that they're going to
13 provide. We're doing that as part of the working
14 group. And trying to make sure that our issues
15 and concerns regarding energy reliability. But at
16 the same time, protection of the environment and
17 public health and safety are issues that we
18 advance for federal consideration.

19 And, you know, obviously ultimately,
20 notwithstanding this working group, final
21 decisions are going to be made by the federal
22 agencies who are running this process. And, you
23 know, it's federal land; they'll make the
24 determination as to what corridors to designate.

25 But, as I said, we're very pleased with

1 the cooperation and the working relationship that
2 has been established between the various state
3 agencies and the federal agencies.

4 MR. SCHORADT: Um-hum, yeah, I think one
5 of the things that we've heard, both from the
6 environmental folks today and from the industry
7 groups, is that existing corridors, and from the
8 state, too, the use of existing corridors really
9 should be looked at as our first, our most optimal
10 first choice.

11 And especially if that's in existing
12 state law. You mentioned the Garamendi
13 legislation from the '90s --

14 MR. O'BRIEN: Pertaining to electric
15 transmission lines, that's correct.

16 MR. SCHORADT: Okay, so I think we
17 definitely would support that, as well. So,
18 thanks.

19 MR. BARTRIDGE: I stood up yesterday for
20 ten minutes and asked for other commenters, so, go
21 ahead. Anyone else?

22 MR. MOORE: I'm not meaning to
23 monopolize this occasion, but on one of your last
24 slides I noticed that you say you will meet with
25 the Department of Energy in early March, providing

1 the comments and letters that have been submitted
2 to the Energy Commission, and provide the
3 interagency working group input.

4 And I'm inquiring if this information
5 will be publicly available in a convenient form?
6 I think it would be very useful.

7 MR. BARTRIDGE: Everything we've
8 received today will go on our website, and from
9 yesterday. I'm not clear about the workings of
10 the interagency group. That's, again, part of the
11 federal process; and we're providing comments to
12 that.

13 As a cooperating agency there's certain
14 rules and procedures that we have to follow. And
15 the last thing we want to do is upset their
16 timeline, and so they can point to California and
17 say, well, it's California's fault.

18 It's very important that we protect the
19 environment, and at the same time point out the
20 best places where we think it would be worthwhile
21 to consider corridors.

22 But also, I think, as part of the rules
23 of acting as an interagency, as part of the
24 cooperating agency in this interagency group,
25 that, you know, it's important to keep that in

1 mind, as well.

2 Did anybody have prepared comments that
3 they'd like to hand in today? If not, I'd say
4 submit those by the 16th.

5 Okay, well, thanks to everyone for
6 coming out today.

7 (Whereupon, at 11:24 a.m., the workshop
8 was adjourned.)

9 --o0o--

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PETER PETTY, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Staff Workshop; that it was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said workshop, nor in any way interested in outcome of said workshop.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 11th day of February, 2006.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

(916) 362-2345