



**FILED**

11-01-06

01:39 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902 E) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Sunrise Powerlink Transmission Project.

Application 06-08-010  
(Filed August 4, 2006)

Application 05-12-014  
(Filed December 14, 2005)

**ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S  
SCOPING MEMO AND RULING**

**Overview**

This ruling, which follows a prehearing conference (PHC) held on September 13, 2006 in Ramona, California, affirms the preliminary categorization of this proceeding as "ratesetting," sets forth the scope and procedural schedule for the proceeding pursuant to the requirements of Section 1701.1,<sup>1</sup> with a final decision projected for January 2008, orders the applicant, San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) and the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO)<sup>2</sup> to submit supplemental testimony and exhibits, and assigns Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Steven Weissman as the principal hearing officer. It also addresses discovery, service, and other procedural issues

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all section references are to the California Public Utilities Code.

<sup>2</sup> The California Independent System Operator Corporation is a non-profit public utility, created by California law and regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The CAISO manages and operates the transmission facilities owned by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and SDG&E.

for the proceeding. Parties can appeal this ruling only as to category of this proceeding under the procedures in Rule 7.6.<sup>3</sup>

We reiterate here our objectives for this proceeding which the Assigned Commissioner articulated at the September 13, 2006 PHC: (1) that we conduct a proceeding that meets all legal requirements; (2) that we have a process that incorporates public input, and where there are issues of concern, we understand what those concerns are; and (3) that we be rigorous about keeping to our schedule to issue a timely decision.

In finalizing this ruling and in delineating the scope of this proceeding, we have considered SDG&E's application and the numerous written responses and PHC statements, oral statements at each of the two PHCs, and letters and e-mails<sup>4</sup> concerning the project. We have also considered the protests filed by the West Chase Homeowners Association; Conservation Groups (the Center For Biological Diversity and the Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter); the Mussey Grade Road Alliance; the Carmel Country Highland Owners; the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA); the California State Parks Foundation; the Starlight Mountain Estates Owners; the Community Alliance For Sensible Energy; Ratepayers For Affordable Clean Energy Coalition; the Nevada Hydro Company; the Ramona Alliance Against Sunrise Powerlink; the Imperial Irrigation District; the Cities Of Hemet, Murrieta And Temecula; and the Utility Consumers' Action Network (UCAN).

---

<sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all references to a "Rule" or "Rules" are to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure available at:  
[http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/RULES\\_PRAC\\_PROC/59776.htm](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/RULES_PRAC_PROC/59776.htm)

In summary, SDG&E seeks a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) authorizing the construction of what it calls the “Sunrise Powerlink Project.”<sup>5</sup> The proposal is of great significance because of the importance of adequate transmission infrastructure to California’s energy future and the sensitive environmental setting of the potential project. The proposed project would cost approximately \$1.265 billion and would stretch approximately 150 miles from the El Centro area of Imperial County to northwestern San Diego County. It would include the construction of three new transmission lines and the reconducturing of several others, as well as the construction of a new substation and the modification of several others. A technical description of the project is attached as Appendix A to this ruling.<sup>6</sup>

The proposed project has many advocates, including the CAISO and the California Energy Commission (CEC). Supporters believe that the project is necessary, among other things, to ensure the reliability of California’s transmission system, to bring renewable energy to California consumers, and/or

---

<sup>4</sup> Interested people and organizations have sent to the Commission letters and e-mails regarding the proposed project that do not meet the formal filing requirements and which have been placed in the proceeding’s correspondence file.

<sup>5</sup> SDG&E originally filed an application for the proposed project on December 14, 2005, and the application was docketed as A.05-12-014. This application was deficient. Among other things, it did not contain a Proponent’s Environmental Assessment (PEA). Consequently, we declined to assess the need for the proposed project until SDG&E filed an amended application, including a PEA, which it did on August 4, 2006. The new application replaces the earlier one, and was docketed as A. 06-08-010. A Chief ALJ Ruling of August 9, 2006, consolidated the applications into the same proceeding.

<sup>6</sup> Another detailed description of the proposed project is available in the Notice of Preparation/Notice of Public Scoping Meetings for an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, which is available at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/asp/sunrise/sunrise.htm>.

to bring lower cost electricity to California consumers. However, the project, as proposed, also faces opposition from a wide variety of entities, including environmental groups, consumer groups, and several of the communities potentially affected by the proposed project or its alternative routes. Among other things, SDG&E has proposed that over 20 miles of the Sunrise Powerlink Project be sited through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (Anza-Borrego), and this raises environmental concerns for many parties. Parties also question the need for and timing of the proposed project; raise additional concerns related to biological, ecological, cultural, recreational and visual impacts, construction impacts, property values, community values, and exposure to electric and magnetic fields (EMFs); and ask for consideration of alternatives, such as undergrounding parts of the proposed project, locating various transmission towers in places other than those proposed by SDG&E, or relying on non-transmission alternatives. As set forth below in more detail, these issues are within the scope of this proceeding.

We have taken two important steps prior to issuing this scoping memo and ruling. First, because SDG&E's application only proposes routes through Anza-Borrego, at the September 13, 2006 PHC and through a subsequent ruling, we directed SDG&E to report on and rank routes that it explored outside of the park. On October 2, 2006, SDG&E distributed further analysis, describing four routes that would not cross Anza-Borrego and ranking one of those as most worthy of further study.<sup>7</sup> Second, in a ruling dated September 21, 2006, the ALJ directed SDG&E to schedule a workshop in early October to clarify project

---

<sup>7</sup> This analysis is available at [http://www.sdge.com/sunrisepowerlink/info/Sunrise\\_Non-Park\\_Alternatives\\_filing.pdf](http://www.sdge.com/sunrisepowerlink/info/Sunrise_Non-Park_Alternatives_filing.pdf).

modeling assumptions and alternative studies. SDG&E held the workshop on October 13, 2006 and the parties will file a workshop report by November 8, 2006. We expect the results of both of these efforts, as well as the testimony that we order here, to inform this proceeding.

### **Categorization, Need for Hearings, *Ex Parte* Rules, and Designation of Principal Hearing Officer**

The Commission preliminarily categorized this CPCN application as “ratesetting” as defined in Rule 1.3(e) and determined that the matter should be set for hearing.<sup>8</sup> No party has disputed the Commission’s preliminary categorization of this proceeding as “ratesetting” or the need for hearing. We affirm that preliminary determination. The applicable *ex parte* rules are set forth in Rule 8.2(c).

In a ratesetting proceeding, Rule 13.2 defines the presiding officer as the principal hearing officer designated as such by the assigned Commissioner prior to the first hearing in the proceeding. The assigned Commissioner has designated ALJ Steven Weissman as the principal hearing officer. The provisions of § 1701.3(a) apply.

### **Scope of the Proceeding**

Sections 1001, 1002, and 1002.3 provide the basic scope of this proceeding. In addition to the determination of need underlying the grant of a CPCN, § 1002 provides, in pertinent part, that the Commission, as a basis for granting any CPCN pursuant to § 1001, shall give consideration to the following factors: (1) community values, (2) recreational and park areas, (3) historical and aesthetic

---

<sup>8</sup> See Resolution ALJ 176-3177.

values, and (4) influence on environment. Section 1002.3 requires that, in considering approval of a transmission line, the Commission consider cost-effective alternatives to transmission, including targeted energy efficiency, other demand reduction resources, and distributed generation. We discuss some of the issues raised by the need determination, and environmental review, in more detail below.

In addition to explicit statutory obligations, the Commission's General Order (GO) 131-D contains rules relating to the planning and construction of electric facilities. It prescribes that, prior to issuing a CPCN, the Commission must find that the project is necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of the public. Section X of GO 131-D requires additionally that the applicant describe the measures taken or proposed by the utility to reduce the potential exposure to EMFs generated by the proposed facilities. The issues raised by GO 131-D are within the scope of the proceeding.

### **Need for the Project**

The issue of need for the Sunrise project, in its proposed form or in alternative forms, is within the scope of the proceeding.

SDG&E asserts that the proposed project is necessary for three "vital purposes": (1) to maintain reliability in the delivery of power to the San Diego area; (2) to reduce the cost of energy in the region, and (3) to accommodate the delivery of renewable energy from geothermal and solar resources in the Imperial Valley, and wind and other sources in San Diego County. SDG&E points to the CAISO's July 28, 2006 "Findings and Recommendation on the Sun

Path Project” to support its position,<sup>9</sup> as well as the CEC’s 2005 Strategic Transmission Investment Plan.<sup>10</sup> However, there remains work to be done prior to a Commission determination on the need for the proposed project.

For example, the CAISO did not evaluate non-wires alternatives, the importance of which it noted in its development of the Transmission Economic Assessment Methodology<sup>11</sup> and which the Commission must evaluate under § 1002.3. Additionally, the CAISO has not fully evaluated the impacts, interdependencies and interactions among the proposed project and the Lake Elsinore Advanced Pumped Storage (LEAPS) project and the Tehachapi area transmission project because its detailed evaluations of LEAPS and the Tehachapi project were not available at the time it issued its study of the proposed project. Also, UCAN alleges that neither SDG&E nor the CAISO adequately considered several feasible and lower cost non-generation alternative scenarios, such as those described in UCAN’s PHC statement, and that neither organization provided power flow studies.

---

<sup>9</sup> Application at Vol. 1, pp. 6-8. The CAISO’s study in support of the proposed project is included in the application at Volume 2 – Part 1, Chapter I, App. I-1 and is available at: <http://www.aiso.com/1841/1841b1925a320.pdf>.

<sup>10</sup> Application at Vol. 2 – Part 1, pp. I-13 and I-14. Strategic Transmission Investment Plan, CEC Publication No. CEC-100-2005-006-CMF, available at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2005publications/CEC-100-2005-006/CEC-100-2005-006-CMF.PDF>

<sup>11</sup> The CAISO has developed a methodology for determining the cost-effectiveness of proposed transmission projects that it refers to as “TEAM” or “Transmission Economic Assessment Methodology.” Additional information about TEAM is available in CPUC Docket No. I. 05-06-041. *See, e.g.*, the Proposed Decision mailed June 20, 2006, and the Alternate Decision mailed October 10, 2006.

In its Proponent's Environmental Assessment, SDG&E's evaluation of the need for the proposed project includes a description of existing power system facilities within both the local San Diego area and the inland Southwest area that would be tapped by the Sunrise project, new power plants under consideration, and a variety of non-wires alternatives, including customer energy efficiency programs, combined heat and power, demand response (including Advanced Metering Infrastructure), and distributed generation, (including rooftop photovoltaics). However, SDG&E only analyzed one load growth scenario. Several intervenors have questioned the application's discussion of in-basin renewable energy options and have also claimed inconsistencies between the application and the San Diego Regional Energy Office's "Energy 2030 - The San Diego Regional Energy Strategy."<sup>12</sup>

Given the above, we direct SDG&E and the CAISO to file testimony regarding the need for the proposed project, as set forth below.

### **Environmental Review**

No party disputes that this project has the potential to have a significant impact on the environment. The Commission is the lead agency for purposes of preparing an environmental impact report (EIR) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).<sup>13</sup> The EIR prepared pursuant to CEQA must identify the potentially significant effects of the project on the environment, identify alternatives to the project, and indicate the manner in which significant environmental effects can be mitigated or avoided. Pursuant to

---

<sup>12</sup> "Energy 2030 - The San Diego Regional Energy Strategy," San Diego Regional Energy Office, May 2003, available at [http://www.sdenery.org/uploads/Regional\\_Energy\\_Strategy\\_Final\\_07\\_16\\_03.pdf](http://www.sdenery.org/uploads/Regional_Energy_Strategy_Final_07_16_03.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> California Public Resources Code § 21000, *et seq.*

CEQA, the Commission cannot approve a proposed project or alternative unless it requires the project proponent to eliminate or substantially lessen all significant effects on the environment where feasible, and determines that any remaining significant effects found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to overriding considerations.

Because the proposed project or its alternatives may cross federal-jurisdictional lands, the federal government must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).<sup>14</sup> The federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is the lead agency for purposes of preparing the EIS.

In order to encourage a greater level of efficiency in reviewing this project request, BLM and this commission have agreed to prepare a joint EIR/EIS. This is both allowed and encouraged under state and federal law. On September 8, 2006, the two agencies issued their Notice of Preparation/Notice of Public Scoping Meetings for an EIR/EIS for the Sunrise Powerlink Project (“Notice of Preparation”), and they recently concluded the public scoping process. The Notice of Preparation, SDG&E’s August 4, 2006 application (including the Proponent’s Environmental Assessment), and other information about the environmental review process, are available at:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/aspen/sunrise/sunrise.htm>.

The Notice of Preparation describes potential environmental effects of the proposed project and alternatives that will be evaluated through the EIR/EIS process. The areas of environmental review include aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils,

---

<sup>14</sup> 42 USC § 4321, *et seq.*

hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public service and utilities, recreation, transportation and traffic, property values, EMF effects, the location of the transmission line near schools and residential areas, and environmental justice issues. In addition to identifying mitigation measures, the EIR/EIS will evaluate alternatives to the proposed project including different routes, the “no project” alternative, and “non-wires” alternatives such as additional local generation, including conventional central station plants, combined heat and power,<sup>15</sup> renewable power, distributed generation, and demand side management. The EIR/EIS may also evaluate alternatives such as partial undergrounding and tower modifications. It may also evaluate combinations of potential alternatives to the project (such as combined wires and non-wires alternatives). All of these issues are within the scope of the proceeding.

Many of these issues have been raised by protestants, are within the scope of the CEQA/NEPA review, and should therefore be pursued within that environmental review process.

The Final EIR/EIS is an informational document. It does not make a recommendation regarding the approval or denial of the CPCN application, and it does not establish the route for the project. The purpose of the Final EIR/EIS is to inform both the public and the decision makers of the environmental impacts of the proposed project and alternatives, design a recommended mitigation program to reduce any potentially significant impacts, and identify, from an environmental perspective, a preferred route. In making a final determination

---

<sup>15</sup> A combined heat and power system, also known as cogeneration, generates electricity and useful thermal energy in a single, integrated system.

on the application, the Commission will consider the information contained in the Final EIR/EIS as well as in the formal evidentiary record.

### **Ruling Requiring Submission of Testimony**

In order to fully understand modeling assumptions and other aspects of the demonstration of need for the project, we hereby direct the CAISO to submit testimony and SDG&E to submit supplemental testimony as described below. We strongly encourage SDG&E and the CAISO to prepare joint testimony where appropriate.<sup>16</sup> Additionally, the CAISO shall work with UCAN to develop a comprehensive evaluation of UCAN's proposed alternatives to the proposed project discussed in UCAN's PHC statement. The CAISO shall submit this evaluation as part of its testimony.

As part of their testimony, SDG&E and the CAISO shall develop a jointly-sponsored exhibit that provides a comparison between their respective assessment methodologies, computer models, critical assumptions, scenarios, sensitivity cases, and results. This exhibit shall identify any and all significant differences between the two assessments, and discuss the sensitivity of the results to each of these differences.

#### **CAISO Testimony**

The CAISO shall submit testimony to address concerns set forth above regarding its evaluation of the proposed project, including:

- (1) Information supplementing its evaluation of the proposed project with a more complete evaluation of wires and non-wires alternatives (including the evaluation of UCAN's proposed alternatives);

---

<sup>16</sup> For such testimony, one or more expert witnesses from each organization should be listed as the sponsoring experts.

- (2) A more complete evaluation of the interaction between the proposed project and the LEAPS and Tehachapi projects, informed by a more complete analysis of those two projects (including the pumped storage aspects of the LEAPS project); and
- (3) An explanation of how these additional factors impact the CAISO's assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposed project based on TEAM.

### **SDG&E Supplemental Testimony**

#### **Analytical Baseline**

As part of its need showing in its supplemental testimony, SDG&E shall rely upon an analytical baseline for the project area - both its service territory and the regions that supply imported power to the SDG&E service territory in California, the inland Southwest, and Mexico (Project Area). The generation baseline shall include all generation resources currently available to serve load in the Project Area, including, without limitation, distributed generation, renewable generation, combined heat and power facilities, and facilities under contract to serve load in the Project Area, whether or not those contracted facilities are located in the Project Area. The baseline shall reflect the import/export capability of each transmission facility in the Project Area and any transmission facility used to transmit purchased power from sources located outside of the Project Area.<sup>17</sup> For each generation and transmission resource, SDG&E shall identify ownership, capacity, transfer capability, and any expected changes in the resource assumed by SDG&E during the planning horizon used by SDG&E.

---

<sup>17</sup> This should include transmission facilities with voltages of 60 kV or greater.

SDG&E shall provide recorded peak loads for the period 1995 through 2005, as well as historic impacts on those peaks resulting from energy efficiency efforts, demand response, and onsite generation within the Project Area.

### **Analysis Period**

Consistent with SDG&E's long-term procurement plans, SDG&E shall provide analysis of the benefits and costs of the proposed project for a period of 10 years after the assumed online date of the proposed project.<sup>18</sup> SDG&E is free to provide analyses over different timeframes as well. SDG&E should clearly explain its justifications for using its recommended analysis period.

### **Consistency with Prior Rulings and Decisions**

SDG&E should, to the degree possible, use the most recent Commission-adopted assumptions, goals, policies, and levels of effort in its base case forecasts of loads and resources. For example, the Commission adopted certain goals for energy efficiency in D.04-09-060. Similarly, the Commission approved certain targets for distributed generation in D.04-12-028. SDG&E should include these levels of impact and reasonable extrapolations from these adopted values in its base case assessment of the benefits of the proposed project. SDG&E is free to provide supplemental analyses using different assumptions. SDG&E should clearly explain its justification for using its recommended assumptions.

### **Energy Efficiency, Demand Response, and Onsite Generation Additions**

SDG&E shall identify the impacts of the assumed, cost-effective, future energy efficiency, demand response, and onsite generation efforts that affect

---

<sup>18</sup> SDG&E shall model, at a minimum, three years: the first year of operation, the 5<sup>th</sup> year of operation, and the 10<sup>th</sup> year of operation. SDG&E is free to model other years as well.

future demand in the Project Area. For each category of resources (energy efficiency, demand response, and onsite generation), SDG&E shall provide for each year of its analysis: (1) peak demand reduction; and (2) reduction in energy needed to be supplied by SDG&E. SDG&E shall address how it expects these future energy efficiency, demand response, and onsite generation efforts to affect the timing of the need for the proposed project.

### **Generation and Transmission Additions**

SDG&E shall identify all new generation resources that have been approved by the relevant siting agencies or are under consideration in the Project Area and all approved or planned additions to the transmission system in and to the Project Area, including: (1) the permitting status; (2) projected on-line date; (3) ownership; and (4) the project's capacity or transfer capability. SDG&E shall address how new generation and transmission resources may affect the proposed project's import/export capability as well as how these additional resources might affect the timing of the need for the proposed project.

### **Additional Analysis Regarding the Reliability, Economic, and Renewable Need for the Proposed Project**

In its supplemental testimony SDG&E shall address the need for the proposed project in terms of the three "vital purposes"<sup>19</sup> it has articulated: the need of the project for reliability reasons, for economic reasons, and/or to meet state renewable policies.<sup>20</sup> SDG&E shall analyze and explain the cost and

---

<sup>19</sup> See Application, Vol. 1 at p. 4 and Vol. 2 – Part 1, at p. I-1.

<sup>20</sup> For renewable requirements, SDG&E should assess need both in terms of meeting the 20% RPS procurement requirement established in SB 107 (enrolled 2006) and to be codified at Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 25740 and the 33% by 2020 strategy set forth in the March 2006 "Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature".

feasibility of the full range of alternatives that would satisfy one or more of these three purposes, including wires, non-wires, generation (including onsite generation), non-generation (including incremental energy efficiency and demand response efforts) and integrated wires/non-wires strategies. This analysis shall include all reasonable combinations of strategies that would meet the need for the proposed project, consistent with the three vital purposes identified by SDG&E.

As a component of this showing, SDG&E shall provide load growth scenarios, including at least one scenario that is lower than the CEC's 90/10 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report<sup>21</sup> demand forecast or more current Commission forecasts, and an assessment of the likelihood of each scenario. SDG&E shall describe and justify its criteria and assumptions utilized in forecasting demand. For the purposes of economic and renewable power-related need assessments, both SDG&E and the CAISO shall present analyses utilizing a one-in-two-year demand forecast, in addition to the one-in-ten year assumption used in the application.

SDG&E shall perform scenario analyses assuming varying future levels of generation and transmission resources, energy efficiency, demand response programs, and onsite generation. SDG&E shall provide an assessment of the likelihood of each scenario coming to fruition. SDG&E shall provide, for each scenario: (1) peak demand reductions and reduction in energy needed to be supplied by SDG&E related to energy efficiency, demand response resources, and onsite generation; (2) the capacity and capacity factors associated with future

---

<sup>21</sup> The CEC's Integrated Energy Policy Reports are available at:  
<http://www.energy.ca.gov/energypolicy/index.html>

generation resources; and (3) the transfer capability associated with future new transmission facilities. These data should be provided for each year of each scenario.

SDG&E shall describe and justify any reliability requirements that drive the need for the Sunrise project as well as its import/export capability under various outage/reliability scenarios. SDG&E shall explain whether and, if so, to what extent, the proposed project is needed for economic rather than reliability reasons, or to meet state renewable power policies. SDG&E shall explain whether the proposed project is needed, or would be used in any way, for export or other competitive purposes. SDG&E shall explain whether the proposed project is necessary to meet its obligation to serve, and how it will comply with the requirements of § 625 concerning the exercise of eminent domain. SDG&E shall address the project's expected effect on economic development, and its contingency plan in the event that not all elements of the proposed project are completed by 2010.

With regard to renewables need, SDG&E shall analyze the potential for and value of the development of renewable energy projects closer to its load center, as well as the near-term and long-term capability of existing and other proposed transmission lines to convey renewable energy from other areas, such as the Imperial Valley or the Tehachapi area, to the San Diego basin.

**Workshop on SDG&E Supplemental Testimony and CAISO Testimony**

SDG&E and the CAISO shall immediately begin work on the testimony ordered herein. In order to assist in adherence to the schedule set forth herein, and to address any questions prompted by this portion of the ruling, the ALJ shall conduct a workshop in San Diego on November 14, 2006, beginning at 10 a.m., at a location to be announced. All active parties are welcome to attend.

SDG&E and the CAISO shall distribute preliminary outlines for their supplemental testimony to all parties no later than Thursday, November 9, 2006.

### **Schedule**

In processing this application and setting the schedule, we are cognizant of the statutory requirements contained in CEQA and NEPA, our commitment to provide interested parties a fair opportunity to participate in the proceeding, the need for a timely decision, and the circumstances supporting the development of the joint EIR/EIS. The preparation of a joint environmental document and coordination with other state and federal agencies will result in a longer schedule than would normally be the case in the preparation of a stand-alone EIR. For instance, federal rules require a longer period for comments on an EIS than state rules normally require for comments on an EIR (90 days instead of 45 days). By agreeing to the preparation of joint environmental documents despite such scheduling differences, we hope to reduce the amount of time for overall state and federal project review.

Another factor affecting this schedule is the timeframe for completing biological surveys along the proposed and alternative routes. Among other things, certain biological surveys necessary to evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed project were not completed this year and others should be repeated to account for the unusual weather experienced last Spring. At the September 13, 2006 PHC, the United States Fish & Wildlife Service (Fish & Wildlife) and the California Department of Fish & Game (Fish & Game) argued strongly for completing such surveys prior to the release of the draft EIR/EIS to ensure that the draft document reflects our best understanding of the biological impacts of the proposed project, and adequately educates agencies and the public about the environmental impacts of the proposed project so that they may

provide informed comments on the draft document. These agencies submitted a joint PHC statement in this proceeding articulating these concerns:

Deferring full analyses of the project-related biological impacts until the preparation of the F[inal] EIS/EIR will prevent full disclosure of project impacts, preparation of meaningful alternatives, preparation of adequate avoidance and minimization measures, and compliance with ... the CEQA Guidelines. It would also impair the opportunity for fully informed public comment, and may impair the ability of the Department to utilize the document as a Responsible Agency. The Wildlife Agencies respectfully request that the project schedule be amended to allow sufficient time to fully incorporate the 2007 survey results into project planning, and to provide a document that, in all respects, complies with the CEQA Guidelines.

Both agencies reiterated these concerns in comments submitted on the CEQA/NEPA scoping process on October 20, 2006.

The target date for completing the surveys (which must be conducted in the Spring and Summer) is July 2007. While we are extremely reluctant to extend the schedule in this case, our staff has recently consulted with BLM staff on this issue. BLM concurs that the delay caused by including the survey results in the draft EIR/EIS is appropriate given the magnitude of the state and federal agency concerns. Moreover, even with the delay, our staff has informed us that the proposed project can be brought on line by June 2010, if approved. Given these concerns, the schedule we set forth below anticipates a draft EIR/EIS release date of August 3, 2007, reflecting the agencies' position on the need to include the surveys in the draft EIR/EIS.

The schedule for this proceeding is as follows (critical path items and dates that will impact the schedule are in bolded italics):

Modeling Workshop Report	November 8, 2006 (Wednesday)
Applicant and ISO Testimony Outlines	November 9, 2006 (Thursday)
Workshop On Testimony	November 14, 2006 (Tuesday)

Discovery Conference	November 15, 2006, 2 pm (Wednesday)
Discovery Conference	November 28, 2006, 2 pm (Tuesday)
Discovery Conference	December 12 2006 (Tuesday)
Discovery Conference	January 9, 2007, 2 pm (Tuesday)
<b>Applicant and ISO Testimony</b>	<b>January 26, 2007 (Friday)</b>
Discovery Conference	February 6, 2007, 2 pm (Tuesday)
Discovery Conference	February 20, 2007, 2 pm (Tuesday)
DRA's Phase I Direct Testimony	March 2, 2007 (Friday)
Intervenors' Phase I Direct Testimony	March 14, 2007 (Wednesday)
All Parties' Rebuttal Testimony	March 30, 2007 (Friday)
Third Prehearing Conference	April 10, 2007 (Tuesday)
Phase I Evidentiary Hearings Begin	April 23, 2007 (Monday)
Phase I Opening Briefs	June 1, 2007 (Friday)
Phase I Reply Briefs	June 15, 2007 (Friday)
<b><i>Publication of Draft EIR/EIS</i></b>	<b><i>August 3, 2007</i></b>
All Parties Phase II Direct Testimony	September 7, 2007 (Friday)
All Parties Phase II Rebuttal Testimony	September 21, 2007 (Friday)
Public Participation Hearing. El Centro <sup>22</sup>	September 24, 2007 (Monday)
Public Participation Hearing Ramona	September 25, 2007 (Tuesday)
Public Participation Hearing. Borr. Spr.	September 26, 2007 (Wednesday)
Public Participation Hearing Miss. Val.	September 27, 2007 (Thursday)
Public Participation Hearing Rancho P.	September 27, 2007 (Thursday)
Fourth Prehearing Conference	October 2, 2007 (Tuesday)
Phase II Evidentiary Hearings Begin <sup>23</sup>	October 8, 2007 (Monday)
Public Comments on Draft EIR/EIS Due	Early November 2007
Phase II Opening Briefs	October 31, 2007 (Tuesday)
Phase II Reply Briefs	November 9, 2007 (Friday)
<b><i>Final EIR/EIS Published</i></b>	<b><i>November 20, 2007</i></b>
Proposed Decision Mailed	December 2007
Commission Decision	January 2008

<sup>22</sup> As discussed further below, all Public Participation Hearing dates and locations are tentative.

<sup>23</sup> As discussed further below, Phase II Evidentiary Hearings will only be held to the extent parties demonstrate the existence of material issues of disputed fact.

We will use the time prior to the issuance of the draft EIR/EIS in August 2007 to complete discovery and conduct evidentiary hearings on all issues that need not await the issuance of the draft EIR/EIS. In these Phase I hearings, we will address, at a minimum, all of the following:

1. Computer models and modeling inputs (including the forecast of regional demand for power, and baseline assumptions for existing and future resources) used to determine the net economic and reliability need for the proposed project, and the merits of different ways to meet that need;
2. Timing issues related to the perceived need for the proposed project;
3. The assumptions underlying SDG&E and CAISO cost-benefit analyses;
4. Additional scenarios and model runs to test assumptions and compare alternatives to the proposed project;
5. Non-wires alternatives to the proposed project, including local generation, enhanced energy efficiency, advanced metering technologies, and demand response;
6. Wires-based alternatives that differ fundamentally from the proposed project;
7. The feasibility and impacts of pursuing the “no project” alternative as defined under CEQA;
8. The potential for and likelihood of developing renewable energy resources in the Project Area;
9. The capability of existing and other planned transmission lines to carry non-local renewable generation into the SDG&E load center on a short-term or long-term basis;
10. Critical environmental concerns that should inform the CEQA review process;
11. Community values;

12. Recreational and park areas; and

13. Historical and aesthetic values

After issuance of the draft EIR/EIS, the schedule permits parties to submit additional evidence in Phase II providing new information or analyses that could materially affect the Commission's decision. **Please note that whether or not there are factual disputes requiring Phase II hearings on environmental matters, parties seeking to provide input on the final EIR/EIS must submit comments on the draft EIR/EIS within 90 days of its issuance. This comment period will be set in the Notice of Availability for the draft EIR/EIS.**

Specific areas that we anticipate examining in Phase II are:

1. A comparison of different modeling efforts, and economic and reliability analyses as informed by the proposed alternatives and mitigation measures in the draft EIR/EIS;
2. Cost-benefit analyses of the proposed project and project alternatives as informed by the proposed alternatives and mitigation measures in the draft EIR/EIS, and by different modeling efforts;
3. Material factual inaccuracies or deficiencies in the draft EIR/EIS;
4. The effect of project alternatives on system reliability and the ability to deliver renewable energy to SDG&E customers;
5. The adequacy of SDG&E's EMF mitigation plan; and
6. The project cost cap.

We will only allow Phase II evidentiary hearings to the extent that parties demonstrate the existence of material issues of disputed fact raised by new information contained in the draft EIR/EIS.

We will hold evidentiary hearings in San Diego, and public participation hearings in the affected communities. The dates and locations for the public participation hearings set forth in the schedule above are exemplary, and the

actual dates and locations may differ. We are still discussing the details regarding the dates and locations for public participation hearings and will announce them in a subsequent ruling. The ALJ may schedule additional PHCs or require a case management statement prior to the evidentiary hearings.

Pursuant to Rule 13.13, parties requesting final oral argument before the Commission should include that request in their opening briefs. We will not honor later requests.

Section 1701.5 (a) requires that the Commission resolve the issues raised in this scoping memo within 18 months of its issuance. We expect to meet that deadline. However, if changes to the schedule are necessary, pursuant to § 1701.5 (b), we will issue a subsequent scoping ruling.

### **Discovery**

A party of which a discovery request has been made shall provide a complete response within 10 working days of each request. If the responding party needs clarification of the request, it shall seek that clarification within two working days of receiving the request. If the responding party cannot provide a complete response within 10 working days, it shall communicate that fact to the requesting party within four working days, along with providing a firm date for a complete response. A party issuing a discovery request shall simultaneously provide a copy of that request to all other parties. A responding party shall provide a copy of its discovery response to each party that makes a request for that specific response. Electronic copies of discovery requests and discovery responses are sufficient unless the receiving party requests a paper copy. SDG&E shall post its discovery responses (along with the request they are responsive to) and those of all other parties to a web page from which the responses can be retrieved by all parties.

As set forth in the master schedule for this proceeding, the ALJ has scheduled regular telephonic discovery conferences, with two goals in mind: to ensure that active parties are undertaking discovery in a timely manner and to resolve any pending discovery disputes. All active parties that have posed, or are planning to pose discovery requests of another party shall participate in each conference call. The ALJ will provide the call-in number at a later time. Further, the ALJ will reduce the frequency of conference calls if and when it seems appropriate to do so.

Parties shall undertake a “meet and confer” process in a good faith effort to resolve any discovery dispute. The meeting may occur telephonically if that is more convenient than an in-person meeting. If that attempt does not resolve the dispute, the parties shall so inform the ALJ at the next scheduled discovery conference. If there is not a timely opportunity to use that forum, the disputing parties may send an e-mail to the ALJ regarding the dispute. The assigned ALJ may schedule an additional conference call, ask for written motions, refer the discovery dispute to the Law and Motion ALJ, or take other steps as deemed appropriate. The assigned ALJ’s e-mail address is [saw@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:saw@cpuc.ca.gov).

### **Filing, Service, and Service List**

In this proceeding, there are several different types of documents that participants may prepare. Each type of document carries with it different obligations with respect to filing and service.

First, many parties will prepare comments for purposes of the environmental review process. In order for comments to be incorporated in the administrative record, a party must follow the instructions included with the environmental document it is commenting on. Comments on environmental documents should not be sent to the ALJ, the assigned Commissioner, or other Commissioners, or filed with the Docket Office. Comments in the environmental

review process do not need to be served on other parties in this case. Please adhere to these directions in order to ensure a clear and comprehensive record.

Second, parties must file certain documents as required by the Rules or in response to rulings by either the Assigned Commissioner or the ALJ. These documents must be filed with the Commission's Docket Office and served on all persons on the service list with the status of appearance or state service. Please note that the Docket Office does not appear on the service list. Article 1 of the Rules contains all of the filing requirements.

Finally, other documents, including prepared testimony, are served on the service list but not filed with the Docket Office.

While parties frequently file documents with the Docket Office in paper form, they may serve those documents on other parties in electronic form, pursuant to Rule 1.10, unless specified otherwise. Please note that parties must serve electronic documents in either PDF or Word form. Parties often prefer PDF files because that process preserves pagination. However, be aware that a PDF file must be in searchable format. Scanned documents are not acceptable. Further, ALJ Weissman prefers using Word files whenever possible. Even when providing PDF files to all parties, you are encouraged to send a Word version to the ALJ. Paper format copies, in addition to electronic copies if made available, shall be served on the Assigned Commissioner, the ALJ, and Energy Division representatives.

In addition to the traditional process of filing paper copies with the Docket Office, electronic filing is now available for use in all proceedings. Using this method can save a great deal of time and expense. Information about this option is available at: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/efiling.htm>, or click the E-File icon near the bottom of the Commission's home page. If you have further questions, please contact the Public Advisor's office.

Any active party that wishes to receive served documents in a paper format may make such a request by serving a notice to that effect on all parties on the service list. All parties shall honor such requests. Parties shall e-mail courtesy copies of all served documents to the entire service list, including those appearing on the list as "Information Only." Pursuant to an earlier request from the ALJ, the following active parties have requested paper service of any document or group of documents in excess of 250 pages: Diane Conklin of the Mussey Grade Road Alliance, Paul Blackburn for the Sierra Club, and Mary Aldern on behalf of the Community Alliance For Sensible Energy. All parties shall provide paper copies of such larger documents to these active participants. We will not require parties to provide paper copies for Information Only parties, but encourage them to do so upon request.

In addition, some have proposed that a party producing electronic files larger than 2 megabytes also provide those files on a computer disk, upon request. Parties shall follow this procedure as well, when providing documents to the three participants listed in the prior paragraph.

The official service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's web page. Parties should confirm that their information on the service list and the comma-delimited file is correct, and serve notice of any errors on the Commission's Process Office, the service list, and the ALJ. Prior to serving any document, each party must ensure that it is using the most up-to-date service list. The list on the Commission's web site meets that definition.

### **Intervenor Compensation**

The PHC in this matter was held September 13, 2006. Pursuant to § 1804(a)(1), a customer who intended to seek an award of compensation but has not done so already should have filed and served a notice of intent to claim

compensation no later than October 13, 2006. In a separate ruling, the ALJ will address eligibility to claim compensation for any pending notices of intent.

Therefore, **IT IS RULED** that:

1. As described in more detail above, the scope of this proceeding includes the following as to the proposed project using SDG&E's preferred route and configuration, alternative routes and configurations, the no project alternative, and non-wires alternatives:
  - Need for and cost-effectiveness of the project (Pub. Util. Code § 1001), including consideration of the decision by the CAISO that the project is needed.
  - The appropriate planning horizon to use in evaluating need for the project.
  - Consideration of the following factors contained in Pub. Util. Code § 1002:
    - 1) Community values;
    - 2) Recreational and park areas;
    - 3) Historical and aesthetic values; and
    - 4) Influence on the environment.
  - Consideration of cost-effective alternatives to transmission as set forth in Pub Util. Code § 1002.3.
  - Consideration of whether, pursuant to General Order (GO) 131-D, the project promotes the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of the public.
  - Consideration of the adequacy of SDG&E's plan, pursuant to GO 131-D and Commission Decision No. 06-01-042, to reduce the potential exposure to electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) generated by the proposed facilities.
  - Consideration, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code § 21000 *et seq.*), of potentially significant effects on the environment of the project, alternatives to the project, the manner in which potentially significant environmental effects can be mitigated or avoided, and whether economic, social or other conditions

make it infeasible to mitigate potentially significant effects on the environment.

- How SDG&E will comply with Pub. Util. Code § 625 concerning the exercise of eminent domain.
  - Impacts on the transmission grid and other transmission users.
  - Project cost, and the amount of a cap on project cost, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1005.5.
2. The schedule of this proceeding is as set forth above in this ruling. The ALJ will issue subsequent rulings providing specific starting times, schedule changes, and locations for hearings and conferences, as appropriate. For the telephonic discovery conferences, he will provide a telephone number.
  3. The CAISO and SDG&E shall submit testimony and exhibits as set forth herein.
  4. This ruling confirms the Commission's preliminary finding in Resolution ALJ 176-3177 that the category for this proceeding is ratesetting and that hearings are necessary. This ruling, only as to category, may be appealed under the procedures in Rule 7.6.
  5. The ex parte rules as set forth in Rule 8.2(c) of the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure and Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c) apply to this proceeding.
  6. Administrative Law Judge Weissman is the principal hearing officer.
  7. Parties shall follow the discovery, filing, service, and service list rules as set forth herein.
  8. The motion of the West Chase Home Owners Association for Leave to File a Late Protest is granted. The time for filing protests in this proceeding has now passed.

Dated November 1, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ DIAN GRUENEICH  
Dian M. Grueneich  
Assigned Commissioner

/s/ STEVEN WEISSMAN by TBO  
Steven Weissman  
Administrative Law Judge

### **INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE**

I have provided notification of filing to the electronic mail addresses on the attached service list.

Upon confirmation of this document's acceptance for filing, I will cause a copy of the filed document to be served upon the service list to this proceeding by U.S. mail. The service list I will use to serve the copy of the filed document is current as of today's date.

Dated November 1, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ DAVID NG

David Ng

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Technical Description of Proposed Sunrise Powerlink Project**

#### **1. Transmission Lines**

- A new 500 kilovolt (kV) transmission line, approximately 91.3 miles in length, beginning at the existing Imperial Valley Substation and terminating at a new 500/230 kV substation referred to as the Central East Substation.
- A new double circuit 230 kV transmission line, approximately 45.3 miles in length, beginning at the new Central East Substation and terminating at the existing Sycamore Canyon Substation.
- A new single circuit 230 kV, approximately 13.4 miles in length, beginning at the Sycamore Canyon Substation and terminating at the existing Peñasquitos Substation.
- Relocation of an existing 69 kV transmission line to the proposed project alignment between the junction of SR76 and SR79 and the existing Santa Ysabel Substation.
- Relocation of existing 69 kV and 92 kV transmission lines to the proposed project alignment between the east boundary of the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (Anza-Borrego) and the proposed Central East Substation.

#### **2. Substations**

- The proposed 500 kV/230 kV Central East Substation would occupy 40 acres of fenced area. SDG&E would build the substation on private property in an undeveloped rural area, west of S2 and approximately 1.5 miles south of the intersection of S2 and S22 in northern San Diego County. The substation would include two 500/230kV, 1120MVA transformers, eight 45MVA shunt reactors, a 240MVA shunt capacitor bank, and line terminations for one 500kV transmission line and two 230kV transmission lines.
- • SDG&E would modify the existing Imperial Valley Substation to accommodate termination of one new 500 kV transmission line.

- SDG&E would modify the existing Sycamore Canyon Substation to accommodate termination of three new 230 kV transmission lines: two lines from the proposed Central East Substation and one line to the Peñasquitos Substation.
- SDG&E would modify the existing Peñasquitos Substation to accommodate termination of one 230kV transmission line from Sycamore Canyon Substation.

### **3. Other System Upgrades**

- SDG&E would replace the conductors on an existing 8.2 mile, 69 kV transmission line from the existing Sycamore Canyon Substation to the existing Elliott Substation.
- SDG&E would modify the San Luis Rey Substation to add a 230/69 kV transformer and a 230 kV shunt capacitor.
- SDG&E would add a shunt capacitor to the South Bay Substation.

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL

A0608010 LIST

A0512014

\*\*\*\*\* APPEARANCES \*\*\*\*\*

Diana Lindsay  
ANZA-BORREGO FOUNDATION & INSTITUTE  
PO BOX 2001  
BORREGO SPRINGS CA 92004  
(760) 767-0446  
dlindsay@sunbeltpub.com  
For: Anza-Borrego Foundation & Institute

Connie Bull  
24572 RUTHERFORD ROAD  
RAMONA CA 92065  
conniebull@cox.net

Sara Feldman  
CA STATE PARKS FOUNDATION  
714 W. OLYMPIC BLVD., SUITE 717  
LOS ANGELES CA 90015  
(213) 748-7458  
sara@calparks.org  
For: CA State Parks Foundation

David Lloyd  
Attorney At Law  
CABRILLO POWER I, LLC  
4600 CARLSBAD BLVD.  
CARLSBAD CA 92008  
(760) 268-4069  
david.lloyd@nrgenergy.com  
For: Cabrillo Power I, LLC

Bradly S. Torgan  
Attorney At Law  
CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF PARKS & RECREATION  
1416 NINTH STREET, ROOM 1404-06  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 653-9905  
btorgan@parks.ca.gov  
For: California Dept. of Parks & Recreation

Karen Norene Mills  
Attorney At Law  
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION  
2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE  
SACRAMENTO CA 95833  
(916) 561-5655  
kmills@cfbf.com  
For: California Farm Bureau Federation

Judith B. Sanders  
Attorney At Law  
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR  
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
FOLSOM CA 95630  
(916) 608-7143  
jsanders@caiso.com  
For: California Independent System Operator

David Hogan  
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY  
PO BOX 7745  
SAN DIEGO CA 92167  
(760) 809-9244  
dhogan@biologicaldiversity.org

Michael P. Calabrese  
CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1100  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101  
(619) 533-5872  
mcalabrese@sandiego.gov  
For: City of San Diego

Frederick M. Ortlieb  
Office Of City Attorney  
CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
1200 THIRD AVENUE, 11TH FLOOR  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101  
(619) 533-5800  
fortlieb@sandiego.gov  
For: City of San Diego

Mary Aldern  
CAROLYN MORROW, JOE RAUH  
COMMUNITY ALLIANCE FOR SENSIBLE ENERGY  
PO BOX 321  
WARNER SPRINGS CA 92086  
(760) 782-9036  
hikermomma1@yahoo.com

Denis Trafecanty  
COMMUNITY OF SANTA YSABEL & RELATED COMM  
PO BOX 305  
SANTA YSABEL CA 92070  
(760) 703-1149  
denis@vitalityweb.com  
For: Self

Diane Conklin  
MUSSEY GRADE ROAD  
RAMONA CA 92065  
dj0conklin@earthlink.net

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL

A0608010 LIST

A0512014

Rory Cox  
AARON QUINTANAR/BILL POWERS  
311 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 650  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 399-8850  
rcox@pacificenvironment.org  
For: C/O Pacific Enviroment

David Kates  
DAVID MARK AND COMPANY  
3510 UNOCAL PLACE, SUITE 200  
SANTA ROSA CA 95403-5571  
(707) 570-1866  
dkates@sonic.net  
For: The Nevada Hydro Company

Demian Dorrance  
PO BOX 910527  
SAN DIEGO CA 92191  
(858) 777-3458  
inbox858-cvcc@yahoo.com  
For: Carmel Country Highlands Owners

Donald C. Liddell  
Attorney At Law  
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
2928 2ND AVENUE  
SAN DIEGO CA 92103  
(619) 993-9096  
liddell@energyattorney.com  
For: Stirling Energy Systems

Regina DeAngelis  
Legal Division  
RM. 4107  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 355-5530  
rmd@cpuc.ca.gov  
For: DRA

Jedediah J. Gibson  
Attorney At Law  
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP  
2015 H STREET  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 447-2166  
jyg@eslawfirm.com

Norman J. Furuta  
FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES  
333 MARKET STREET, 10TH FLOOR, MS 1021A  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105-2195  
(415) 977-8808

Brian T. Cragg  
Attorney At Law  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 392-7900  
bcragg@gmsr.com  
For: LS Power

Carrie Downey  
HORTON KNOX CARTER & FOOTE  
895 BROADWAY  
ELCENTRO CA 92243  
(760) 352-2821  
cadowney@san.rr.com  
For: Imperial Irrigation District

Heidi Farkash  
JOHN & HEIDI FARKASH TRUST  
PO BOX 576  
RANCHO SANTA FE CA 92067  
(858) 756-3594  
jhfark@pacbell.net  
For: Farkash Ranch in Santa Ysabel

John W. Leslie  
Attorney At Law  
LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS, LLP  
11988 EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 200  
SAN DIEGO CA 92130  
(858) 720-6352  
jleslie@luce.com  
For: Coral Power, LLC and Energia Azteca/Energia de Baja California (La Rosita)

Scot Martin  
PO BOX 1549  
BORREGO SPRINGS CA 92004  
(760) 767-1045  
scotmartin478@msn.com

Joetta Mihalovich  
11705 ALDERCREST POINT  
SAN DIEGO CA 92131

Diane J. Conklin  
MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE  
PO BOX 683  
RAMONA CA 92065  
(760) 787-0794  
dj0conklin@earthlink.net

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL

A0608010 LIST

A0512014

norman.furuta@navy.mil  
For: DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Don Wood Sr.  
PACIFIC ENERGY POLICY CENTER  
4539 LEE AVENUE  
LA MESA CA 91941  
(619) 463-9035  
dwood8@cox.net

Michael Page  
17449 OAK HOLLOW ROAD  
RAMONA CA 92065-6758  
(760) 788-9319  
oakhollowranch@wildblue.net  
For: Starlight Mountain Estates Owners

James H. Caldwell Jr.  
PPM ENERGY, INC.  
1650 E NAPA STREET  
SONOMA CA 95476  
(503) 796-6988  
james.caldwell@ppmenergy.com  
For: PPM ENERGY, INC.

Elizabeth Edwards  
RAMONA VALLEY VINEYARD ASSOCIATION  
26502 HIGHWAY 78  
RAMONA CA 92065  
(760) 789-8673  
edwrdsgrfx@aol.com  
For: Ramona Valley Vineyard Assoc.

Harvey Payne  
RANCHO PENASQUITOS CONCERNED CITIZENS  
600 W. BROADWAY, STE. 400  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101  
(619) 702-4307  
hpayne@sdgllp.com  
For: RANCHO PENASQUITOS CONCERNED CITIZENS

Keith Ritchey  
Powerlink Issues Manager  
8744 CREEKWOOD LANE  
SAN DIEGO CA 92129  
(858) 484-4429  
kritchey@san.rr.com  
For: West Chase Homeowner's Association

Billy Blattner  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 2060  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 202-9986  
wblattner@semprautilities.com  
For: San Diego Gas & Electric

Kevin O'Beirne  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32D  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
(858) 654-1765  
ko'beirne@semprautilities.com  
For: San Diego Gas & Electric

Patricia C. Schnier  
BARBARA E. SCHNIER, ESQ.  
14575 FLATHEAD RD.  
APPLE VALLEY CA 92307  
(760) 240-7668  
barbschnier@yahoo.com  
For: Self

Osa L. Wolff  
Attorney At Law  
SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER, LLC  
396 HAYES STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 552-7272  
wolff@smwlaw.com  
For: Cities of Temecula, Murrieta & Hemet

Paul Blackburn  
SIERRA CLUB, SAN DIEGO CHAPTER  
3820 RAY STREET  
SAN DIEGO CA 92104  
(619) 299-1741  
sdenergy@sierraclubsandiego.org  
For: Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter

Thomas A. Burhenn  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE  
ROSEMEAD CA 91770  
(626) 302-9652  
thomas.burhenn@sce.com  
For: Southern California Edison

Nicholas Sher  
Legal Division  
RM. 4007  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-4232  
nms@cpuc.ca.gov

Michel Peter Florio  
Attorney At Law  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK (TURN)  
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL

A0608010 LIST

A0512014

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 929-8876  
mflorio@turn.org  
For: TURN

Michael Shames  
Attorney At Law  
UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK  
3100 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE B  
SAN DIEGO CA 92103  
(619) 696-6966  
mshames@ucan.org  
For: UCAN

Clare Laufenberg  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
1516 NINTH STREET, MS 46  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 654-4859  
Claufenb@energy.state.ca.us

Edward Gorham  
WESTERNERS INCENSED BY WRECKLESS ELECTRI  
4219 LOMA RIVIERA LANE  
SAN DIEGO CA 92110  
(619) 990-3848  
gorhamedward@cox.net  
For: Self

Judy Grau  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
1516 NINTH STREET MS-46  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-5512  
(916) 653-1610  
jgrau@energy.state.ca.us

Pam Whalen  
24444 RUTHERFORD ROAD  
RAMONA CA 92065  
(760) 440-0202  
pwhalen2@cox.net

Marc Pryor  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
1516 9TH ST, MS 20  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 653-0159  
mpryor@energy.state.ca.us

\*\*\*\*\* STATE EMPLOYEE \*\*\*\*\*

Susan Lee  
ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP  
235 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 935  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 955-4775 X 203  
slee@aspeneg.com

Scott Cauchois  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4209  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1525  
wsc@cpuc.ca.gov  
For: DRA

Tom Murphy  
Vp., Sacramento Operations  
ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP  
8801 FOLSOM BLVD., SUITE 290  
SACRAMENTO CA 95826  
(916) 379-0350  
tmurphy@aspeneg.com

Robert Elliott  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2527  
rae@cpuc.ca.gov

Billie C. Blanchard  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2068  
bcb@cpuc.ca.gov

Thomas Flynn  
Energy Division  
770 L STREET, SUITE 1050  
Sacramento CA 95814  
(916) 324-8689  
trf@cpuc.ca.gov

Traci Bone  
Legal Division  
RM. 5206

Scott Logan  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4209  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1418

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL

A0608010 LIST

A0512014

505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2048  
tbo@cpuc.ca.gov

sjl@cpuc.ca.gov  
For: DRA

David Ng  
Executive Division  
RM. 5207  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1791  
dhn@cpuc.ca.gov

Pat/Albert Biane  
1223 ARMSTRONG CIRCLE  
ESCONDIDO CA 92027  
patricia\_fallon@sbcglobal.net

Marcus Nixon  
Consumer Service & Information Division  
RM. 500  
320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500  
Los Angeles CA 90013  
(213) 576-7057  
mrx@cpuc.ca.gov

Eileen Bird  
12430 DORMOUSE ROAD  
SAN DIEGO CA 92129  
(858) 538-9595  
sanrocky@aol.com

Terrie D. Prosper  
Executive Division  
RM. 5301  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2160  
tdp@cpuc.ca.gov

Tom Gorton  
BORREGO SUN  
PO BOX 249  
BORREGO SPRINGS CA 92004  
tgorton@cableusa.com

Steven A. Weissman  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
RM. 5107  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2195  
saw@cpuc.ca.gov

Phillip & Eliane Breedlove  
1804 CEDAR STREET  
RAMONA CA 92065  
(858) 618-5087  
wolfmates@cox.net

Keith D White  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 355-5473  
kwh@cpuc.ca.gov

Lynda Kastoll  
Realty Specialist  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
EL CENTRO FIELD OFFICE  
1661 SOUTH 4TH STREET  
EL CENTRO CA 92243

Thomas Zale  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
1661 SO. 4TH STREET  
EL CENTRO CA 92243  
(760) 337-4420  
Thomas\_Zale@blm.gov

\*\*\*\*\* INFORMATION ONLY \*\*\*\*\*

Bob & Margaret Barelmann  
6510 FRANCISCAN ROAD  
CARLSBAD CA 92011  
(760) 497-7777  
ecp@ixpres.com

G. Alan Comnes  
CABRILLO POWER I LLC  
3934 SE ASH STREET  
PORTLAND OR 97214  
(503) 239-6913  
alan.comnes@nrgenergy.com

Jim Bell  
4862 VOLTAIRE ST.  
SAN DIEGO CA 92107

Michael L. Wells  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS & RECREATION  
200 PALM CANYON DRIVE  
BORREGO SPRINGS CA 92004  
(760) 767-4037  
mwells@parks.ca.gov

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL

A0608010 LIST

A0512014

(619) 758-9020  
jimbellelsey@cox.net

J.A. Savage  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY CIRCUIT  
3006 SHEFFIELD AVE  
OAKLAND CA 94602  
(510) 534-9109  
editorial@californiaenergycircuit.net

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS  
517 - B POTRERO AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110  
(415) 552-1764  
cem@newsdata.com

Legal & Regulatory Department  
CALIFORNIA ISO  
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
FOLSOM CA 95630  
e-recipient@caiso.com  
For: CALIFORNIA ISO

Tom Blair  
Energy Administrator  
CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
9601 RIDGEHAVEN COURT, SUITE 120  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1636  
(858) 492-6001  
TBlair@sandiego.gov

Dahvia Locke  
Enironmental Resource Manager  
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & LAND USE  
5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1666  
(858) 694-3075  
Dahvia.Locke@sdcountry.ca.gov

Glenn E. Drown  
PO BOX 330  
SANTA YSABEL CA 92070  
(760) 765-3381  
gedrown@mindspring.com

Andrew B. Brown  
Attorney At Law  
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP  
2015 H STREET  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Dan Perkins  
ENERGY SMART HOMES  
983 PHILLIPS ST.  
VISTA CA 92083  
(760) 315-2055  
perkydanp@yahoo.com

Rebecca Pearl  
Policy Advocate, Clean Bay Campaign  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH COALITION  
401 MILE OF CARS WAY, STE. 310  
NATIONAL CITY CA 91950  
(619) 474-0220  
rebeccap@environmentalhealth.org  
For: ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH COALITION

Epic Intern  
EPIC/USD SCHOOL OF LAW  
5998 ALCALA PARK  
SAN DIEGO CA 92110  
(619) 260-4806  
usdepic@gmail.com

Steve/Carolyn Esposito  
37784 MONTEZUMA VALLEY ROAD  
RANCHITA CA 92066  
(760) 782-9011  
cesposit@sdcoe.k12.ca.us

Mary Kay Ferwalt  
24569 DEL AMO ROAD  
RAMONA CA 92065  
(760) 789-9192  
mkferwalt@yahoo.com

Diane I. Fellman  
Attorney At Law  
FPL ENERGY, LLC  
234 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 703-6000  
diane\_fellman@fpl.com

Kelly Fuller  
PO BOX 1993  
ALPINE CA 91903  
k.d.fuller@sbcglobal.net

Willie M. Gaters  
1295 EAST VISTA WAY

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL

A0608010 LIST

A0512014

(916) 447-2166  
abb@eslawfirm.com

VISTA CA 92084  
(858) 829-1983  
williegaters@earthlink.net

Richard Lauckhart  
GLOBAL ENERGY  
2379 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 200  
SACRAMENTO CA 95833  
(916) 609-7769  
rlauckhart@globalenergy.com

Michael J. Gergen  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
SUITE 1000  
555 ELEVENTH STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20004-1304  
(202) 637-2200  
michael.gergen@lw.com

Carolyn Morrow  
GOLIGHTLY FARMS  
36255 GRAPEVINE CANYON ROAD  
RANCHITA CA 92066  
(619) 977-9961  
Csmmarket@aol.com

Richard W. Raushenbush  
Attorney At Law  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2000  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 395-8237  
richard.raushenbush@lw.com

Laurel Granquist  
PO BOX 2486  
JULIAN CA 92036  
celloinpines@sbcglobal.net

Lara Lopez  
16828 OPEN VIEW RD  
RAMONA CA 92065  
soliviasmom@cox.net

Karl Higgins  
President  
HIGGINS & ASSOCIATES  
1517 ROMA DRIVE  
VISTA CA 92083  
(760) 727-5227  
karlhiggins@adelphia.net

Audra Hartmann  
Regional Director, Gov'T Affairs  
LS POWER GENERATION  
980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 1420  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 441-6242  
ahartmann@lspower.com

Christopher P. Jeffers  
24566 DEL AMO ROAD  
RAMONA CA 92065  
polo-player@cox.net

MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.  
1999 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 1440  
OAKLAND CA 94612  
(510) 834-1999  
mrw@mrwassoc.com

Glenda Kimmerly  
PO BOX 305  
SANTA YSABEL CA 92070  
kimmerlys@yahoo.com

Dave Downey  
NORTH COUNTY TIMES  
207 E. PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE  
ESCONDIDO CA 92025  
(760) 740-5442  
ddowney@nctimes.com

Brian Kramer  
PO BOX 516  
JULIAN CA 92036-0516  
(760) 765-3177  
colobiker@gmail.com

Peter Schultz  
OLD JULIAN CO.  
PO BOX 2269  
RAMONA CA 92065  
(760) 789-0987  
oldjulianco@integrity.com

Juile B. Greenisen  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
SUITE 1000  
555 ELEVENTH STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20004-1304  
(202) 637-2142

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL

A0608010 LIST

A0512014

juile.greenisen@lw.com

David T. Kraska  
Attorney At Law  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
PO BOX 7442  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120  
(415) 973-7503  
dtk5@pge.com

Jason Yan  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE STREET, MAIL CODE B13L  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
jay2@pge.com

Michael S. Porter  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE ST., MAIL CODE 13L RM 1318  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 973-6625  
mspe@pge.com

Scott Kardel  
PALOMAR OBSERVATORY  
PO BOX 200  
PALOMAR MOUNTAIN CA 92060  
(760) 742-2111  
WSK@astro.caltech.edu

Nancy Parinello  
PO BOX 516  
JULIAN CA 92036-0516  
(760) 765-3177  
nparinello@gmail.com

John Raifsnider  
PO BOX 121  
JULIAN CA 92036-0121  
(760) 765-2722  
skyword@sbcglobal.net

Carolyn A. Dorroh  
RAMONA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP  
17235 VOORHES LANE  
RAMONA CA 92065  
(760) 789-4429  
carolyn.dorroh@cubic.com

Maureen Robertson

Joseph Rauh  
RANCHITA REALTY  
37554 MONTEZUMA VALLEY RD  
RANCHITA CA 92066  
(760) 782-3632  
joe@ranchitarealty.com  
For: RANCHITA REALTY

Aaron Quintanar  
RATE PAYERS FOR AFFORDABLE CLEAN ENERGY  
311 CALIFORNIA STREET, STE 650  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 399-8850 X302  
rcox@pacificenvironment.org

Paul Ridgway  
3027 LAKEVIEW DR.  
PO BOX 1435  
JULIAN CA 92036-1435  
cpuc@92036.com

Susan Freedman  
Senior Regional Energy Planner  
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
401 B STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101  
(619) 699-7387  
sfr@sandag.org

Abbas M. Abed  
Electric And Gas Procurement  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC  
8315 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP21D  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
(858) 654-8253  
amabed@semprautilities.com

Central Files  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP31E  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
(858) 654-1766  
centralfiles@semprautilities.com

E. Gregory Barnes  
Attorney At Law  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
101 ASH STREET, HQ 13D

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL

A0608010 LIST

A0512014

Editor  
RAMONA SENTINEL  
611 MAIN STREET  
RAMONA CA 92065  
(760) 789-1350  
maureen@ramonasentinel.com

SAN DIEGO CA 92101  
(619) 699-5019  
gbarnes@sempra.com  
For: San Diego Gas & Electric

Matthew Jumper  
SAN DIEGO INTERFAITH HOUSING FOUNDATION  
7956 LESTER AVE  
LEMON GROVE CA 91945  
mjumper@sdihf.org  
For: SAN DIEGO INTERFAITH HOUSING FOUNDATION

Case Administration  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
ROOM 370  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE  
ROSEMEAD CA 91770  
(626) 302-4875  
case.admin@sce.com

Irene Stillings  
Executive Director  
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY  
8520 TECH WAY, SUITE 110  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
Irene.stillings@sdenenergy.org

Clay E. Faber  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY  
555 WEST FIFTH STREET, GT-14E7  
LOS ANGELES CA 90013  
(213) 244-5129  
cfaber@semprautilities.com  
For: San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Jennifer Porter  
Policy Analyst  
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY OFFICE  
8690 BALBOA AVENUE  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
(858) 244-1180  
jennifer.porter@sdenenergy.org

Wally Besuden  
President  
SPANGLER PEAK RANCH, INC  
PO BOX 1959  
ESCONDIDO CA 92033  
(702) 429-7525

Sephra A. Ninow  
Research Assistant  
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY OFFICE  
8690 BALBOA AVENUE  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
sephra.Ninow@sdenenergy.org

Justin Augustine  
THE CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY  
1095 MARKET ST., SUITE 511  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103  
(415) 436-9682 302  
jaugustine@biologicaldiversity.org  
For: The Center for Biological Diversity

Greg Schuett  
PO BOX 1108  
JULIAN CA 92036  
gregschuett@mac.com

Craig Rose  
THE SAN DIEGO UNION TRIBUNE  
PO BOX 120191S  
SAN DIEGO CA 92112-0191  
craig.rose@uniontrib.com

Paul G. Scheurman  
SHEUERMAN CONSULTING  
3915 RAWHIDE RD.  
ROCKLIN CA 95677  
(916) 630-7073  
PGS@IEEE.org

William Tulloch  
28223 HIGHWAY 78  
RAMONA CA 92065  
(760) 789-3854

Sheridan Pauker  
SHUTE,MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP  
396 HAYES STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 552-7272  
wolff@smwlaw.com

Scott J. Anders  
Research/ Administrative Center  
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO - LAW  
5998 ALCALA PARK  
SAN DIEGO CA 92110

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST \*\*\*\*\*

Last Update on 25-OCT-2006 by: LIL  
A0608010 LIST  
A0512014

For: Cities of Temecula, Hemet and Murrieta

(619) 260-4589  
scottanders@sandiego.edu

Darell Holmes  
Transmission Manager  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
2244 WALNIT GROVE AVE, 238M, QUADB, G01  
ROSEMEAD CA 91770  
(626) 302-6498  
darell.holmes@sce.com

Martha Baker  
VOLCAN MOUNTAIN PRESERVE FOUNDATION  
PO BOX 1625  
JULIAN CA 92036  
(760) 765-2300  
vmp@sbcglobal.net

Kevin Woodruff  
WOODRUFF EXPERT SERVICES, INC.  
1100 K STREET, SUITE 204  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 442-4877  
kdw@woodruff-expert-services.com