

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Public Scoping)
 Comment Period)
)
 In Re: West-Wide Energy)
 Corridor Programmatic)
 EIS)
 _____)

**CERTIFIED
COPY**

PUBLIC MEETING
 TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2005
 2:00 P.M.

Held At: Radisson Hotel
 500 Leisure Lane
 Sacramento, California

Reported by: Desiree C. Tawney, CSR No. 12414



Northern California Court Reporters

3610 American River Drive, Suite 114 ■ Sacramento, CA 95864-5922
 (916) 485-4949 ■ Toll Free (888) 600-NCCR ■ Fax (916) 485-1735

1 serve as a primary point of contact with the Federal
2 Government in this proceeding.

3 We would therefore ask you ensure all communications
4 and information pertaining to the work on the PEIS
5 concerning California be made available to the Energy
6 Commission for its review and comment.

7 Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

8 MR. JOHNSON: All right. If you have a hard copy of
9 your comments, we could take them or you could give them
10 after the session is over.

CA03

11 Thank you. Our next speaker is William Zobel.

12 MR. ZOBEL: Good afternoon. I also have a statement
13 to read into the record. Terry has stolen my thunder.
14 But it's good to hear we're here on the same page.

15 My name is Bill Zobel with Sempra Energy. I'm here
16 today representing Sempra Energy Company.

17 Sempra Energy is based in San Diego, California.
18 It's a Fortune 500 Service Holding Company which provides
19 electricity, natural gas and value added products and
20 services to the economy.

21 Sempra Energy Company employs close to 13,000 plus
22 people and is serving more than 10 million customers in
23 the United States, Europe, Canada, Mexico, South America
24 and Asia.

25 Sempra Energy supports the Federal Government's

1 designation of energy corridors on Federal land. This is
2 an important issue to provide the safe, reliable and cost
3 effective delivery of energy to the American people.

4 Congress reinforces this as a national priority in
5 their actions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 that brings
6 us here today.

7 As the nation's economy continues to expand, our
8 population continues to grow and so will our need for
9 energy.

10 While we have seen great success in the demands I've
11 mentioned, this does not and will not preclude the need
12 for additional supplies of energy and the infrastructure
13 necessary to carry the load centers. We simply cannot
14 conserve our way out of the need for additional energy
15 supplies and infrastructure.

16 At the highest level, the corridor designation
17 process must take into account public safety and system
18 reliability, create opportunity to optimize cost-effective
19 delivery of energy in a competitive manner and support to
20 the extent feasible of the renewable portfolio objectives
21 in the western states.

22 System-wide reliability and public safety must be a
23 primary consideration in the identification of the
24 corridors as has already been mentioned today.

25 The need for additional facilities and upgrades to

1 existing ones is abundantly clear. As recently as this
2 past August 25th, the California independent system
3 operators required a transmission emergency causing a
4 forced outage of more than 450,000 customers in our
5 service territory.

6 It will take the concerted and cooperative efforts of
7 both public and private interests to make the necessary
8 long-term improvements to prevent future events like this
9 from occurring.

10 Optimizing energy delivery for customers depends on
11 several factors. Not the least of which is access and
12 availability to energy infrastructure and ensuring the
13 corridor designation process does not distort competitive
14 markets.

15 One alternative to be evaluated by the PEIS as
16 mentioned in the Federal Register is an optimization
17 analysis of the new and existing corridors based on a set
18 of criteria and strategies that incorporate environmental
19 concerns, project the supply and demands, network
20 efficiencies, landscape features, the availability of new
21 technology and cost.

22 In addition to these, we recommend you also consider
23 the competitive process for the delivery of energy. If
24 done correctly, this comprehensive analysis including all
25 of these factors should clearly identify the best possible

1 solutions.

2 With regard to renewable energy, many states have
3 taken the initiative and imposed renewable energy
4 portfolios on regulated utilities. In order for the
5 regulated utilities to meet their goals, land throughout
6 the country must be set aside for renewable energy project
7 developments. These projects must have competitive access
8 to markets.

9 In California we have a goal of achieving 20 percent
10 of our demand served by the renewable energy by 2010.
11 This is an aggressive target. It will require the
12 cooperation of both State and Federal agencies if we're to
13 be successful.

14 We support and encourage the Federal Government to
15 work closely with the State of California to ensure this
16 process does its part to meet that goal.

17 Ongoing experiments with energy infrastructures
18 development are showing us space -- available space for
19 energy infrastructures are diminishing at a rapid pace.
20 Southern California in particular has experienced
21 substantial residential growth in the past several years.
22 This, coupled with many land use restrictions imposed by
23 Federal, State and local government, limits energy
24 infrastructure sites.

25 Our case in point, we recently unveiled a proposal to

1 build a new electric transmission line between San Diego
2 and Imperial counties. This project could produce enough
3 power to serve 650,000 customers. It's called the Sunrise
4 Power Link.

5 This is an example of trying to site a project on
6 land where no dedicated utility corridors currently
7 exists. Existing land use and environmental concerns make
8 siting the route an extreme challenge. Having the ability
9 to access dedicated energy corridors for configuring a
10 specific route would make this segment easier for future
11 projects. Something to keep in mind.

12 In a more general sense, the geographic location of
13 our regulated business -- excuse me -- pose some specific
14 concerns. First, the Federal Government is Southern
15 California's largest landowner as was pointed at the
16 opening of the presentation. In particular, San Diego
17 County serves as home to numerous defense facilities. On
18 one hand, this adds national security component to the
19 importance of ensuring energy delivery systems for the
20 region. But it also adds the unique difficulty in that
21 these facilities are large plots of land that in many
22 cases block access to existing or proposed energy
23 transmission infrastructure. We need to solve this
24 problem and we -- to do so, we recommend the Department of
25 Defense property be explicitly considered in this process.

1 Doing so opens up critical areas of government land's
2 energy in the infrastructure development and adds to the
3 security or adds to the security transmissions.

4 Second, directly south of our California utilities
5 service territory is the sovereign nation of Mexico, which
6 presents immediate concerns. For example, close proximity
7 on both sides of the border creates a need for new energy
8 projects of delivery infrastructure. These issues are
9 further complicated by the fact the projects within
10 Mexico are outside of the jurisdiction of the U.S.
11 planning process, making infrastructure decisions
12 difficult -- infrastructure decisions that much more
13 difficult.

14 We encourage the Federal Government where appropriate
15 to consider working cooperatively with Mexico on these
16 issues to ensure the best possible solutions for everyone.

17 And, finally, Sempra Energy Companies are very
18 interested in the identification of these corridors for a
19 variety of specialists. We have specific concerns we will
20 identify in detail in our later comments. I want to
21 mention a few of them here today.

22 One, corridors natural gas transmission projects
23 associated with the delivery of energy supplies to our
24 service territories might be considered.

25 Two, corridors touching off Camp Pendelton need to be

1 considered as well.

2 Three, corridors expanding our connection with
3 Southern California Edison system to the north to
4 strengthen our transmission system supply in the Orange
5 County service area.

6 Four, corridors connecting to our Sycamore Canyon
7 substation need to be reconsidered and strengthened.

8 And, finally, corridors connecting potential wind
9 generations in San Diego County, and existing transmission
10 systems and the plans of substations.

11 I want to thank the Department of Energy, Interior
12 Bureau of Land Management, Agriculture for their efforts
13 on this project.

14 Sempra Energy supports the designation of energy
15 corridors. Formal comments will follow.

CA04

16 Thank you.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Next speaker will Diane
18 Ross-Leech.

19 MS. ROSS-LEACH: Good afternoon. My name is Diane
20 Ross-leech and I represent Pacific Gas and Electric
21 Company, another energy provider. We serve 1 in 20
22 Americans. We are the largest investor on the utilities.
23 I want to thank you for having this meeting and inviting
24 us to participate.

25 PG&E supports this effort and we have a few comments