

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