

Docket Optical System - Re: Response to your letter to John Ruskovich.

From: "Robin Bell" <robin@midstateexpo.com>
To: "AGENA GARNETT" <AGARNETT@ash.dmh.ca.gov>, "John Kessler" <jkessler@energy.state.ca.us>, "Michael Strobridge" <mike_76@live.com>
Date: 1/26/2009 11:39 AM
Subject: Re: Response to your letter to John Ruskovich.
CC: <mstrobridge@sbcglobal.net>, "Public Advisor Elena Miller" <pao@energy.state.ca.us>

Dear All,

I was mentioned a few times in the letter below and would like clarify a few of my opinions.

Fist of all, I did indeed find it frustrating to converse with the first public advisor which we were referred to, Nick Bartcsh. I appreciated John Kessler's recommendation that I speak with Elena Miller and found her very helpful and easy to understand.

Secondly, I participated in both the Wildlife Corridor teleconference and the CURE Motion to compel hearing. I would like to clarify that my comments regarding these teleconferences were not exactly as Agena understood them. I was frustrated by the motion to compel hearing procedure as it is different that the workshops we have become accustomed to and allow only for public comment at the end. I was however given ample time to speak and appreciated that my comments were recognized and considered by the commissioners in their rulings. After speaking with John Kessler, I understood this hearing was similar to what could be expected at the final hearings. This led me to contact Elena Miller for more detailed information regarding the responsibilities and benefits of becoming an intervener. I found both John and Elena very helpful.

Regarding the Wildlife Corridor Workshop, I found the technology used to facilitate the conference impressive. The meeting format was similar to the workshops that have been held on the plains and allowed ample opportunity for public participation. My only suggestion regarding the format of the meeting is that it would be helpful if all callers logged in by name rather than some using a caller number (Caller #1, Caller #2 and etc...) as it was somewhat confusing to figure out who was speaking.

However, while I did find the meeting format productive, I can see that accessibility to the meeting is limited to persons with internet and phone access. This could be resolved by providing a location for the public to participate.

Best Regards,

Robin Bell

DOCKET

07-AFC-8

DATE JAN 26 2009

RECD. JAN 28 2009

----- Original Message -----

From: [AGENA GARNETT](#)
To: [John Kessler](#) ; [Michael Strobridge](#)
Cc: [mstrobridge@sbcglobal.net](#) ; [Public Advisor Elena Miller](#) ; [Robin Bell](#)
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2009 10:14 AM
Subject: Response to your letter to John Ruskovich.

Mr. John Kessler,

Response to John Kessler's letter dated January 16, 2008 about the sitting process

Your letter was very eloquent, but again, not answering the actual questions asked of you. I find it very interesting that you should mention the conversation that John had with the public advisor in the beginning of this sitting process, which was months before you came onboard. You can ask Mary Dyas about that conversation, as both John and I complained to her that the man was rude and not at all helpful. You can also ask Robin Bell about this man, because she too was treated poorly by this individual. If he was so good, why is he no longer our contact? I do not appreciate your implication that John does not have the right to be upset and stating he was not left out of the process just because he spoke with this individual.

It is amazing that you learned from contacting the public advisors office that John had a 45 minute conversation with them in January of 2008. It is further amazing that out of how many phone conversations you found the person he talked to and was so clear about the entire conversation (according to the public advisor in January 2008). Now, in my opinion, if the CEC would start answering simple questions asked by John and Mike instead of spending so much time and energy to cover their asses, maybe this process could be finalized.

As far as the Corridor Teleconference goes – this too upsets me very much. John did not call in because we cannot afford the 3 hour cell phone bill (as I know that Mike and Robin too really couldn't afford to sit on the phone all that time, but they did.) Following the meeting, both Mike Strobridge and Robin Bell told us that they were very unsatisfied with the phone process, as they did not have a chance to comment until the very end and even then were cut short. Plus they had no idea who was still connected, as supposedly many had already disconnected by this time for various reasons

The next time the state has this type of process they need to set up a site where **all** locals can meet (for example: County Planning Dept., Fish & Game Dept. etc.) so that we who live in this area and study the wildlife on a daily basis can be actively involved as is our right. We have knowledge that a degree can't give, because we live and breathe the Plains!

For me personally I find your letter like a slap in the face. I do not believe that it is John who doesn't follow the process, but you. As the Applicant has again and again turned in incomplete and inaccurate data that you keep accepting. I find it very interesting that you can make note of John's conversation with the Public Advisor in January 2008, but when I ask you why our Airstrip information was never changed, your comment was that you cannot be responsible for something that was submitted before you came on board.

Agena Ruskovich