

Comment Set D0171
C. D. Stout, Ph.D.

From: 'Dave Stout'
To:
Sent: Sun Apr 6 14:35
Subject: Fwd: Comment letter on Sunrise Powerlink Draft EIR/EIS

April 6, 2008

Re: Sunrise Powerlink in San Diego County

I am strongly opposed to this proposed power line. It is not required, and therefore the environmental damage it would cause is unmitigable under CEQA.

D0171-1

The region's power needs can be met by modest new in-basin gas-fired generation, combined with conservation and renewable in-county electrical sources. If built the project will certainly be litigated and is probably illegal under CEQA because it countervails against the California Solar Initiative program.

As a strong supporter of County of San Diego District 2 Supervisor, Dianne Jacob, I fully endorse her comments at the CPUC hearing in Ramona, CA in February, and reprinted in 'The Jacob Journal' for March 2008. All the points and arguments in this commentary are true and logical.

D0171-2

The Sunrise Powerlink would also damage the ability of the U.S. economy to establish energy independence, and therefore is a detriment to national security.

D0171-3

Sincerely,
C. D. Stout, Ph.D.
P.O. Box 2146
Alpine, CA 91903

Responses to Comment Set D0171

C. D. Stout, Ph.D.

- D0171-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding the purpose and need for the Proposed Project. The New In-Area All-Source Generation Alternative includes components on in-basin gas fired generation and in county electrical sources, as suggested by the commenter.
- The commenter suggests the Proposed Project is contrary to the California Solar Initiative (CSI) program and therefore potentially illegal. The transmission line project would not prevent implementation of the CSI; there is no conflict between these two energy concepts. The Sunrise Powerlink Project is not intended to replace the CSI.
- D0171-2 The commenter's support for San Diego District 2 Supervisor, Dianne Jacob, and her comments concerning the Proposed Project at the CPUC hearing in Ramona is acknowledged.
- D0171-3 The commenter's concern that the Proposed Project would be detrimental to the U.S. economy because it would not allow for energy independence and would therefore be detrimental to national security is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-7 concerning the Sunrise Powerlink Project connection to Mexican generation.

Comment Set D0172
Violet Devoe

From: Videvoe@cs.com
To: sunrise@aspeneg.com
Sent: Sun Apr 6 10:21
Subject: Fwd: re: Sunrise Powerlink project

Sir,
My husband, Daniel Devoe, and I own property in Borrego Springs. We frequently go to and from San Diego and enjoy the pristine beauty which changes beautifully each season.

D0172-1

It would be a crime to put those UGLY power towers through the valley and the Anza Borrego Desert State Park. I suggest that we do not need the additional power in San Diego. I suggest that SDGE has consistently made decisions not for the end user benefit but for the stockholder benefit. I suggest that the power which would be transmitted would not be "clean" power.

If a power line must be built, put it at the border, parallel to the existing power line. To the "potential fire hazard" argument, I have heard that SDGE power lines are responsible for many of the back country fires which are started because SDGE will not put the proper separators between the lines. When the wind blows, the lines touch and fires are started. Spend the money to bury the additional border power line.

D0172-2

I am against the Sunrise Powerlink project.

Best regards,
Violet Devoe
2161 Borrego Valley Rd.
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

Responses to Comment Set D0172

Violet Devoe

- D0172-1 The commenter's opposition to transmission lines through the valley and the ABDSP is acknowledged. The commenter suggests additional power is not necessary in San Diego and that the power that would be transmitted would not be clean power. Please see General Response GR-12 concerning the purpose and need for the project and General Response GR-7 concerning the Sunrise Powerlink Project connection to Mexican generation.
- D0172-2 The commenter's support for a transmission line along the border parallel to the existing power line is acknowledged. The I-8 Alternative runs along a southern border and parallels the existing SWPL for the first 36 miles. The I-8 Alternative heads north away from the SWPL when the fire risk becomes moderate. The commenter's suggests that the second line should be underground to avoid increased fire hazard of a second southern route. Please also see Appendix 1 Screening report Alt. 230/500 UG. Please see General Response GR-9 concerning fire issues and the comparison of alternatives.

Comment Set D0173
Lila K. O'Connell & Patti C. Reed

Dear Sirs:

April 4, 2008

We appreciate the maps and other information you sent. If you go with the northern route, the path will come within 300 ft. of the Keating/O'Connell parcels in Dixieland. The property has belonged to our family for three generations.

D0173-1

Some of our family members in Texas have humming Electrical towers on the edge of their property. They are no longer able to lease that part of the ranch because cattle can't tolerate the noise. I was told that you moved the line so as not to come close to a dairy near our land.

We had hoped to be able to sell our property in Dixieland and to be able to realize a good return on our investment. If the line goes that close to us, it is certain that we will not be able to sell it or develop it for future use. We have been paying taxes and water availability for over 50 years.

D0173-2

It seems to us, the three families involved, that you will be asking our family to sacrifice a lot to get power to San Diego. Property values will certainly go down.

The line is not needed and will be a disaster to the environment as well as the people involved.

D0173-3

It is inconceivable that the Sunrise Powerlink/ Green Path Southwest project could come along side of our property and render it useless. If this happens, you will be forcing us to let the land go for taxes.

Please rethink your plan and find a better solution.

Sincerely,

Lila K. O'Connell, For Keating and O'Connell Families

Patti C. Reed, For Keating and Reed families

Responses to Comment Set D0173

Lila K. O'Connell & Patti C. Reed

- D0173-1 The commenters' opposition to the northern route alternative and concern that the route adjacent to their families' property would increase corona noise and impact to cattle ranching is acknowledged. Impact N-3 in Section D.8.5 in Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes permanent noise level increase due to corona noise from operation of the transmission lines and noise from other project components and concludes this would be significant and unmitigable. Impact AG-3 in Section D.6.5 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the interference of the Proposed Project with Active Agricultural Operations and concludes this impact would be significant and unmitigable.
- D0173-2 Please see General Response GR-11 regarding property values. As stated in Mitigation Measure L-2b in Section D.4 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS, SDG&E will revise project elements to minimize land conflicts including identifying potential reroutes of the alignment that would be mutually acceptable to SDG&E and the landowner. Mitigation Measure L-2b further states that property owners whose land may be divided into potentially uneconomic parcels shall be afforded this same opportunity even if development plans have not been established.
- D0173-3 The commenter suggests the transmission line is not needed and would be detrimental to the environment and to the people involved. Please see General Response GR-12 concerning the purpose and need for the Proposed Project.

Comment Set D0174
Shirley Beyer

April 2, 2008

CPUC/BLM
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to add my name to the list of those who oppose the Sunrise Powerlink Project. My concerns are many:

1. Fire Danger - - The fire danger from overhead electric lines and the delays and difficulty of fire fighting in and around those lines is a real and constant concern in our fire prone location. The cost of under grounding lines is minimal compared to the cost of rebuilding homes and lives. The cost of loss of life is incalculable.

D0174-1

2. Environmental Impact

- * Air pollution
- * The danger to people, animals and birds from power fields given off by overhead wires.
- * Damage to the terrain due to the construction of access roads, substations and towers.
- * Visual pollution of the large towers.
- * Loss of and destruction to habitats for birds, wildlife, plants, trees, grasses and wildflowers.
- * Erosion of hillsides after construction equipment has torn up the native plants and grasses.
- * The loss of the beauty, peace and solitude of the back country.

D0174-2

D0174-3

3. Financial Impact

- *The loss in tourist revenue. Why should people from the city come to the desert and mountains to take in the view of a destroyed landscape and electrical towers?
- * Loss to private landowners and ranchers due to lower property values, harm to livestock and the loss of use of their land where easements are created and/or expanded.
- * No recoverable cost to customers/rate payers at a time when most consumers are already stretched to their financial limits. Why must we pay for outdated 19th Century technology?
- * The loss and destruction of protected lands that have been set aside in perpetuity; i.e. State Parks, National forest and BLM lands.

D0174-4

From my observations and reading regarding the Sunrise Powerlink Project, it appears the only ones to benefit from this project are those who stand to make a profit.

D0174-5

Please respect the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Vote NO on this damaging project that threatens the quality of our lives and the world our children will inherit.

Sincerely,



Shirley Beyer
P.O. Box 2138
Julian, CA 92036

cc: Billie Blanchard, CPUC Project Manager

Responses to Comment Set D0174

Shirley Beyer

D0174-1 The commenter's opposition to the Sunrise Powerlink Project and concern about fire risk and the impact of overhead transmission lines on firefighting is acknowledged. The commenter suggests the cost of undergrounding transmission lines is minimal compared to the damage caused by wildfires. Please see General Response GR-9 concerning fire issues.

D0174-2 The commenter's concern about air pollution cause by the Proposed Project is acknowledged. Section D.11 in Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses the impacts to air quality by the Proposed Project.

D0174-3 The commenter's concern about impacts to human and animal health from power fields is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-10 concerning EMF related health effects. The commenter's concern about impacts to habitat and terrain due to construction of the access roads and towers is acknowledged. D.2.11 in Volume 1 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses direct or indirect loss of listed or sensitive wildlife or direct loss of habitat for listed or sensitive wildlife and concludes this impact would be significant and unmitigable for sensitive species.

The commenter's views and concerns about impacts of the Proposed Project on visual resources and the loss of the beauty and peacefulness of the backcountry are acknowledged. Please see Section D.3 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS for specific impacts to visual resources.

The commenter's concern about erosion impacts is acknowledged. Impact G-1 in Section D.13 in Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes if the Proposed Project would trigger or accelerate erosion due to construction activities and concludes it would be less than significant. As stated in WQ-APM-4 a required Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared and implemented during the life of the project that would require erosion control.

D0174-4 The commenter's views and concerns about the financial impact of the Proposed Project due to the loss of tourist revenue, the loss of property value, loss of agriculture, and loss of protected lands is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-11 regarding loss of property value. As stated in Mitigation Measure L-2b in Section D.4 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS, SDG&E will revise project elements to minimize land conflicts including identifying potential reroutes of the alignment that would be mutually acceptable to SDG&E and the landowner. Mitigation Measure L-2b further states that property owners whose land may be divided into potentially uneconomic parcels shall be afforded this same opportunity even if development plans have not been established. Loss of tourist and agriculture revenues are addressed in Section D.14 in Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The commenter suggests there would be no recoverable costs to customers/ratepayers. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding the cost-benefit of the Proposed Project.

D0174-5 The commenter's support for the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS and opposition to the Proposed Project is acknowledged.