

Comment Set D0176
Trixie Deveau

From: Trixie Deveau
To: sunrise@aspenerg.com
Sent: Mon Apr 7 9:07
Subject: Fwd: transmission lines.

We are not too far away from companies being held responsible for their environmental mismanagement. Please consider your choices VERY carefully. We all have a stake in the future. Alternatives are always possible. Imagine how well you and your children can sleep at night, when you can be proud of your actions, instead of ashamed. Trixie

D0176-1

Responses to Comment Set D0176 Trixie Deveau

- D0176-1 The commenter suggests companies should be held accountable for their environmental mismanagement and supports alternatives to the Proposed Project. Please note the Draft EIR/EIS fully analyzed 27 alternatives and ranked five alternatives as environmentally superior to the Proposed Project.

Comment Set D0177
Janine Palmer

Janine Palmer
20580 Bexley Road
Jamul, CA 91935

7 March 2008

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

Re: Sunrise Powerlink-Modified 'D' Alternative Route

To Whom it May Concern:

I wish to comment on the proposed energy corridor in the Cleveland National Forest and residential area as it pertains to Jamul. People attempting to build or sub-divide acreage must comply with tests and waiting periods for the protection of the following:

- Coastal Swamp Grass
- Endangered rare butterflies (Quino Checkerspot)
- Gnatcatcher Bird
- Southwestern Flycatcher Bird
- Eagles
- Southwest Arroyo Toad

Does this not apply when proposing health risks to residents when electrical lines are scheduled to invade nature preserve areas human living space? I know some of the above mentioned endangered species have been found in this area, due to a neighbor who was not allowed and unable to subdivide, due to these findings.

We want the eco friendly energy options now available. We want it for the future of our planet and for the better future of humankind. The health risks of what you are proposing are huge along with; ground water quality for wells, water shed to Barrett Lake which is emergency water for all of San Diego. Fire risk(s) and we any many others just lost our home in the wild fires, lower property values. No roads in forest and BLM.

The comment here is PROTEST.

Regards,



Janine Palmer

Resident in support of eco friendly, safer power sources like windmills
OPPOSED TO SUNRISE POWERLINK-MODIFIED 'D' ALTERNATIVE ROUTE and subsequent devastation

D0177-1

D0177-2

D0177-3

D0177-4

Responses to Comment Set D0177

Janine Palmer

- D0177-1 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the proposed energy corridor in the CNF and the impacts to residential areas along the Modified Route D Alternative are acknowledged. The commenter suggests that when a person attempts to build or subdivide acreage they must comply with protection for multiple special status species many of which are found in the general Jamul region. The species mentioned have been analyzed in Section E.4.2 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- Please see General Response GR-11 regarding EMF.
- D0177-2 The commenter's support for environmentally friendly energy options is acknowledged. The commenter's concern regarding the groundwater and watersheds within the Jamul region are acknowledged. Impact H-2 in Section E.4.12.2 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the degradation of water quality of watercourses within the Modified Route D Alternative ROW and the downstream water supply reservoirs due to spills of potentially harmful materials. The impact analysis concludes it would be significant but mitigable with the implementation of mitigation that would comply with the Forest Service Conditions, be subject to an approved SWPPP and Sediment Control Plan, avoid sensitive water resources, and properly dispose of and clean-up of hazardous materials.
- D0177-3 The commenter's views and concern regarding fire risk are acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-9 concerning wildfire issues. Please see General Response GR-11 concerning property values.
- D0177-4 The commenter's opposition to the Modified Route D Alternative is acknowledged.

Comment Set D0178
Mr. and Mrs. Dick Martin

April 7, 2008

Mr. and Mrs. Dick Martin
225 Riverpark Ln.
Brawley, CA 92227

Billie Blanchard, CPUC / Lynda Kastoll, BLM
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104
Fax: (866) 711-3106

Dear Ms. Billie Blanchard:

Subject: *Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Land Use Amendment, San Diego Gas & Electric Company Application for the Sunrise Powerlink Project, SCH #2006091071, DOI Control No. DES-07-58, January 2008 (Draft EIR/EIS)*

SDG&E's Proposed Project Alternative and the Environmentally Superior Northern Route Alternative in the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) Draft EIR/EIS both are routed through existing Imperial County dairy property along the segment, West Main Canal-Huff Road Modification Alternative. The proposed 500 kV transmission line (Line) needs to be located five miles away from dairy facilities such as milking barns and cow/calf operational facilities. Dairy cows stay in the same area for years and are negatively impacted from the electrical fields. SDG&E says they modified this route segment to eliminate dairy operational impacts and avoid Bullfrog Farms but that is not true. SDG&E moved the Line from across the milking barn to across the dairy's cow/calf operational facilities. These alternative routes continue to be located on Bullfrog Farms property and negatively impact dairy operational facilities.

SDG&E's map overviews are from the early 1990s and do not show current structures along the routes: (1) Proposed Project Alternative, (2) Environmentally Superior Northern Route Alternative, and (3) West Main Canal-Huff Road Modification Alternative. The 1990s aerial base used for the Imperial Valley Link along the proposed Line does not show current site conditions such as dairies, agricultural businesses, Centinela State Prison, and newer residential structures along the route. Using a map overview from the early 1990s makes it appear that the proposed route for the 500kV transmission line goes through vacant lands when that is not the case.

Distance setback requirements for 500kV lines could be greater for state prisons than for the general population. It may be the same as the five-mile setback distance needed for dairies. This needs to be verified in the CPUC process because lawsuits, filed by prisoners, could cost the state, Imperial County, and other agencies loss of funding in coming years with a 500kV transmission line located so close.

Two additional Bullfrog Farms dairies are planned for construction on the east side of Huff Road. The proposed 500kV transmission line segment, going north along Huff Road from the Westside Main Canal, will cause severe negative impacts to these dairy expansions. Another

D0178-1

Comment Set D0178, cont.
Mr. and Mrs. Dick Martin

smaller dairy, proposed to be developed along the Westside Main Canal, has withdrawn from escrow due to SDG&E's proposed 500kV transmission line. Proposing to location a 500 kV transmission line in this area is negatively impacting new dairy development in Imperial County. Loss of existing and additional proposed dairies will negatively impact Imperial County's economy by millions of dollars.

D0178-1 cont.

I request that the State of California and the CPUC support Imperial County's dairy industry and dairy development process by locating SDG&E's proposed 500kV transmission line away from the western edge of Imperial County's agricultural lands. The two route alternatives that are located along the western edge of Imperial County's agricultural lands are 1) Environmentally Superior Northern Route Alternative and 2) SDG&E's Proposed Project.

Several rural residences in Imperial County, located along the proposed Line and the Westside Main Canal, have children living in them. Additional existing cattle operational facilities located along the Westside Main Canal are less than 500 yards from the proposed Line and will experience severe negative impacts. Along the West Main Canal-Huff Road Modification Alternative route there are: (1) two residences located directly underneath the proposed Line on a single parcel directly west of the cow/calf operational facilities, (2) a residence located less than 1,500 feet from the proposed Line that according to SDG&E staff will have to be removed, (3) three additional residences along the Westside Main Canal are located less than 1,800 feet from the proposed Line, and (3) five or more additional residences are located near the proposed Line from Boley Road through the Dixieland Community.

One of the residences along the Westside Main Canal currently produces energy with solar panels and plans to add wind generation facilities. Placement of the proposed 500kV transmission line, along the West Main Canal-Huff Road Modification Alternative, will destroy this existing solar renewable energy resource facility located in Imperial County. Why would SDG&E be allowed to destroy an existing facility that produces renewable energy in an adjacent county? I request that the CPUC not allow SDG&E to destroy existing renewable energy resources located in Imperial County along the Environmentally Superior Northern Route Alternative and SDG&E's Proposed Project.

Thank you for the opportunity to share and express issues of concern that negatively impact Imperial County's: (1) economy, (2) agricultural and dairy industries, and (3) residents due to the proposed 500kV transmission line to be located along the Environmentally Superior Northern Route Alternative, SDG&E's Proposed Project Route Alternative, and the West Main Canal-Huff Road Modification Alternative as currently described in the January 2008 *Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Land Use Amendment, San Diego Gas & Electric Company Application for the Sunrise Powerlink Project, SCH #2006091071, DOI Control No. DES-07-58.*

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Dick Martin



Responses to Comment Set D0178

Mr. and Mrs. Dick Martin

- D0178-1 The commenters' concern regarding impacts of the Proposed Project to Bullfrog Farms and to Imperial County's dairy industry in general is acknowledged. Please see Responses D0152-1 through D0152-6 and D0198-1 through D0198-11.

Comment Set D0179
Ivars Ozolins

From: Ivars Ozolins
To: sunrise@aspenerg.com
Sent: Mon Apr 7 10:44
Subject: Fwd: NO to Sunrise Powerlink

CPUC/BLM
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104
Fax: 866-711-3106

Subject: Protect Anza-Borrego State Park and reject
the proposed
route of the Sunrise Powerlink

Dear CPUC and BLM,

As a frequent user of Anza-Borrego, I urge you to
reject and say NO to the proposed Sunrise Powerlink
debacle.

As you already know, Anza-Borrego is California's
largest state wilderness area that provides countless
opportunities for citizens such as myself, my family
and my friends to use this pristine wilderness park.
To have it destroyed by Sunrise Powerlink is something
that must not happen. Who the hell wants ugly
powerlines trampling through what is currently a
majestically beautiful natural area? I tell you - I do
not nor do any of my family and friends.

So, please, step up and do the right thing. I urge you
to reject this damaging route and to instead choose one
of the environmentally preferable alternatives. Your
actions today will solidify your standing and
reputation among current and future citizens of
California and users of our natural wilderness areas.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ivars Ozolins
725 Barrington Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90049

D0179-1

Responses to Comment Set D0179

Ivars Ozolins

- D0179-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project through the ABDSP because of the impacts to a pristine and natural environment and support for an environmentally preferred alternative is acknowledged.

Comment Set D0180
Terence Palmer

Terence Palmer
20595 Sycamore Springs Rd.
Jamul, CA 91935

March 6, 2008

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

Re: Sunrise Powerlink-Modified 'D' Alternative Route

This is to comment on the proposed energy corridor through the Cleveland National Forest and surrounding residential areas in Jamul (Deerhorn Valley).

D0180-1

How does this affect the nature preserve of the national forest which is not supposed to be built on? Why is it okay to do something so devastating to so many? What about the knatcatcher and flycatcher birds and endangered butterflies and grasses and toads which the county protects and which prevent others from building or sub-dividing?

It is my understanding that this is also to supply energy to Mexico at least to some extent. Doesn't Mexico cause us enough problems with what we have to pay for their medical coverage, loss of jobs to U.S. citizens, drugs, sewage, etc.? Now, potentially, my family and neighbors might be subjected to major health risks to supply an unnecessary and unsafe power source to them thru my front yard? I don't agree. I protest most vehemently.

D0180-2

What about eco friendly energy options? What about WINDMILLS? The health risks of what you are proposing are frightening. The ground water quality for wells would be threatened. The water shed to Barrett Lake, which is emergency water for San Diego would be threatened. Risk of fire, again. I just lost my home in the fires. No roads in the forest and BLM.

D0180-3

D0180-4


Please re-think, re-design and re-plan for the future. For the future of our planet and our children and their children and the animals who share this planet and depend on us not to make them extinct.

D0180-5

Are you aware that if you stand in a natural source of water underneath of the those large electrical towers, that your skin will be burned?

D0180-6

Sincerely,


Terence J. Palmer

Responses to Comment Set D0180

Terence Palmer

- D0180-1 The commenter's views and concerns about siting a transmission line through the CNF and surrounding residential areas in Jamul and concern with the biological impacts of the transmission line are acknowledged. The biological impacts to the CNF of the Modified Route D Alternative are addressed in Section E.4.2 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impact B-7 analyzes direct or indirect loss of listed or sensitive wildlife or a direct loss of habitat for listed or sensitive wildlife. Impact B-7 concludes this would be a significant unmitigable impact to sensitive species. Please see Section E.4.2 for individual discussions on specific species.
- D0180-2 The commenter's concern regarding the importation of energy generated in Mexico and the health impacts of the transmission line is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-7 regarding the Sunrise Powerlink Project connection to Mexican power generation and General Response GR-10 concerning EMF. The commenter's opposition to the Modified Route D is acknowledged.
- D0180-3 The commenter's support for environmentally friendly energy, including wind energy, is acknowledged. The New In-Area All-Source Generation and New In-Area Renewable Generation Alternatives use wind energy as a component of their energy generation.
- The commenter's concern regarding the groundwater and watersheds impacts within the Jamul region are acknowledged. Impact H-2 in Section E.4.12.2 analyzes the degradation of water quality of watercourses within the Modified Route D Alternative ROW and the downstream water supply reservoirs due to spills of potentially harmful materials. The impact concludes it would be significant but mitigable with the implementation of mitigation that would comply with the Forest Service Conditions, be subject to an approved SWPPP and Sediment Control Plan, avoid sensitive water resources, and properly dispose of and clean-up of hazardous materials.
- D0180-4 Please see General Response GR-9 regarding wildfire issues. The commenter's opposition to road on forest land and BLM land is acknowledged.
- D0180-5 The commenter's concern for the environment for future generations and for wilderness is acknowledged.
- D0180-6 A transmission line emits a magnetic field and an electric field. Neither would burn skin, but the electric field can create shock hazards. Please see discussion in EIR/EIS Sections D.10.20 through D.10.26, Public Health and Safety.

Comment Set D0181
Blake Jopling

From: Blake Jopling [mailto:bjopling@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2008 11:17 PM
To: Aspen@AspenEG.com
Subject: Sunrise Powerlink Draft EIR response

The emails I sent to the specified name Sunrise@AspenEG.com failed. Please forward this email to the appropriate place.
Thank You.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to support the conclusions of Aspen Environmental Group in their draft Environmental Impact Report study for SDGE's proposed Sunrise Power Link project. Upon review of the Draft EIR, I agree that the proposed route is of too great a detriment to the people and the environment of northern San Diego county. I believe the proposed project has too many negative impacts to merit its construction. While the EIR is extensive in its findings, there are other, less measurable impacts that I hope would be taken into consideration while the California Public Utilities Commission reviews this project.

D0181-1

I have lived in urban places for most of my life. Most recently, San Francisco 's Mission District was my home. One reason San Francisco is such a great place to live is that it is relatively easy to find wilderness not too far from home. The residents of the city flock to Marin and the east bay on the weekends to get away from the city and enjoy the open space. Healthy cities must have wild places for people to stretch their legs.

San Diego has certainly grown significantly in the last fifteen years especially with expansion to the east. People here in San Diego have the same need for contact with nature, and I have noticed a marked increase in weekend traffic on Hwy. S2, as people explore the back country on their weekends. There are many trails in this region, the most famous being the Pacific Crest Trail, which the power lines would severely impact, but many other trails as well, so many that would be so much less interesting to explore if the power lines were visible.

I currently live directly across the road from the proposed substation adjacent to Hwy S2, and it deeply saddens me to think about what this beautiful place will feel like if the substation were to be built here. The sound, the lights, not to mention the towers and lines, these things are alien to the back country and will destroy a very unique place.

Thank you for your time,

Blake Jopling

29665 San Felipe Rd.

Warner Springs , CA 92086

Responses to Comment Set D0181

Blake Jopling

D0181-1 The commenter's support for the conclusions of the Sunrise Powerlink Project Draft EIR/EIS and concern regarding the impacts to wilderness and the importance of the San Diego back-country and the Pacific Crest Trail are acknowledged.

The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Central East Substation and the impacts it would have on the region including the commenter's concern about the lights, towers and lines from the substation are acknowledged. Impacts of the Proposed Central East Substation are considered in the D Sections of the Draft EIR/EIS. Specifically, impacts of lights from the Central East Substation are considered in Impact V-21 and in Impact V-22 in Section D.3.7 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The impacts conclude this would be a significant and unmitigable impact.

Comment Set D0182 Steve Green

From: 'Steve Green'
To:
Sent: Mon Apr 7 21:54
Subject: Fwd: Cuyamaca - Sunrise Powerline letter 4-3-08

April 7, 2008

To Who It May Concern:

I am writing you in regard to the proposed SDGE Sunrise powerline. For some time now I have been hearing about a large powerline in the planning stages that is proposed to cross San Diego County. From the maps of proposed routes it seemed that this 500 kva line was not an issue for the Cuyamaca region of the Cleveland National Forest.

D0182-1

Recently however I was informed by neighbors whom own property near my 15785 Boulder Creek Road property that SDGE is seriously considering placing this large electrical transmission line within a stones throw or directly through our lands.

Covered in old growth oak and manzanita trees, ponds, rivers this area has a vigorous and healthy ecology. This land remains an unspoiled region perched high on the alpine flanks of the Cuyamaca Peaks. It is a pristine and rugged land that is home to one of the few remaining wild places within San Diego county. Along with the many natural wonders there are also relics from the past : historic stage routes and numerous archeological sites are contained within this unique area. It is surprising to find a place like this, so close to the large urban sprawl that runs along the SoCal coast. There is no doubt that placement of the proposed powerline would have a severe negative and irreversible affect on the area.

When I bought my 160 acres on Boulder Creek Road I was well aware of the desires of the County, Forest Service and other community groups to keep development to a minimum on these still wild and unspoiled lands. Groups like Save Our Forest and Ranch Lands (SOFAR) fought hard to get the Forest Conservation Initiative into effect limiting the possible subdivision of these lands and maintaining their unique character for generations to come. After purchasing my parcel of land I promptly proceeded to spend considerable money to create a contract with San Diego County placing my land into what is called an Agricultural Preserve. Like the name states, this type of contract limits development of the land while preserving its wild undeveloped nature for generations to come. Recognizing the actions and spirit of others before me I also felt it was only logical that land of such beauty in this pristine natural setting be protected from excessive subdivision and other inappropriate manmade impacts like this 500 kva powerline.

Over the last 8 years of my Cuyamaca land ownership I have been continuously amazed at how remote this land is and yet how near it is to downtown San Diego. The area serves not only as home to many unique wild animals and plants but is also a Mecca for lovers of the outdoors from all over California and the world. Hunters, hikers, mountain bikers, bird watchers, forest service employees, wildlife officials all appreciate this area for what it is – one of the last remaining wild habitats on the Pacific side of the San Diego County mountains. It is truly an easily accessible gem in the midst of the millions of people who live in Southern California. Why would you want to spoil it by routing a 500 kva powerline down the middle ?

Please do not route the Sunrise powerline through the heart of the Cuyamaca section of the Cleveland National Forest. Granted there are not a lot of private land owners in this area to protest such a project, but that is exactly the reason you should not consider it. As a remote and pristine place so close to and within reach of so many from the urban sprawl below, placement of a large powerline in this area would

D0182-2

Comment Set D0182, cont.
Steve Green

be of far more impact than many other areas already containing numerous manmade impacts. Wild public lands like these serve an ever more important place in our future. People need a place to go to enjoy their public lands in their natural state. As growth continues wild lands near urban centers become scarcer and more valuable. Please keep the Sunrise Powerline Project off the Cuyamaca Peaks and surrounding lands.

D0182-2 cont.

Thank you,
Steve Green
Landowner - 15785 Boulder Creek Road
Mailing address: P.O. Box 621813 Littleton, CO 80162-1813

Cc Cleveland National Forest office, Nathan Weflan, Cindy Buxton

Responses to Comment Set D0182

Steve Green

D0182-1 The commenter's concerns regarding siting a transmission line within the Cuyamaca region of the Cleveland National Forest and the impacts this would have on the region's ecology and cultural resources and opposition to the a proposed 500 kV transmission line are acknowledged. The Route D Alternative is located within the Cuyamaca region of the Cleveland National Forest. Notice regarding the Alternatives to the Proposed Project, including the Route D Alternative, was mailed to individual living within 300 feet of any alternative following the CPUC's General Order 131-D which guides utilities in the application process. Item 1.b in Section XI, details the 300-foot notification requirement, which applies to SDG&E when it files its application. These notification guidelines apply only to the proposed route, and the EIR/EIS preparers also used these guidelines to develop the mailing list for notification of landowners along alternative routes. The mailing lists were developed by using County Assessor's parcel data.

The Route D Alternative, within the Cuyamaca region of the Cleveland National Forest, was not found to be an environmentally preferred route to the Proposed Project and therefore is not among the top six environmentally ranked alternatives including the Proposed Project. Please see Section H in Volume 5 regarding the comparison of alternative routes.

D0182-2 The commenter's opposition to a proposed route through the CNF and support for the pristine environment that exists within this region is acknowledged.

Comment Set D0183
Carl Johnson

From: 'Carl Johnson'
To:
Sent: Tue Apr 8 7:44
Subject: Fwd: San Diego Gas & Electric Company's Sunrise Powerlink Project

San Diego Gas & Electric Company's Sunrise Powerlink Project --

D0183-1

NO There has to be a better way!

NO Especially to Plan D NO San Diego Gas & Electric Company's Sunrise Powerlink Project across the San Diego River Gouge and Eagle Peak - this area should be a Wilderness Area

THERE NEEDS TO BE A FEW PLACES LEFT ALONE

Responses to Comment Set D0183
Carl Johnson

D0183-1 The commenter's opposition to the Sunrise Powerlink Project and especially the Route D Alternative is acknowledged. No further response is required because the comment does not address significant environmental issues.

Comment Set D0184
Marley & Lorell Hardaker

From: M or L Hardaker
To: sunrise@aspeneg.com
Sent: Tue Apr 8 7:49
Subject: Fwd: Sunrise Powerlink

We have been visitors to Anza Borrego Desert State Park for over thirty years. We strongly protest the Sunrise Powerlink route through the park. While electrical routes can be built through different areas, pristine wilderness can not be rebuilt once it is harmed. Wilderness designation is for all people of our state and actually the world since the park is visited by international travelers as well. Needed electricity must be supplied by routes that do not degrade park land, even if the initial cost of installing the lines is much higher. Power companies and their customers have to bear that price, not the flora and fauna of the wilderness.

Morley and Lorell Hardaker
Davis, CA

D0184-1

Responses to Comment Set D0184 Marley & Lorell Hardaker

D0184-1 The commenter's opposition to the Sunrise Powerlink Project route through the ABDSP because of the impact it would cause to wilderness areas is acknowledged. The impacts to wilderness and recreation within the ABDSP of siting a 500 kV transmission line were fully disclosed in the D Sections of the Draft EIR/EIS. The commenter's support for alternatives that do not degrade the ABDSP even if the cost is higher is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding the cost-benefit of the Proposed Project and alternatives.

Comment Set D0185 Kay Stewart

From: 'Kay' <kaytaff@sbcglobal.net>
To: <sunrise@aspeneg.com>
Cc: 'CNPSSD List Post' <cnpsdd-L@ucsd.edu>

Sent: Tue Apr 8 15:07
Priority: Normal

Subject: Sunrise Alternative would span best San Diego waterfalls: comments due April 11

To: Aspen Environmental, consultant to San Diego Gas & Electric Co.

Re: Comments to the EIS on alternatives for SDG&E to build an unneeded powerline to San Diego from Mexicali - (oops! they are calling it Calexico, I think the EIS has the international border mapped wrong, since the primary source of future electricity will be Sempra's natural gas plant in Mexicali)

To Whom It May Concern:

I think the only acceptable alternative is the NO TRANSMISSION LINE alternative based on what I know at this point. My work load did not permit me time to read the 7500 page current EIS on proposed alternatives to the original preferred route through ABDSP. However, I will make a few statements based on information that I have been able to collect from sources who have read the current EIS.

D0185-1

The original route is still unacceptable for reasons noted below.

In addition, Route D is a horrible alternative route. The EIS failed to credibly assess the many impacts of 25 miles of access roads and the construction of several dozen tower pads and pull sites to the water quality, fire risk, natural resources (e.g. turtles and eagles), archeological resources (sacred sites that would be flattened for pads for towers) and scenic resources. Cedar Creek Gorge and the headwaters of the San Diego River are among the most beautiful areas of San Diego County, as I can attest, having been fortunate enough to have hiked there several times. To mar this area by roads and powerlines soon after this area has been purchased as conservation land would be as stupid as going through ABDSP and the state wildernesses along Grapevine Canyon. This is a completely unacceptable route. Please view the powerful video at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qkTb5bpN-18> to confirm these findings.

D0185-2

I sent detailed comments on the original EIS focused only on the documentation related to plant issues. The EIS was impossible to apply to careful on-site analysis, and the mitigation proposals 100% likely to fail to protect any rare or endangered species of plants located in the path of access roads, tower pads, or pull sites. I found the ABDSP/Santa Ysabel/Sorrento Valley route a deep insult to the tens of thousands of citizens of San Diego who have worked and contributed to establish protection for our natural heritage in the string of parks and wildernesses that this powerline would pass through and would damage.

D0185-3

Last, and this is not a comment on the EIS but on the intended mission of any powerline route from Imperial Valley to San Diego, my thoughts are:

D0185-4

In the 21st Century, decentralized solar PV becomes more affordable every month, and some cities in the US are capitalizing on this by becoming manufacturing centers for PV equipment. This industry would avoid job losses that are plaguing our region, which is currently so dependent on housing and tourism, both of which are in a slump. The idea of San Diego County relying principally on fossil-fuels - including LNG from South America or Indonesia, two major sources - is a stupid solution given the volatility of international politics. Our San Diego regional energy plan recommends in-basin generation not out-of basin sources, especially not ones 50-100 miles away: any event that would sever such a line would halt transmission which belies the "reliable" pitch put on this transmission line. A powerline from the Imperial Valley is not even wanted for our needs.

Last, I also am deeply offended that SDG&E (a Sempra subsidiary) could

D0185-5

Comment Set D0185, cont.
Kay Stewart

start to bill all of us San Diego regional rate payers for this unneeded "improvement" as soon as it is built, and so will make money no matter what needs we have or don't have nor whether it meets any renewable supply target. This is a replay of the Southwest Powerlink along the border, which has extra capacity to San Diego, and which was built with promises to convey renewable energy from Imperial Valley, but which never has. Any new transmission line also is just as unlikely to carry anything except Sempra's natural gas-powered electrons from Mexico. Sempra paid third world construction costs and will be billing us at US rates. What a great profit-making venture for this company.

I would like to conclude by encouraging SDG&E and Sempra to get in the business of manufacturing and installing solar PV on rooftops throughout San Diego, billing people at current non-solar rates to pay off the investment, and making SDG&E a healthy model for 21st century energy companies, instead of a money pit for this region's customers. If they don't, I hope that a citizen's movement will ensue in which a publically owned energy company will be created and will make an offer that SDG&E can't refuse, so we can start doing the right things for all of us, not just for SDG&E shareholders.

Sincerely,

Kay Stewart, Landscape Architect
CA R.L.A. # 2967
2171 India Street Suite A
San Diego CA 92101
619-234-2668

D0185-5 cont.

From: 'Kay' <kaytaff@sbcglobal.net> - Sunrise Alternative would span best San Diego waterfalls: comments due April 11

Responses to Comment Set D0185

Kay Stewart

- D0185-1 The commenter's support for the No Project/No Action Alternative is acknowledged. Please see Responses D0185-2 through D0185-5 for responses to specific comments on the Proposed Project and Alternatives.
- D0185-2 The commenter's opposition to the Route D Alternative is acknowledged. Impacts from the Route D Alternative were fully disclosed in the Draft EIR/EIS in Section E.3 in Volume 4. Impacts to water quality are discussed in Section E.3.12 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impact H-1 analyzes the impact of construction activity on water quality due to erosion and sedimentation and Impact H-2 analyzes the impact of construction activity on water quality through spills of potentially harmful materials and both were found to be significant but mitigable with the implementation of mitigation that would comply with the Forest Service Conditions, be subject to an approved SWPPP and Sediment Control Plan, avoid sensitive water resources, and properly dispose of and clean-up of hazardous materials.
- Fire and fuels management was analyzed in Section E.3.15 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impact F-2 analyzed the impact that the presence of the overhead transmission line would increase the probability of a wildfire and found this to be significant and unmitigable. Biological resources were analyzed in Section E.3.2 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impacts to archaeological resources were analyzed in Section E.3.7 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS and impacts to visual resources were analyzed in Section E.3.3 of Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- D0185-3 The commenter states the Draft EIR/EIS did not apply careful onsite analysis and that rare plants in impact areas would not be adequately protected. See General Response GR-16 regarding the adequacy of rare plant surveys. Mitigation Measure B-5a provides adequate mitigation for impacts to rare plants and requires pre-construction surveys, avoidance where possible, and mitigation in the form of relocation and/or habitat acquisition and preservation.
- D0185-4 The commenter's support for decentralized and in-basin solar PV and opposition to San Diego County relying on fossil fuels, including LNG from foreign countries is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-7 regarding the Sunrise Powerlink Project connection with Mexican power generation.
- D0185-5 The commenter's opposition to the cost of the transmission line being passed on to the ratepayers and concern regarding the lack of renewable energy in Imperial Valley is acknowledged. Please see General Response GR-12 regarding the cost-benefit of the Proposed Project and General Response GR-5 concerning the status of renewable power in Imperial Valley. The commenter suggests Sempra and SDG&E should look into manufacturing and installing solar PV on rooftops throughout San Diego. California allows net metering and provides kilowatt-based credits to residential producers on a monthly basis, but does not require producers to be compensated for excess energy produced above what is consumed on an annual basis.
- Other incentives have been created through CPUC rules, such as the California Solar Initiative (CSI), which was developed through a public rulemaking process and provides \$2.2 billion in incentives for PV over the next decade for existing residential homes and

existing and new commercial, industrial, and agricultural properties. The CSI incentives were taken into consideration in development of the All Solar Alternative, which is presented in Appendix 1 of the EIR/EIS, and which was rejected for full analysis based on the infeasibility of developing sufficient electrical capacity in the near term to match the reliability benefits of Sunrise.

Although SDG&E paid incentives for solar PV was not considered as an alternative in the Draft EIR/EIS, other types of existing incentives were evaluated. Even if increased incentives for solar photovoltaics (PV) and other modes of distributed generation (DG) are undertaken, increased market penetration of these modes via producer payback incentives is not, in and of itself, expected to result in the production of sufficient electrical capacity in the near term (2010 or 2012).

Comment Set D0186 Catherine Gorka

From: <catherine@pamperedparrots.com>
To: <sunrise@aspeneq.com>
Subject: opposition to SDGE powerlink

Sent: Tue Apr 8 10:10
Priority: Normal

CatherineGorka
14560 Willow Rd. Lakeside, CA 92040-1922
April 8, 2008

Emailed to Sunrise@aspeneq.com

CPUC/BLM

Re: SDGE Sunrise Powerlink Project Alternative Line

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am in opposition to your line going through my property. I am the owner of APN 391-060-36-00 14560 Willow Rd Lakeside, CA. 92040-1922

There are numerous reasons I am opposed to this.

1. Loss of value to my land.
2. High fire danger.
3. Health issues.
4. Loss of subdividing my property for my boys.
5. Breeding of exotic parrots would be disrupted.

I bought this property so that I could subdivide the land for my children and to breed my parrots. We have dealt with the Cedar fire and have learned by the other fires of the dangers of your wires, there is no way to evacuate all the parrots that I have should one of your lines catch my property or neighbors on fire, hence the fire threat is extreme to us. I would lose the value in subdividing as your lines would be where 2 of the lots would be in or near of your lines. There is no way any one in their right mind would build a house under the lines or next to a tower. I am also worried about health issues with such lines to my family and to my endangered species and other parrots that I have on this property.

I ask that you please do not build anything on my land. I have spent a fortune on this property and have no desire to leave here at all. There are 3 generations of our family here; we wish to remain here with our views as they are and health till death.

Please go back to your original path and leave us alone. Any questions please call 619-443-7424

Sincerely yours,

Catherine Gorka

Catherine Gorka
www.PamperedParrots.com

D0186-1

D0186-2

D0186-3

Responses to Comment Set D0186

Catherine Gorka

- D0186-1 The commenter's opposition to the Interstate 8 Alternative is acknowledged. Please see responses D0186-2 and D0186-3, which address the commenter's specific reasons for her opposition.
- D0186-2 The commenter's concerns regarding the ability to subdivide her property and to continue her business are acknowledged. The commenter suggests subdividing her property would be more difficult should the Interstate 8 Alternative be approved because two of the lots would be adjacent to transmission lines causing a loss of property value. Please see General Response GR-11 regarding property value. Please see General Response GR-10 concerning EMF. No further response is required because this aspect of the comment does not address significant environmental issues.
- The commenter's views and concerns regarding impacts to the commenter's business are acknowledged. As is discussed in Section E.1.15 under Impact F-2 (Presence of the overhead transmission line would increase the probability of a wildfire) in the Draft EIR/EIS, there would be a significant increase in the probability of wildfires with the presence of the overhead line under the Interstate 8 Alternative. An increase in wildfires, would result in an increase in risk of property and business loss in the surrounding area. These factors have been incorporated into the fire analysis in Section E.1.15. The fire analysis methodology is described in Section D.15 in the Draft EIR/EIS and in General Response GR-9 (Fire Risk and the Comparison of Alternatives).
- D0186-3 The commenter's opposition to having any transmission line built on her property and concerns regarding loss of view are acknowledged. Impacts to visual resources are analyzed in Section E.1.3 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The commenter's support for the Proposed Project northern route is acknowledged.

Comment Set D0187
Paul Zabloutny

From: Paul Zabloutny [mailto:paulzabloutny@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2008 8:50 AM
To: Public.advisor
Subject: Against Sunrise Powerlink (raw) referred to LA

I am against the Sunrise Power link proposed route through Anza Borrego State Park.

D0187-1

San Diego's back country is quickly being developed and Anza Borrego State Park is an area that has been kept relatively pristine. We can not afford to loose these last remaining wide open vistas to a 22 mile long line of massive 160 foot tall towers.

Anza Borrego plays an integral role in the variety of natural resources that our county offers. In fact, ZOOM Airlines, which flies non-stop from London, UK to San Diego lists Anza-Borrego on their web site as one of our many attractions.

One of the uniquely San Diegan experiences is to drive from our beautiful beaches, up to our snowy peaks and down to the warm desert floor, all within an hour and a half. This simple, Sunday car ride is an All-American experience that would be greatly lessened by the towering lines of Sunrise Powerlink.

The San Diego County General Plan calls for the protection of Scenic Highways, specifically those effected by Powerlink.

D0187-2

The plan states: "The 18.2 miles of State Route 78, from the western to the eastern boundary of the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is an existing official Scenic Highway and has been identified as such in the Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan. Two other Scenic Highways exist within the Desert Subregion: Old Overland Stage Route (S2) from the Imperial County line north to State Route 78; and Montezuma Valley Road, Hoberg Road and Truckhaven Trail (S22) from the western boundary of the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park to the Imperial County Line."

Lastly, Powerlink would set a precedent for further incursion and development of state and federal park land.

D0187-3

Anza Borrego State Park is a Southern California resource that must be protected.

Say No To Powerlink.

Paul Zabloutny
4739 Glacier Ave
San Diego, CA 92120
619-993-8113

Responses to Comment Set D0187

Paul Zabloutny

- D0187-1 The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project route through the ABDSP and concerns regarding the loss of view shed of the ABDSP is acknowledged. Section D.3.6 in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes 8 key viewpoints within the Anza-Borrego Link and concludes the impacts would be significant and unmitigable.
- D0187-2 The commenter's concern for the protection of Scenic Highways is acknowledged. Please see Response to Comment D0175-4 regarding Scenic Highways and visual impacts. Section D.16.4.1 of Volume 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses applicable policies and the Proposed Project's consistency with these policies and states that the Proposed Project is not consistent with the Scenic Highway Element Objective 2 of the San Diego County General Plan.
- D0187-3 The commenter's concern that the Proposed Project would set a precedent for further development within the ABDSP and opposition to the Proposed Project because of the impacts to the ABDSP as a resource for Southern California are acknowledged. The decision on the project's merits will be made by the Lead Agencies' decision-makers, who will consider all comments. No further response is required because the comment does not address significant environmental issues.

Comment Set D0188 Lynn A. Snyder

Lynn A. Snyder
Self and others of Japatul Rd. and Alpine
20276 Japatul Rd
Alpine, CA 91901
619 445-9823
lynnwb@gmail.com

4/5/2008

I have lived at 20276 Japatul Rd. In Alpine for 19 Years. This powerlink (if built) will run adjacent to my land about 1000 feet and will come within 75 feet of it. I oppose this project for the following reasons.

D0188-1

1.) Visual- This powerlink will not only spoil the natural landscape and beauty of the entire back country and Cleveland National Forest but it will be in our view from all areas of my entire property.

D0188-2

2.) Noise -We have been told that we are in the area where the 500ku power line will produce noise level that are concentrated extensively . Any noise will significantly affect our quality and enjoyment of our property. We live in the country.

D0188-3

3.)Property Values - The powerlink if built (D3 Modified Alternative) will significantly affect our property values. The powerlink is to run about 1000 feet along our western and northern borders within 75 feet at some locations. I would like to request that any and all reports of property values be sent to Lynn Snyder-- P.O. BOX 873 ALPINE CA 91903

D0188-4

4.) Health - It has been passed in several states that these high voltage lines cannot be within x distance to schools. But what about all the kids and families that will be in line with it thru our back country. We have heard of people in Campo under the power lines that have died and have cancer and their livestock have died. This issue has to be investigated further.

D0188-5

5.) Water Resources - We are on well water and depend solely on it for our water needs. Any drilling needed for the towers may interfere with our water resources. The EIR report does not cover any responsibility to SDG & E on providing us 100% insurance of any damage to our water sources This is not acceptable.

D0188-6

6.) Alternative power- the DEIR confirms we don't need the Sunrise Powerlink. There are other ways to meet our regions energy needs without destroying our National Forest, State Parks and local communities.

D0188-7

I am requesting any and all reports of all the topics I have listed that pertain to the Sunrise Powerlink be forwarded Via mail to Lynn Snyder P.O. Box 873, Alpine , CA 91903

Lynn Snyder
Bryon Harrington
Ron & Carol Matzenauer 2096 Via Dieguenos, Alpine CA 91901
And all other concerned friends of Japatul and Alpine.

Responses to Comment Set D0188

Lynn A. Snyder

- D0188-1 The commenter's opposition to the Modified Route D Alternative is acknowledged. Please see Responses D0188-2 through D0188-7.
- D0188-2 The commenter's views and concerns regarding the impacts to visual resources and the views of the CNF are acknowledged. Impacts to visual resources are analyzed in Section E.4.3 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- D0188-3 The commenter's concern regarding corona noise levels of a 500 kV powerline is acknowledged. Impact N-3 in Section E.4.8.2 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the increase in permanent noise levels due to corona noise from operation of the transmission lines and noise from other project components and concludes this would be significant and unmitigable.
- D0188-4 Please see General Response GR-11 regarding property values and transmission lines. Please note that the commenter's request to be provided with all reports and studies cited in the Draft EIR/EIS related to property values is outside the scope of these responses to comments. Please also note that preparation of an EIR is dependent upon information from many sources, which may be cited, but need not be included, in the EIR. (See CEQA Guidelines § 15148.)
- D0188-5 Please see General Response GR-10 regarding EMF.
- D0188-6 The commenter's views and concerns regarding impacts to water resources are acknowledged. Impacts H-1 and H-2 in Section D.4.12.2 in Volume 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS address impacts to water quality due to construction activities and concludes these impacts would be significant but mitigable with the implementation of mitigation that would comply with the Forest Service Conditions, be subject to an approved SWPPP and Sediment Control Plan, avoid sensitive water resources, and properly dispose of and clean-up of hazardous materials.
- The commenter's concern that drilling may interfere with the water resources of the region is acknowledged. Mitigation Measure H-4b has been added to address damage to water supply wells and springs. For the full text of Mitigation Measure H-4b see Response to Comment A0009-45.
- D0188-7 The commenter suggests there is no need for the Sunrise Powerlink Project and that the energy needs can be satisfied through other means such as the non-wires alternatives. Please see General Response GR-12 concerning purpose and need for the project. Please note that the commenter's request to be provided with all reports and studies cited in the Draft EIR/EIS related to her comments is outside the scope of these responses to comments. Please also note that preparation of an EIR is dependent upon information from many sources, which may be cited, but need not be included, in the EIR. (See CEQA Guidelines § 15148.)

This page intentionally blank.