

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
November 26, 2006	<b>Pine Valley Community Planning Group</b> Vern Denham, Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with the environmental, financial, and historical destruction of the communities of Pine Valley and Guatay.</li> <li>• Believe that the 200-foot-wide tower footprint of Alternative C would destroy 50 homes and community character.</li> <li>• Community voted 10-2 (21 absent) to oppose the SRPL Project.</li> <li>• Enclosed: letter of November 14, 2006.</li> </ul>
November 28, 2006	<b>Campo/Lake Morena Planning Group</b> Beverly Esry, Chairperson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voted to oppose the SRPL Project for the following reasons: the back-country already bears the burden of the SWPL, there will be large impacts to sensitive habitat, scenic viewsheds, wilderness areas, National Forest, State Parks, rural communities, private property, and agriculture, the Project will induce growth, there may be impacts to groundwater flow from blasting, which may affect private wells.</li> </ul>
January 30, 2007	<b>Haagen Company LLC</b> Alexander Haagen III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property owner near SDG&amp;E Route B.</li> <li>• Supports elimination of SDG&amp;E Routes B and BC from consideration.</li> </ul>
February 1, 2007	<b>Raceland Holdings, LLC</b> Bill Reichers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is adamantly opposed to the proposed route, which passes over their 1,134 acres, as they are in the process of entitlement applications for the proposed Desert Springs Oasis Resort. This development would include as many as 3,000 condominium lots and is budgeted at \$100 million.</li> </ul>
February 3, 2007	<b>Castle Eurasia Corp./ Zen Media Corp.</b> Benjamin Kwon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks to avoid project impacts to planned community at Dunaway and I-8 in Imperial County.</li> <li>• Opposes the proposed route and Imperial Valley FHTL Alternative.</li> <li>• Recommends an alternative across BLM lands.</li> <li>• Found public noticing from SDG&amp;E and CEQA/NEPA agencies to be late and confusing.</li> <li>• Claims there is a conflict of interest among the parties involved, including Stirling Energy Systems' lease of BLM land and contract with Aspen Environmental Group.</li> <li>• References BLM's Yuha Desert Resources EIR/EIS.</li> </ul>
February 5, 2007	<b>Castle Eurasia Corp./ Zen Media Corp.</b> Benjamin Kwon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The beneficiary should bear the project cost.</li> <li>• The shortest route would be least costly in long-term maintenance.</li> </ul>
February 5, 2007	<b>Protect Our Communities Fund</b> Denis Trafecanty and Emily Young	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fundraiser flyer for organization to stop the Project in courts.</li> <li>• Works toward long-term local generation and distribution of renewable and clean energy.</li> </ul>
February 5, 2007	<b>S.D. Center for BioPsychosynthesis</b> Penelope Young Andrade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes routes that impact ABDSP.</li> <li>• Avoid EMF exposure to public.</li> <li>• Supports in-basin generation and renewable generation and non-wires alternatives.</li> <li>• Considers human and environmental needs to be absolute.</li> </ul>
February 5, 2007	<b>West Chase Homeowner's Association</b> Keith Ritchey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insists on retaining the State Route 56 Alternative for analysis with Caltrans permission because it is in the interest of the public and community. References Caltrans regulations providing exception to prohibition of new utility installations.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 6, 2007	<b>Bloomdale Ranch Partnership</b> Norman Feigel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can herd cattle under power lines though firefighters will not work near lines.</li> <li>• Proposed substation impacts Williamson Act land, which should be kept pristine.</li> <li>• EMF effects on cattle production.</li> <li>• Expandability and future new lines in proposed widening of ROW.</li> <li>• Favors SWPL Alternatives.</li> <li>• Concerned with impacts to Golden Eagle and backcountry visual resources.</li> </ul>
February 6, 2007	<b>Peoples Powerlink</b> Jeanette Hartman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports San Diego local generation.</li> <li>• References legal, social, and research agencies that would support non-wires alternatives.</li> </ul>
February 6, 2007	<b>San Diego Country Estates Association</b> Perry Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends underground option from MPs 122–125.</li> <li>• Traffic from SDCE and to and from Ramona is primarily on San Vicente and Wildcat Canyon Roads. Keep line underground until after it leaves Wildcat Canyon.</li> </ul>
February 6, 2007	<b>Santa Ysabel General Store</b> Patricia McConnell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests an alternative along the Mexican border, then underwater as far north as Los Angeles.</li> <li>• Avoid routes through State and National Parks.</li> <li>• Costly to ratepayers.</li> <li>• Impacts to property values, biological resources, visual resources, particularly near San Felipe and from grading for the proposed substation.</li> <li>• Favors SWPL alternatives and upgrades to existing infrastructure.</li> </ul>
February 6, 2007	<b>United States Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association</b> <b>San Diego Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association</b> Tad Hurst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interstate 8, BCD Alternative, and West of Forest Alternative impact the two most popular hang gliding and paragliding sites.</li> <li>• Urges the rejection of these 3 alternatives. Suggests underground segments and local re-routes.</li> <li>• Includes 5 maps.</li> </ul>
February 6, 2007	<b>Utility Consumers' Action Network</b> Michael Shames	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2500 MW of generation in the Imperial Valley should be evaluated as a related action.</li> <li>• References the Salton Sea 6 geothermal project environmental document.</li> <li>• References SDG&amp;E data request responses that indicate renewable generation is independent of the Proposed Project and there is no price difference in renewable energy delivery to Imperial Valley versus Miguel substations.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E's filing with 2020 grid operation forecasts is inconsistent with data request response that the proposed substation is expandable.</li> </ul>
February 7, 2007	<b>Concerned Residents of Boulder Creek</b> Gregg Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route D, Interstate 8, and BCD Alternatives impacts to Cleveland National Forest and adjacent area include proposed designated wilderness, watershed, inaccessible terrain, construction and maintenance, fire risk at Cuyamaca Mountains, private residence, erosion, recreation.</li> </ul>
February 8, 2007	<b>Back Country Coalition</b> Bonnie Gendron George Courser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes de-designation of State wilderness for the proposed route through ABDSP because of impacts to recreational, cultural, and aesthetic resources.</li> <li>• Distrust of stated project objectives; Sempra would profit at the expense of public resources.</li> <li>• Impacts from Elsinore Fault.</li> <li>• Requests the Department of Park and Recreation to continue to protect its public resources and examine complete information.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

---

Date	From	Comments
February 8, 2007	Borrego Water Exchange Lane Sharman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about global, chronic impacts to the environment.</li> <li>• Favors in-area and distributed generation as well as shared cost and profit.</li> <li>• Urges CPUC to approve non-wires alternatives.</li> <li>• Supports PV solar and other renewable generation.</li> <li>• Urges public education on energy conservation and limits to growth.</li> <li>• Attachment: Limits to Growth, including hydrogen power sources.</li> </ul>
February 8, 2007	Center for Biological Diversity Sierra Club (Conservation Groups) Dave Hogan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports non-wires alternatives.</li> <li>• Suggests striking SDG&amp;E's proposed project and route alternatives from analysis.</li> <li>• Criticizes "Basic Project Objectives" for being biased toward a transmission solution.</li> <li>• Urges consideration of California's loading order and RPS and upholding current policy protecting the environment.</li> <li>• Global warming, renewable generation feasibility, renewable energy delivery on existing or alternative lines, and cost estimates should be areas of EIR/EIS analysis.</li> <li>• Skeptical of SDG&amp;E's ability or motivation to contract for all renewable energy generated in Imperial Valley.</li> <li>• Supports energy efficiency alternatives analysis.</li> <li>• Full Loop is a foreseeable related action.</li> <li>• Requests full analysis of 100' ROW through ABDSP based on easement documents.</li> <li>• Lists significant impacts to visual, biological, recreational and cultural resources and air quality and land use that should be analyzed with proposed mitigation measures.</li> <li>• SWPL Alternatives impacts to Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), Cleveland National Forest roadless area, biological resources.</li> <li>• Favors the Existing SWPL and Interstate 8 Alternative over the BCD, Route D, and West of Forest Alternatives.</li> <li>• Opposes the Partial UG 230 kV ABDSP SR 78 to S2 Alternative because of construction on designated Wilderness and impacts to protected land.</li> <li>• Opposes the MCAS Miramar Alternative due to impacts biological resources.</li> <li>• Lists ACECs, State preserves, wildlife refuge, and BLM and County preserves not labeled on the Notice map.</li> </ul>
February 9, 2007	Castle Eurasia Corp./ Zen Media Corp. Palmeri, Tyler, Wiener, Wilhelm & Waldron, LLP Michael H. Leifer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplement to Mr. Kwon's comment made at scoping meeting.</li> <li>• Master planned community would be bisected by the proposed route; this would be inconsistent with County land use plan.</li> <li>• Favors the "line of sight" route to avoid impacts to planned residences; suggests a local route alternative to avoid the property.</li> <li>• Favors the Desert Western and proximate, eliminated alternatives to avoid impacts to private land.</li> </ul>
February 9, 2007	NRG Energy, Inc. Paul L. O'Neal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States plan to respond to SDG&amp;E's Request for Offers with in-basin generation, including the repower of the Encina station in Carlsbad. in-basin generation should be part of EIR/EIS analysis.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 12, 2007	<b>Back Country Coalition</b> Bonnie Gendron George Courser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonably foreseeable actions include renewable generation in Imperial County, generation in Mexico, and transmission extension northward.</li> <li>• Finds System Alternatives to be reasonably foreseeable extensions of the projec.</li> <li>• References UCAN alternative generating project.</li> </ul>
February 14, 2007	<b>Friends of Goodan Ranch and Sycamore Canyon Open Space Preserves</b> Anonymous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the Proposed Project due to long-term impacts to visual and biological resources in designated open space.</li> </ul>
February 17, 2007	<b>Back Country Horsemen American Endurance Riders Association</b> Anonymous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests using existing power lines to San Diego.</li> <li>• Supports system and plant upgrades.</li> <li>• Opposes the Proposed Project.</li> </ul>
February 20, 2007	<b>Crest, Dehesa, Granite Hills, Harbison Canyon Planning Group</b> Jack A. Vandover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning group finds that all of the transmission line routes including the Southwest Powerlink Alternatives would result in unacceptable significant and unmitigable impacts to residents as well as natural resources of San Diego County.</li> <li>• Public safety would be a serious impact because the 500 kV line would increase the already significant fire dangers in the County.</li> <li>• All proposed routes would have negative impacts to sensitive, protected natural resources of San Diego County.</li> <li>• Rejects all above ground transmission routes and urges agencies to consider combining non-wire and system alternatives to meet future power needs of the San Diego area without constructing Sunrise.</li> </ul>
February 20, 2007	<b>Lillian B. Cauzza Trust/ Santa Ysabel Ranch</b> Albert and Kathleen Cauzza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of 9/2/06 letter published in Scoping Report Part .</li> <li>• Challenges the 3-mile overhead segment of the Santa Ysabel Existing ROW Alternative because it is on San Dieguito River Park and County land.</li> </ul>
February 20, 2007	<b>Natural Resources Defense Council</b> Johanna H. Wald	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.2 million supporters, 250,000 California residents.</li> <li>• Supports alternatives identified that avoid ABDSP and de-designation of State wilderness and Park resources.</li> <li>• Attachment: letter to State Park and Rec Commission stating that SDG&amp;E proposed alternative routes through ABDSP are inconsistent with California Wilderness Act and urging the Park to oppose the Project.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2007	<b>Crest, Dehesa, Granite Hills, Harbison Canyon Planning Group</b> Jack A. Vandover Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning group finds that all of the transmission line routes including the Southwest Powerlink Alternatives would result in unacceptable significant and unmitigable impacts to residents as well as natural resources of San Diego County.</li> <li>• Public safety would be a serious impact because the 500 kV line would increase the already significant fire dangers in the County.</li> <li>• All proposed routes would have negative impacts to sensitive, protected natural resources of San Diego County.</li> <li>• Rejects all above ground transmission routes and urges agencies to consider combining non-wire and system alternatives to meet future power needs of the San Diego area without constructing Sunrise.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

---

Date	From	Comments
February 22, 2007	Castle Eurasia Corp./ Zen Media Corp. Susan D. Lamoureux	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,150-acre property planned for development would be bisected by the Proposed Project.</li> <li>• Project is incompatible with planned land uses due to safety, visual, EMF, and fire impacts.</li> <li>• Opposes the Imperial Valley FTHL Alternative.</li> <li>• Documents and opposes an alternative in a 2/26 communication from SDG&amp;E designed to avoid impacts to proposed Stirling Energy Systems (SES) project; criticizes avoidance of the SES project because its proposed location is unclear and it could be co-located with the Proposed Project.</li> <li>• Supports the Desert Western Alternative and in-basin generation and non-wires alternatives to reduce or eliminate impacts.</li> <li>• Suggests alternatives to avoid land use inconsistencies: West of Dunaway, Western, Eastern, or Imperial Valley Alternatives.</li> <li>• IID's Green Path project is directly related to the Proposed Project.</li> </ul>
February 22, 2007	CBH [John, last name illegible]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property would be visually impacted along Interstate 8 and Old Hwy 80.</li> <li>• Impacts to unique biological and cultural resources and energy development and research uses on property.</li> <li>• Suggests alternative to underground along I-8 from McCain Valley Rd in Imperial Co. to San Diego Co.</li> <li>• Suggests high-capacity 300 kV DC underground lines to reduce EMF impacts from AC lines and because of potential cost reduction.</li> <li>• Supports in-area generation, including photovoltaic, offshore wind, and natural gas.</li> <li>• References photos of the property available online and papers on DC technology and power line safety hazards.</li> </ul>
February 22, 2007	Holly Oaks Ranch Community Sharon Lynch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Project, but if it must be built, supports only the I-8 or West of Forest Alternative as it would spare the 90-family community of Holly Oaks Ranch from potentially hazardous and unsightly transmission line.</li> <li>• Support the No-Project Alternative.</li> <li>• Encloses petition with 86% approval of the I-8 or West of Forest Alternatives by residents of the Community.</li> </ul>
February 22, 2007	Mountain Empire Resources Information Taskforce Michael C. Thometz, President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the SRPL Project. Believes that the route through ABDSP is not a viable alternative as it would have devastating impacts to the Park.</li> <li>• Believes that public commentary ought to follow the publication of the draft EIR/EIS, not the other way around.</li> <li>• Supports the No Project Alternative, and requests that the CPUC fairly evaluate this alternative.</li> <li>• As a second choice, supports the Non-Wire Alternatives. Believes that an analysis on conservation and changes in energy demands via improvements in household appliance technologies ought to be included in the Report. Finds it problematic that SDG&amp;E refuses to buy back electricity from rooftop solar homes that generate more than they can use.</li> <li>• Supports system upgrades and the SWPL routes as third and fourth best choices. Supports undergrounding of the Proposed route as a fifth and final best choice.</li> </ul>
February 22, 2007	Peace Engineering, Inc Stuart Peace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the West of Forest Alternative from Harbison Canyon to Interstate 8 because the detail route has not been publicized.</li> </ul>
February 22, 2007	Protect Our Communities Fund Denis Trafecanty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References a film, 'Enron &amp; The California "Rolling Blackouts" Conspiracy' about Enron's abuse of the State's electricity market through transmission operation.</li> <li>• Points out that SDG&amp;E was a participant in the scandal.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 22, 2007	Tulloch Family Partners Glenn E. Drown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed Project would cross private property with direct impacts to agricultural resources from MP 108.3–113.</li> <li>• EMF effects and operational effects on cattle.</li> <li>• Construction impacts on traffic related to agricultural operations.</li> <li>• Suggests Santa Ysabel SR79 Underground Alternative should continue underground south to 109.5 MP because the terrain is relatively accessible. Agrees with the updated route at scoping meetings.</li> <li>• Supports the Santa Ysabel Existing ROW Alternative but suggests it should continue south along the existing 69 kV corridor instead of along SR 78 to reduce visual impacts. Agrees with the updated route at scoping meetings. Land use south of Santa Ysabel is similar to that of County land north of the town; critical of County opposition of this alternative.</li> <li>• The route at the south end of the Santa Ysabel Partial Underground Alternative should be changed to follow parcel boundaries until it meets the existing 69 kV line.</li> <li>• Opposes the Central South Substation Alternative due to inaccessibility and impacts to private Williamson Act lands.</li> <li>• Supports the Cleveland National Forest Existing 69 kV Route Alternative because it would minimize construction and visual impacts.</li> <li>• Supports in-basin generation.</li> </ul>
February 23, 2007	Boy Scouts of America Terry Trout, Scout Executive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly oppose the reintroduction of the Mataguay Substation Alternative as it would impact the Mataguay Scout Ranch, owned by the Boy Scouts of America for 50 years and described as the “heart” of the scouting program.</li> <li>• Request that the substation not be at the mouth of the Mataguay Valley or at the Top of the World site, that the line run between S2 and top of the ridge line until nearly reaching SR 79, that the line follows S2 until close to the historic ranch house so that the towers would not be visible for the site, and that the lines go underground from this point in order to visually maintain the wilderness experience the Scouts now enjoy.</li> <li>• Believe that the Grapevine Canyon route is far less disruptive.</li> </ul>
February 23, 2007	California State Parks Foundation Sara Feldman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports evaluation of non-wires and system alternatives.</li> <li>• Analysis should include impacts on public good and biological, visual, recreational, cultural, and economic resources.</li> <li>• Requests independent analysis to verify SDG&amp;E’s 100’ ROW within ABDSP.</li> <li>• Impact comparison of undergrounding versus overhead option should be comprehensive and not cost-based.</li> <li>• Construction and maintenance impacts.</li> </ul>
February 23, 2007	Castle Eurasia Corp./ Zen Media Corp. Palmeri, Tyler, Wiener, Wilhelm & Waldron, LLP Michael H. Leifer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports an alternative west of Dunaway Road in the Imperial Valley Link to avoid impacts to property and visual resources.</li> <li>• Finds the Imperial Valley FTHL Alternative second best to the route west of Dunaway Rd. Includes a route adjustment to mitigate impacts to planned community on property.</li> <li>• Attachments: map of alternative route west of Dunaway Rd, description of route modification recommended for Imperial Valley FTHL Alternative.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 23, 2007	<b>Center for Biological Diversity</b> <b>Sierra Club</b> <b>(Conservation Groups)</b> <b>Desert Protective Council</b> <b>Denis Trafecanty</b> David Hogan and Bill Corcoran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports non-wires and some system alternatives.</li> <li>• Considers the Proposed Project and all standalone transmission alternatives to be infeasible because they are not in the public interest and have greater impacts than alternatives. Suggests striking SDG&amp;E's proposed project and route alternatives from analysis.</li> <li>• Criticizes "Basic Project Objectives" for being biased toward a transmission solution.</li> <li>• Urges consideration of California's loading order and RPS and upholding current policy protecting the environment.</li> <li>• Global warming, renewable generation feasibility, renewable energy delivery on existing or alternative lines, and cost estimates should be areas of EIR/EIS analysis.</li> <li>• Skeptical of SDG&amp;E's ability or motivation to contract for all renewable energy generated in Imperial Valley.</li> <li>• Supports energy efficiency alternatives analysis.</li> <li>• Consider non-wires and system alternatives aside from potentially infeasible status of new generation in Chula Vista.</li> <li>• Full Loop is a foreseeable related action.</li> <li>• Requests full analysis of 100' ROW through ABDSP based on easement documents.</li> <li>• Lists significant impacts to visual, biological, recreational and cultural resources and air quality and land use that should be analyzed with proposed mitigation measures.</li> <li>• SWPL Alternatives impacts to ACEC, Cleveland National Forest roadless area, biological resources.</li> <li>• Favors the Existing SWPL and Interstate 8 Alternative over the BCD, Route D, and West of Forest Alternatives.</li> <li>• Opposes the Partial UG 230 kV ABDSP SR 78 to S2 Alternative because of construction on designated Wilderness and impacts to protected land.</li> <li>• Opposes the MCAS Miramar Alternative due to impacts to biological resources.</li> <li>• Lists ACECs, State preserves, wildlife refuge, and BLM and County preserves not labeled on the Notice maps.</li> </ul>
February 23, 2007	<b>Community Alliance for Sensible Energy</b> Mary Aldern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Mexico Light and Path 44 System Alternatives.</li> <li>• Full loop is a reasonably foreseeable expansion of the Project.</li> <li>• Consider non-solar generation hours in comparing transmission capacity with and without the Project.</li> <li>• Direct and indirect impacts on global warming.</li> <li>• Efficiency upgrades to SWPL.</li> <li>• Energy conservation and proposed energy efficiency measures in San Diego.</li> <li>• Research new solar technology for local generation with cost comparison.</li> <li>• Refers to Owens Valley development in that rural areas would not recover from development.</li> <li>• Regardless of routing alternatives, the Proposed Project would change the character of the Central Link area.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 23, 2007	<b>Environmental Health Coalition</b> Laura Hunter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends elimination of the South Bay Replacement Project from non-wires alternatives considered because of its regulatory infeasibility.</li> <li>• Recommends independent assessment of non-South Bay potential gas-fired generation projects.</li> <li>• Opposes No Wires All Source Alternatives due to environmental justice impacts to the South Bay area.</li> <li>• Recommends analysis of small generators, in-basin renewable generation, demand-response, and energy efficiency measures.</li> <li>• Lists measures constituting regulatory barriers removal under a renewable generation alternative.</li> <li>• Recommends a maximum greenhouse gas emission prevention alternative.</li> <li>• Requests climate change and air quality impacts analysis for all alternatives with gas-fired generation.</li> <li>• Attachments: 2 news articles on infeasibility of South Bay Replacement and alternative energy plan on South Bay Replacement.</li> </ul>
February 23, 2007	<b>Spangler Peak Ranch, Inc.</b> Wally Besuden, President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the recommended elimination of the Creelman Alternative from analysis. Prefers the Proposed Project underground along San Vicente Rd.</li> <li>• Attachment: 4/20/06 letter published in Scoping Report Part 1.</li> </ul>
February 23, 2007	<b>Starlight Mountain Estates Owners</b> Michael Page	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports analysis of Oak Hollow Rd Underground Alternative.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2007	<b>Acctiva Corporation</b> Lane Sharman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Company is developing modular, mid-range renewable generators.</li> <li>• Opposes transmission infrastructure to connect generators that emit greenhouse gases.</li> <li>• Favors local renewable generation over Imperial County renewable generation that requires transmission. Stirling Energy technology is unproven.</li> <li>• CPUC should ask SDG&amp;E to cooperate with communities and companies to increase and secure power supply and improve efficiency.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2007	<b>Back Country Coalition</b> Bonnie Gendron George Courser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note that ratepayers bear all the risks, costs, and overruns of the Project, including all costs from eminent domain to easement road maintenance. Believe that the costs are too high for a Project that is unnecessary.</li> <li>• Believes that the Project will open the floodgates to cheap, dirty Mexican power that has the ability to expand at the speed of the Mexican approval process.</li> <li>• Believes that this Project represents state-sanctioned corporate welfare, and comes at the expense of stifling competition and innovation of renewable energy technology while sanctioning market dominance for Sempra.</li> <li>• Requests that the CPUC explore and seek expert input on the following: monopolization and attempts to monopolize, anticipating demand growth by building excess capacity, foreclosing markets to potential or future competitors, boycotts or refusals to deal, price squeezes, predatory behavior, and State action doctrine prior and post deregulation.</li> <li>• Enclose newspaper articles.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 24, 2007	<b>Back Country Coalition (BCC)</b> Bonnie Gendron George Courser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contend that the Project has failed to meet its basic objectives, including avoiding areas with fire history or potential. BCC is concerned that the Project would exacerbate fire danger by making firefighting difficult, and believe that the loss of human lives should be considered in the EIR/EIS.</li> <li>• Contend that the objective to “support regional expansion of the electric grid” is irrelevant, because there are far superior ways to achieve this objective, and urge Aspen and Sempra to consider them. Believe that the SRPL is not needed to achieve the goal of providing transmission capability for renewable resources.</li> <li>• Believe that if the true costs of the Project, including costs to ratepayers for eminent domain procurement and legal proceedings, and construction and maintenance of all aspects of the SRPL, were included in the cost-savings analysis, there would doubtless be no savings but a large deficit.</li> <li>• Believe that the objective to “improve regional transmission system infrastructure” makes the Project a foregone conclusion, and is thus in ill-conceived objective.</li> <li>• Find the objective to diversify fuel sources to decrease “dependence on increasingly scarce and costly natural gas” disingenuous due to Sempra’s ongoing construction of the LNG plant in Costa Azul, Baja, Mexico.</li> <li>• Contend that the objectives to avoid taking of property and creating new ROW rely on the assumption that the Project is necessary, and are therefore unfair objectives.</li> <li>• Contend that because the Project objectives are based on faulty premises and unsubstantiated claims, it could easily be claimed by the applicant that any alignment would accomplish most of the basic project objectives. Believe that they have shown that the Project fails to meet each of its objectives.</li> <li>• Contend that the Proposed Project is a corporate scheme to deliver cheap, dirty energy throughout San Diego and beyond at the expense of ratepayers.</li> <li>• Believe that the Non-Wires Alternatives are the only acceptable alternatives.</li> <li>• Highlight in detail the expected impacts of one of the Project’s links.</li> <li>• Appendices are included.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2007	<b>California State Park Rangers Association</b> Gail Sevrens, Legislative Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a 700-member organization of retired State Park Rangers, strongly opposes the Proposed Project because its aesthetic, biological, cultural, and recreational impacts are unacceptable.</li> <li>• Contends that the SRPL would shatter the wilderness feel of the Park, discourage tourism, threaten unique paleontological, archaeological, historical, and geological resources within ABDSP.</li> <li>• Contends that the towers would destroy the viewshed, cause erosion, and have unacceptable impacts to wildlife.</li> <li>• Supports demand reduction and the No Project Alternative.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 24, 2007	<b>California Wilderness Coalition</b> Ryan Henson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a non-profit organization with 5,000 members and more than 200 member organizations, opposes the Proposed Project as it violates the State Wilderness Act and would greatly impact an important ecosystem.</li> <li>• Request that the lead agencies honor the Federal Wilderness Act, Federal Land Policy Management Act, California Wilderness Act, 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule, and pending federal legislation prohibiting the construction of power lines in Wilderness Areas and Roadless Areas through which the Project would pass.</li> <li>• Request that existing rights of way be used to the maximum extent possible.</li> <li>• Request that the EIR/EIS study: the risk of reducing water quality, impacts to air resources, consequences of fire, impacts of development, cumulative impacts of project, impacts to terrestrial animal and plant habitat, impacts to aquatic animal habitat, impacts to threatened, endangered, proposed, and sensitive species, impacts to research, monitoring, and reference landscaped, consequences for recreation, risk of opening trackless areas to unauthorized ORV use, impacts to scenic quality, consequences to heritage resources, mitigation measures to offset visual impacts, and risk of introducing non-native plant species to natural areas.</li> <li>• Note that BLM must consider connected, cumulative, and similar actions in the EIS, including reasonably foreseeable development projects, therefore BLM must develop alternatives that emphasize environmental protection even if they limit or strongly regulate development. Believe that such options should not be dismissed without thorough analysis in the EIS.</li> <li>• Reminds the lead agencies of their legal requirements to do analyses at appropriate scales, including landscape-level scale if applicable, and to engage in monitoring of EIR/EIR implementation.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2007	<b>Castle Eurasia Corp./ Zen Media Corp.</b> Benjamin Kwon, Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contends that current Project proposals are not compatible with the Imperial Gateway development due to safety, maintenance, views, landscape, fire hazard and liabilities, and the nature of its business characteristics.</li> <li>• Contends that, as landowners, Castle Eurasia/Zen Media should have the right to refuse a third party's proposal.</li> <li>• Recommends a new alternative that is at least one mile away from the Imperial Gateway development.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 24, 2007	<b>Mussey Grade Road Alliance</b> Diane Conklin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a grassroots citizen organization, is unsatisfied with the analysis in the Notice on the risk of fire outside of the SWPL corridor. Believe that this omission is an important issue in the wake of the destructive Cedar fire of 2003, which claimed 270,000 acres.</li> <li>• Encourage the Team to evaluate impacts of fire, impacts on multiple open space preserves, and impacts on the Multiple Species Conservation Program in the EIR/EIS. Contend that project Alternatives should include wildland fire in their comparison criteria, and make suggestions as to criteria to include.</li> <li>• Believe that, from a wildfire standpoint, non-Wire Alternatives are preferable to transmission lines, buried transmission lines are preferable to above-ground transmission lines, and routes that minimize distances in hazardous areas are preferable to other routes.</li> <li>• Request that Alternatives be revisited with respect to wildfire impacts before the lead agencies decide which to include in the EIR/EIS, and that a full analysis of wildfire impacts be performed within the scope of the Draft EIR/EIS.</li> <li>• Concerned about timing of biological surveys.</li> <li>• Consider the effects of the Cedar Fire on vegetation surveys.</li> <li>• Listed survey locations for and presence of specific species.</li> <li>• Recommends long-term surveys to be included in biological impacts mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Impacts to Boulder Oaks Preserve; avoid Tubb Canyon.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2007	<b>Protect Our Communities Fund</b> Denis Trafecanty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the Proposed Project is unnecessary, and supports the Non-Wires Alternatives with in-basin generation.</li> <li>• Request investigation into asthma as a health impact of pollution from dirty power plants in Mexico.</li> <li>• Requests analysis on impacts to Big Horn Sheep and Bald and Golden Eagles.</li> <li>• Requests analysis on EMF impacts to cattle fertility and fire risks of Preferred and alternate routes.</li> <li>• Believes that the Park should be kept pristine.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2007	<b>San Diego Conservation Resources Network</b> Cindy Stankowski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a nonprofit organization with 25 member organizations, believes that the Park should be kept pristine. Believe that the few remaining places that offer the open-space experience without the intrusion of the built world must remain intact so that their integrity provides continuing opportunities for recreation and enjoyment of future generations.</li> <li>• Express concern about the introduction of non-native species introductions, impacts to the integrity of Park and open space areas, impacts to users' enjoyment of the Park, impacts to Wilderness Areas and Wild and Scenic Rivers, impacts to wildlife movement; impacts of efforts to protect the lines from natural and manmade disasters, impacts to cultural resources, and impacts from erosion.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 26, 2007	<b>CAISO</b> Anthony Ivancovich Assistant general Counsel Judith B. Sanders Counsel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has evaluated some of the Alternatives.</li> <li>• No Project: predicts that new generation in the SD area would be required, that other projects such as LEAPS or Crestwood Area wind project might develop, or that transmission upgrades would be made that could increase import capability (Mexico Light and/or Path 44 Upgrade). Has reliability concerns with the No Project scenario.</li> <li>• Imperial Valley and Anza Borrego Link Alternatives: SDG&amp;E Desert Western Alternative raises reliability issues with the proposed additional 50 miles of 500 kV line running parallel to the SWPL 500 kV line (comments are similar to CAISO Comments Regarding Alternative Route Proposals Submitted by SDG&amp;E, 10/11/06). Imperial Co. location poses a lightning risk.</li> <li>• Central Link Alternatives: Santa Ysabel partial underground Alternative includes the additional costs of undergrounding a 230 kV line but could provide the advantage of reducing fire risk.</li> <li>• Inland Valley Link Alternatives: CNF Alternative presents possible reliability concerns due to fire exposure.</li> <li>• Coastal Link Alternatives: With exception of the Rancho Peñasquitos Blvd Bike Path Alternative, all other Coastal Link Alternatives include underground portions, raising the project cost. CAISO is studying three optional project approaches proposed in the Coastal Link System Upgrade Alternative fore the segment between the Sycamore canyon and Peñasquitos Substations and will provide results of reliability studies in testimony.</li> <li>• SWPL Alternatives: With exception of West of Forest Alternative, the SWPL Alternatives involve additional SWPL parallel lengths and pose all of the fire/reliability concerns noted in the CAISO's 10/11/06 Comments on the SDG&amp;E Corridor BCD Alternatives.</li> <li>• Non-Wires Alternatives: All of these Alternatives are being studied by the CAISO in one form or another with respect not only to reliability and economic concerns, but also whether they present an economically efficient means by which SDG&amp;E can meet its RPS goals.</li> <li>• System Alternatives/Upgrades: The Team identified LEAPS or Serrano Valley North, Mexico Light and Path 44 as possible system alternatives or upgrades in lieu of SRPL. Like the Non-Wires Alternatives, these Alternatives are also being evaluated by the CAISO in terms of economic and reliability benefits and access to renewables.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2007	<b>Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens</b> Harvey Payne, Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a recognized intervenor within the SRPL CPCN proceeding, submits the following comments.</li> <li>• Believes the transmission upgrades are preferable to SDG&amp;E's coastal link portion of the Proposed Project and superior to Alternative routes as well.</li> <li>• Requests that the lead agencies scrutinize the reasons given by the Marines about their objection to the MCAS Miramar routing. Requests a copy of correspondence from the Marines before a determination is made to eliminate this alternative.</li> <li>• Refutes the rationale for eliminating the Mercy Road to Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Alternative as based on an erroneous conclusion that SD County's historical Home property would be affected. Requests reconsideration of the originally proposed route.</li> <li>• Believes that the description of the Rancho Peñasquitos Blvd Bike Path Adjustment in the Notice is incorrect. Details are provided.</li> <li>• Requests consideration of preferred route adjustments that would minimize impacts on homes in the Rancho Peñasquitos area.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Community Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
March 5, 2007	La Jolla Industries William R. Collins, Vice President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note that the technology behind the Stirling power plant is not yet commercially viable, and that even small prototype systems have significant flaws.</li> <li>• Emphasize that the SRPL will not generate electricity, and to claim that the Project satisfies a need when there is not yet any “green” energy to be moved is premature. If Stirling fails, the SRPL will have contributed nothing, and will have destroyed viewsheds, wilderness, and habitat.</li> <li>• Encourages the CPUC to view the energy needs of the San Diego area in a broader context than just the arguments put forth by SDG&amp;E in the current proposal. Note that SDG&amp;E is attempting to eliminate two projects for local generation, and then claim that in the absence of local generation capability, the SRPL is necessary.</li> <li>• Questions why the applicant refuses to extend it’s lease to buy power from LS Power, which would provide local power. Believes that Semptra is aiming toward monopoly on power generation and distribution in the San Diego region.</li> <li>• Questions why SDG&amp;E continues to pursue court ordered access to properties along the eliminated Borrego Valley/Desert Alternative Route.</li> <li>• Expresses concern over effects to a property that contains a herd of Big Horn Sheep and Native American resources.</li> <li>• Believes that California should not set the precedent of de-designating wilderness at the request of a profit-driven entity, particularly when its arguments are dubious.</li> <li>• Requests that the CPUC continue to recommend the Borrego Valley/ Desert Alternative Route for elimination and deny the Proposed Project.</li> </ul>