



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT



Comment Form

Proposed Sunrise Powerlink Project

Date: Feb 15 07

Name*: John Greenhalgh

Affiliation (if any):* _____

Address*: PO BOX 2172

City, State, Zip Code*: JULIAN CA 92026

Telephone Number*: _____

Email*: JGreenJulian@Hotmail.com

Comment: Why do ^{so} this above ground
wires do not make sense over the next
20 years 75 million people will make
CA their home along with the 30 plus
here now 100 million people in So
CA. Just Charge All the
millions of customers SDGE will have
.50 cents a month extra. 50 million
A month extra x .50 is 25 million A month
x 12 = 300 million extra dollars. Put
the damn bloody thing under
ground A wire/wire for ALL DO

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Allow this to proceed Above Ground

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 24, 2007. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (866) 711-3106 or emailed to sunrise@aspenerg.com.

A unique part of CA will be
Lost.

Billie Blanchard, Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Sunrise Powerlink

All of us who have experienced the biological resources of Anza Borrego Desert State Park oppose the proposed route that would pass through a wilderness area. It would be unprecedented in recent times in California to so directly encroach on the values of a park or reserve. I urge you to reject this route and encourage SDG&E to substitute conservation and renewable energy sources.

Sincerely,



Lawrence Maxwell
3620 Market St., #5
San Francisco, CA 94131
Larmax@pacbell.net

From: Glenn Stokes [mailto:grs4102@cox.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2007 07:23 PM
To: sunrise@aspeneg.com
Cc: LNastro@parks.ca.gov, deborah@theabf.org
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT ON: SDG&E's Proposed Sunrise Powerlink Project

TO: Billiei Blanchard / Lynda Kastoll CPUC/BLM
c/o Aspen Environmental Group

CC: Louis Nastro, Assistant to the California State Park & Recreation System
Deborah Knapp, The Anza Borrego Institute

FM: Glenn Stokes
550 Front St. #804
San Diego, CA 92101
619-865-5940
<mailto:grs4102@cox.net> grs4102@cox.net

RE: Comments on the Sunrise Powerlink Project; Feb 5-90 2007 Second Round of Scoping Meetings on Alternatives for Draft EIR/EIS

Scoping Meeting Question #1 : Do I agree or disagree with alternatives proposed for retention or elimination?

Answer:

- A. Power Link: NO, but regrettably YES, with conditions. (See A1 and A2 Below)
- B. Non-Wire Alternatives, YES, with additions. (See Question 2 Below)

Note: I suggest you change "Non-Wire Alternatives" to "Non-Powerlink Alternatives", as electricity does travel over wires; it is not wireless.

A1. CONDITIONS FOR A POWER LINK:

Before proceeding with the Sunrise Powerlink review process, require SDG&E or other qualified parties to conduct detailed studies that will provide supportable data that prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a powerlink is the ONLY viable solution that will provide the 3 key elements contained within SDG&E's filing:

- a) reliable power,
- b) power that contribute to SDG&E's ability to meet renewable power requirements, and
- c) power that will be reasonable affordable

Consider strongly that

- a) failure to develop electric power within the service area for use within the service area will increase dependence on imported electric power and will continue to place San Diego and Southern California at risk of being without needed power should damage of some sort interrupt the imported power supply,
- b) SDG&E has made no guarantee what percent of the Sunrise Powerlink power will be from renewable sources or that the power will enable them to meet their renewable power goals, (there should be a guarantee and penalties if the guarantee is not met), and
- c) SDG&E claims the Sunrise Powerlink will lower the high cost of power. As demand for power increases, competition for finite availability of power will increase and no one can reliably claim that the Sunrise Powerlink will lower the high cost of power.

A2: REGARDING THE ANZA BORREGO DESERT STATE PARK POWERLINK ROUTE
ALTERNATIVE:

EVEN IF A POWERLINK IS APPROVED AS ONLY WAY TO PROVIDE NEEDED POWER TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
IT SHOULD NOT BE INSTALLED THROUGH THE ANZA BORREGO
DESERT STATE PARK !

WHY?

1. Upon signing SB 1 on August 21, 2006 Governor Arnold Schwarznegger said:

...."I am very happy to now be in a position where I can do things for the environment. When I campaigned in 2003 I made it very clear that the environment is going to be a centerpiece of my administration. That I'm going to work very very hard to make sure to protect our oceans, to protect our coast line, our forests, our water our air. to do everything we can, and also to put land aside for future generations and that's exactly what we have done. 25 million acres of the Sierra Nevada Conservancy; right now we are petitioning the Bush Administration to put aside an additional 4 million acres that are roadless right now, that we want to keep roadless so we have gotta continue fighting because I want to prove to the rest of the world that you can protect the environment and also have an economic expansion and boom. And we have proven that for the last three years and I am very proud of that and the only reason that we were able to do it is by having really strong environmental groups that are fighting for it and also to have great legislators that believe in the same thing and we all work together, Democrats and Republicans working together
..... "

Business leaders and government agencies should be following the Governor's lead in this instance. In particular the installation of the Sunrise Powerlink has 22 environmental impacts listed in the current documentation, most of which will wind up being tolerated, not mitigated.

2. It's against California law:

It doesn't matter if a trench is dug, or if power poles and lines are installed in Anza Borrego Desert State Park, or Humbolt State Park, or the California Poppy fields. These areas are preserved and protected by law. Chopping down redwoods to put in power lines is no different than digging up or driving on a few small plants in the desert, protected and preserved means protected and preserved. Just because someone has an easement to pass over protected and preserved land does not give them any right to damage the easement land or its contents in any way. It will be impossible to install the Sunrise Powerlink through the State Park without causing irreversable and permanent damage to the easement land and its contents. It seems improbable that a new power link could be installed using only the easement land. Any use of the land outside of the easement is further protected:

See: CALIFORNIA CODES, PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE, SECTION 5001-5019.5
especially:

5001.8. (a) The use of motor vehicles in units of the state park system is subject to the following limitations:

- (1) In state wildernesses, natural preserves, and cultural preserves, use is prohibited.
 - (2) In state parks, state reserves, state beaches, wayside campgrounds, and historical units, use is confined to paved areas and other areas specifically designated and maintained for normal ingress, egress, and parking.
 - (3) In state recreation areas, use is confined to specifically designated and maintained roads and trails.
- (b) The use of motor vehicles on lands in the state vehicular recreation areas is confined to areas and routes designated for that purpose.

and especially:

5001.9. (a) Any improvement existing within the state park system as of January 1, 1979, which fails to comply with the provisions of former Section 5001.5 as they read immediately prior to January 1, 1979, or Article 1.7 (commencing with Section 5019.50) of this

chapter shall not be expanded. (b) No new facility may be developed in any unit of the state park system unless it is compatible with the classification of the unit.

And in particular see: CALIFORNIA CODES, PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE, SECTION 5019.50-5019.80 especially:

5019.53. State parks consist of relatively spacious areas of outstanding scenic or natural character, oftentimes also containing significant historical, archaeological, ecological, geological, or other similar values. The purpose of state parks shall be to preserve outstanding natural, scenic, and cultural values, indigenous aquatic and terrestrial fauna and flora, and the most significant examples of ecological regions of California, such as the Sierra Nevada, northeast volcanic, great valley, coastal strip, Klamath-Siskiyou Mountains, southwest mountains and valleys, redwoods, foothills and low coastal mountains, and desert and desert mountains.

Each state park shall be managed as a composite whole in order to restore, protect, and maintain its native environmental complexes to the extent compatible with the primary purpose for which the park was established.

Improvements undertaken within state parks shall be for the purpose of making the areas available for public enjoyment and education in a manner consistent with the preservation of natural, scenic, cultural, and ecological values for present and future generations. Improvements may be undertaken to provide for recreational activities including, but not limited to, camping, picnicking, sightseeing, nature study, hiking, and horseback riding, so long as those improvements involve no major modification of lands, forests, or waters. Improvements that do not directly enhance the public's enjoyment of the natural, scenic, cultural, or ecological values of the resource, which are attractions in themselves, or which are otherwise available to the public within a reasonable distance outside the park, shall not be undertaken within state parks.

State parks may be established in the terrestrial or nonmarine aquatic (lake or stream) environments of the state.

My comment:

Another CA Law specifies that the State Park Commission MAY permit water, gas, electric, telephone and other utility services to be put through a State Park, with conditions. The scope of the proposed project is so enormous that establishment of conditions can not prevent permanent and irreversible damage to the State Park and the Commission is obliged to protect the Park. Also, specifically because power lines DO exist through the Anza Borrego Desert State Park, improvements to those power lines are, in my observation and opinion, prohibited by law.

QUESTION #2: What other Non-Wire (Non-Powerlink) alternatives should be included?

1: Ocean Wave generation of electric power. San Diego county is not even attempting to utilize a major available resource.

http://money.cnn.com/2006/12/14/magazines/fsb/nextlittlething_wave_power.fsb/index.htm?postversion=2006121510
<http://www.awsocan.com/home.html>
<http://www.oceanpd.com/default.html>

2: Mandatory Conservation and Mandatory rationing and fines for violations. Wasting electricity is wasting Earth's precious resources, and polluting the Earth and putting us all at risk of not having enough electricity to live, work, and play in the future.

Being wasteful and/or using more than your fair share and paying a higher rate, just because you can afford to pay a higher rate, is a flawed approach that only benefits the who can afford to waste is detrimental to those who can not afford to waste and is detrimental to the public at large and not in the national interest.

3. Regardless of any other consideration, remove the existing power lines that go through Anza Borrego Desert State Park as they are inconsistent with the mission of the Park

System.

Final Comments:

CA ISO and Dept of Energy are both pressuring electric companies that serve "Critical Transmission Corridors" to build new transmission lines to import power from regions outside their service areas. I might concede that SDG&E, in filing to install a Sunrise Powerlink, is only attempting to comply with short sighted directions that are being put forth by State and Federal agencies. SDG&E needs to be more creative and innovative and not subject themselves to mis-guided leadership. However in selecting the Anza Borrego Desert State Park as their preferred route, SDG&E, as an investor owned company, appears to be catering more to their stockholders and profit motive and are being socially and environmentally irresponsible

A Sunrise Powerlink, or a dozen other new powerlinks, only serves to make Southern California, and San Diego further dependent on imported power and power links. Should any one or more of the power links fail in a natural or human disaster, where will Southern California and San Diego get its power? Our region is a virtual "Electric Island" that has become dependent on electricity from far away. Eventually, once all available land is used, where will new powerlinks be placed? This can not go on indefinitely.

Anza Borrego Desert State Park is the place where a line in the sand has been drawn by opponents of the Sunrise Powerlink. This does not need to be perceived as a negative stance, it should be viewed an opportunity to make this the moment in time that a shift must occur to move away from the old ways and start developing renewable power supplies within service areas. Even if such a shift is not immediately cost effective or serves the profit motive of stockholders in a investor owned power company, in the long run it will be in everyone's best interests. On the surface, making this shift now seems a far better use of \$1.3 Billion instead of building a power link that will only transport power, not produce power.

Conclusion:

We must make a change in course now, and not perpetuate an outdated method of power generation and transmission and instead start creating conventional and renewable power within the service areas of Southern California and San Diego to :

- a) minimize dependency on outside power,
- b) risk loosing power because of failed power links, and
- c) create a diversity of power generating sources to eliminate one source as a single cost factor.

The first Draft that will be submitted later this year must make note of the above. The second Draft should include recommendations that the Power Link should not be approved, but even if approved it should not be put through Anza Borrego Desert State Park.

Glenn Stokes

550 Front St. #804
San Diego, CA 92101

PO BOX 124797
San Diego, CA 92112-4797

3013 Roadrunner Dr. So.
PO BOX 713
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

619-865-5940



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT



Comment Form

Proposed Sunrise Powerlink Project

Date: 2/16/07

Name*: SYLVIA, HAROLD & BRENT CAVINS

Affiliation (if any):*

Address*: 1096 STONERIDGE Rd.

City, State, Zip Code*: EL Cajon, CA, 92021

Telephone Number*: 619-447-0123

Email*: _____

Comment: WE ARE ALL (2 FAMILIES)
victims of the '03 Fire in Crest.
We believe the proposed S.D.G. & E.
poles will hinder the use of
B-8 Bombers to fight any fires again
in Crest. WE also believe there are
other alternatives to the energy
problem than this. We are
against any proposal to this
project in every way.

JAC

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 24, 2007. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (866) 711-3106 or emailed to sunrise@aspenerg.com.



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT



Comment Form

Proposed Sunrise Powerlink Project

Date: 2/16/07

Name*: JEANNE A. CURRY

Affiliation (if any)*: JUST A CONCERNED CITIZEN

Address*: 2767 BLACKBUSH LANE

City, State, Zip Code*: EL CAJON, CA. 92019

Telephone Number*: unlisted

Email*: 0

Comment: I oppose the Sunrise Powerlink as proposed. One thing that comes to mind are fires. This project would be totally dependent on the C.D.F. (Calif. Dept. of Forestry) which our tax dollars pay for. Second, the expense to tax payers and third, we can buy our energy from other sources.

Thank you,

Jeanne Curry

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 24, 2007. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (866) 711-3106 or emailed to sunrise@aspneg.com.

From: mtnfolks@attwb.net [mailto:mtnfolks@attwb.net]
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2007 07:43 PM
To: sunrise@aspenerg.com
Subject: COMMENT ON ALTERNATIVES SUNRISE POWERLINK PROJECT

From: Christine and Bryan Rowson
PO Box 574
13895 Boulder Creek Road
Descanso, CA 91916
(619) 895-3815

We strongly protest the installation of the POWERLINK PROJECT Alternate D and have the following comments on the scope and content of the EIR/EIS on the Sunrise Powerlink Project.

Please add us to the appropriate lists to receive all documentation and correspondence regarding this issue.

First of all please explain to us WHY this powerlink is needed at this time when we should be researching alternative energy sources - wind power comes to mind.

We are contacting AARP for legal advice on any legal protections that would prohibit construction of the project on or near our residence near mile marker 9 on Boulder Creek Road. As disabled seniors it would be an extreme hardship to have to relocate and it would be discriminatory to reduce the value of our home and property, our future by putting these lines on or near our place.

We have owned the property for 23 years and lived here since 1990.

1) Your documents states that Alternate D is in the least fire risk area. I beg to differ on that. Not only is this remote area subject to very high fire risk, the proposed high power lines would eliminate any fire fighting possibility by air. With the height of the lines and in a smoke filled environment the helicopters would not be able to fight any fire in or around the lines. As evidenced by the 2003 Cedar Wildfire, which started very near your proposed line, was impossible to fight in this area. The fire crews just had to watch it burn in the area near our home on Boulder Creek Road, mile marker 9.

2) When we had to rebuild our home after the losing it to the devastating Cedar Creek wildfire in 2003, we did all the massive cleanup ourselves and since we were both over 60 years old, it was no easy task. We went through many difficulties in the rebuilding.

Why did SDG&E planners allow all of us to go through the agony of rebuilding knowing they would be subjecting us to the uncertainty and pain of worry over once again losing our home?

3) It appears that the people who checked the Alternative D line and said there were no private land occupants north beyond the 8 mile marker on Boulder Creek Road obviously stopped looking at that point. Our home is located just beyond that location along with 7 other property owners and residents. Someone DIDN'T do their job correctly

when they reported at your meeting in Alpine there were no residence north of the area near mile marker 8 on Boulder Creek Road.

4) IF Alternate D is selected at least put the power lines to the east of the existing power line which would then be east of existing residents along Boulder Creek Road at the 8 - 10 mile marker. This require ONLY the movement of two of the power poles approximately 350 yards to the east of the suggested route, thus avoiding local resident's properties.

We protest the discrimination shown toward homeowners in our area. Just because we are older property owners and we are in a remote area, you act as if our rights must be given up in favor of peoples' rights in other areas.

2476

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT



Comment Form

Proposed Sunrise Powerlink Project

Date: 2/17/07

Name*: Alma Russell (ALMA T. RUSSELL)

Affiliation (if any):* _____

Address*: 9718 Shamrock Lane, Lakeside, CA 92040

City, State, Zip Code*: Lakeside, CA 92040

Telephone Number*: 619-390-9427

Email*: _____

Comment: The Sunrise Powerlink should be ^{under} ~~under~~ ground along a free way where the ~~one~~ ^{one} is ~~at~~ path is already formed - not through a residential area like Harrison Canyon. The towers ^{will} mess up a beautiful view.

Alma T. Russell

Also this letter is in agreement with my view

Alvin C. Munnich
9718 Shamrock Ln
Lakeside, CA 92040

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 24, 2007. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (866) 711-3106 or emailed to sunrise@aspenerg.com.

· BILLIE C. BLANCHARD AICP • REGULATORY ANALYST V
 · PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION • ENERGY DIVISION
 · 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 · SAN FRANCISCO • CALIFORNIA 94102-3298

· 18 FEBRUARY 2007

· Dear M. Blanchard,

It is appalling that anyone is seriously considering allowing SDG & E (or anyone else) to send a 500 kV powerline through our State Park. I grew up here believing that state parks were, by definition, protected. This monster would march through the heart of Anza-Borrego's Sonoran desert, through one of the last remnants of untamed desert left in California. Why is this being contemplated when in February of this year the CPUC president said the Sunrise Powerlink would not be needed?

Many people feel deserts are wastelands, not worth protecting, a place to throw trash, or a place to tame so it looks like any other manufactured place. However, for those of us who live here the desert is full of life. It is a place to understand that the unique plants, adapted to the climate, are both shelter and food for the wild life from the smallest insects to the Bighorn sheep, as well as a place to study previous civilizations. There are many other reasons not to allow the powerline such as raising light pollution in one of the very few places left where astronomers can go to study the night sky. There are also questions regarding the magnetic fields which affect humans as well as wild life.

The desert is the most fragile of all plant communities. It does not heal quickly and often, even with little damage, does not recover at all - EVER. With the destruction of the desert will go a landscape of such overwhelming beauty we should stand in awe of it - not destroy it.

PLEASE help us preserve this treasure.

Very Sincerely,


 BARNABY DAVIDSON

PO BOX 1525

BORREGO SPRINGS • CALIFORNIA 92004

From: Fred Emery [mailto:fredemery@cableusa.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2007 07:59 PM
To: sunrise@aspenerg.com
Subject: Comment

Having attended the 2nd round of scoping meeting in Borrego Springs I would like to commend the CPUC for its thorough work and openness in considering so many alternatives. However I find myself now persuaded that the non wires and system alternatives are now the only reasonable ways forward to avoid the disaster of irrevocably damaging the international asset that is the Anza Borrego desert State Park.

I look forward to the Commisssioners coming to the same conclusion.
Regards Fred Emery, 1447 Yaqui Rd po Box 97, Borrego Springs CA 92004,
phone 760 767 4654

From: Cynthia Priest [mailto:cynthia_46@mac.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2007 07:36 PM
To: sunrise@aspeneg.com
Subject: sunrise power link

Hello

We are in opposition to the power link through Japatul Valley.
We are concerned that this will affect our valley in a very negative way.

Residents of Japatul Valley
Cynthia Priest
Lynn Snyder
Brian Harrington

From: jflynn2@san.rr.com [mailto:jflynn2@san.rr.com]
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2007 2:22 PM
To: Environmental Team
Subject: SDG&E & Sempra Energy's Solar Energy Power Link

I understand that SDG&E & Sempra Energy are trying to get CPUC to approve a Power Link to distribute California Desert Solar Energy to San Diego. I've also been told that this proposed Power Link will then be extended into Arizona and Nevada, where Sempra Energy has access to Solar Energy. There are numerous major problems with this proposal. SDG&E customers like me will pay a very high cost toward the building of this very expensive Power Link. The building of this Power Link will also damage California's pristine desert. Most important, San Diego County has all the Solar Energy that SDG&E needs to meet all of San Diego's energy needs. There is absolutely no need to import it from far away at a much higher cost to San Diego rate payers. Another problem with this extended Power Link is that it will be very easy to sabotage. I'm a retired Marine who knows that from experience. Do not approve this Power Link. It is not in the best environmental and economic interest of San Diego and SDG&E's energy customers. Please respond to me on this message in San Diego at jflynn2@san.rr.com or (619) 298-5554.