

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
August 23, 2006	Alvin C Ruppert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Proposed Project and proposes the following alternatives:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Upgrades to two existing transmission lines which already serve areas of growth would cost less and have less impact to biological resources.</li> <li>— In-area generation; references the California Solar Initiative.</li> <li>— Rising electricity prices will encourage people to use efficient lighting, reducing demand.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Favors project objectives of strengthening the power grid, satisfying Southern California energy demand, and accessing desert solar power.</li> <li>• Impacts to visual resources, urban residential land use.</li> </ul>
August 24, 2006	Joetta Mihalovich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact to visual resources in Scripps Ranch in addition to existing transmission.</li> <li>• Supports an underground alternative through Scripps Ranch comparable to the proposed underground segments.</li> </ul>
August 24, 2006	Carol Levin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the project due to impacts to ABDSP, biological and visual resources in San Diego backcountry, public health, and migratory birds.</li> <li>• Urges the CPUC to consider alternatives.</li> </ul>
August 24, 2006	Glenn Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to San Diego backcountry character, residential land use, ABDSP, and recreation.</li> <li>• Favors alternative along Interstate 8 (I-8)..</li> <li>• Supports evidentiary hearings if it includes the concerned public in the permitting process.</li> </ul>
August 24, 2006	Richard and Sara Radigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the proposed route through their property in Ramona and wish to dispute it in a public hearing.</li> <li>• Favor an alternative route along existing lines.</li> </ul>
August 28, 2006	Stacey Landfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed Project unfairly burdens backcountry residents to satisfy urban energy demand.</li> <li>• Impacts to backcountry and parks.</li> <li>• Suggests an energy usage ceiling above which customers are heavily fined. References her own low electricity bill.</li> </ul>
August 28, 2006	Earl H. Gompper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the project due to increased risk of wildfire in backcountry. References the Pines Fire.</li> <li>• Proposed route through Ranchita would inhibit his current readiness to fight fire and endanger firefighting efforts.</li> <li>• Favors reducing electricity and gas consumption.</li> <li>• High cost of transmission construction.</li> <li>• Impacts to property values, biological and visual resources, landscape character, and public health and safety.</li> </ul>
August 30, 2006	27 residents of Capistrano Beach, Encinitas, Irvine, Oceanside, Riverside, and Vista.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Proposed Project due to impacts to public health and safety, residential land use, property values, wildlife and habitat, and visual and recreational resources.</li> <li>• Supports alternative routing to avoid the area of the signees.</li> </ul>
September 1, 2006	Scott Flinn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rejects SDG&amp;E's claim that the Proposed Project increases access to renewable generation because Imperial Valley hosts no viable or proposed renewable energy.</li> <li>• Project will access electricity from unregulated power plants in Mexico, turning profits for SDG&amp;E while impacting air quality.</li> <li>• Recommends evidentiary hearings on SDG&amp;E plans to procure renewable energy through the Proposed Project.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
September 1, 2006	Grazyna Krajewska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Million Solar Roofs program will provide a distributed energy alternative to the project.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E would seek in-area generation if project costs were not paid by ratepayers.</li> <li>• Residential development in Torrey Hills after the construction of existing lines makes inappropriate the proposed route's EMF impacts.</li> </ul>
September 2, 2006	Debra Oestreich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the project size and route due to impacts on residences in east Ramona.</li> <li>• Prefers co-location with the existing 69 kV line through federal land to mitigate public health impacts and property value decrease.</li> <li>• Criticizes SDG&amp;E's proposed routing to avoid the cost of meeting federal requirements to cross public land.</li> </ul>
September 2, 2006	Todd Eisenberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed Project is economically unnecessary and will not access renewable resources.</li> <li>• Upgrades on existing in-area generation will eliminate need for the project by providing sufficient generating capacity; closing local plants takes away jobs.</li> <li>• Comparative cost analysis of the project and non-wires alternatives as well as estimate of project cost on rates should be publicized.</li> <li>• Rejects SDG&amp;E's claim that the project is needed to reduce congestion.</li> <li>• San Diego is experiencing slow to negative growth due to unaffordable cost of living.</li> <li>• Project would access power generated in Mexico and damage parks and backcountry.</li> <li>• Public health impacts from EMF</li> <li>• Renewable generation in Imperial Valley is of unconfirmed availability.</li> <li>• Should the project be approved, requests proposed underground segments to be enforced to be placed underground in construction.</li> <li>• Project conflicts with the mission of the CPUC in terms of public interest.</li> <li>• Attachments: Letter to Kim Malcolm dated 2/16/06 and UCAN/ Border Power Plant Working Group Comments on Draft 2005 IEPR Transmission Chapter</li> </ul>
September 2, 2006	Lynda R. Motta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on private property on Old Kane Springs Road include property value, residential and recreational land use, desert community character, health, wildfire, and quality of life.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E has been unresponsive to inquiries about EMF.</li> <li>• Attachments: SDG&amp;E letter to property owners, map of affected parcel, broker's price comparison, research paper on wildfire risk related to the project.</li> </ul>
September 4, 2006	Rita Pinkerton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the project because of impacts to ABDSP and backcountry.</li> <li>• Requests evidentiary hearings.</li> </ul>
September 4, 2006	Louise Russell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the project because of impacts to ABDSP and backcountry.</li> <li>• Requests evidentiary hearings.</li> </ul>
September 4, 2006	Robert G and Grace A Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to terrain and biological, educational, and recreational resources of ABDSP and backcountry near Warner and Santa Ysabel valleys.</li> <li>• Favors in-area generation, including solar rooftop, and energy conservation to avoid environmental impacts and climate change.</li> <li>• Favors the I-8 or Route 86 corridors as alternatives because they are already developed.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
September 4, 2006	Peter I and Susan D Suranyi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to private property that would be crossed by the proposed route on San Felipe Road include: conflict with residential use, decrease property value, public health, biological resources, community character, and EMF.</li> <li>• Request informational hearings because SDG&amp;E Notice of Application is inadequate.</li> <li>• Favor use of existing substations and ROWs to avoid impact to undeveloped land and rural communities.</li> <li>• Find impacts above to be unjustified by SDG&amp;E advertising.</li> </ul>
September 5, 2006	Judith Withers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the project, particularly the Central Link and proposed substation because of impacts to San Felipe community.</li> <li>• Impacts to biological resources, EMF, wildfire, and local business.</li> <li>• Alternatives exist to fulfill project objectives and mitigate impacts.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Requests undergrounding, especially 500 kV and 230 kV lines at Central East Substation.</li> <li>— Suggests existing corridors along S2 and SR-79.</li> <li>— References the solar rooftop initiative.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SDG&amp;E staff have been inaccessible for discussion of alternative options with residents.</li> </ul>
September 5, 2006	Arnold Mroz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends independent analysis of the Proposed Project.</li> <li>• Interested in encouraging competition to the project.</li> <li>• References CPUC General Order 131-D.</li> </ul>
September 8, 2006	Mary Westmoreland Manseau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hydrological impacts, specifically at Coyote Wash and Dixieland in Imperial County.</li> <li>• Recommends routes that avoid flash flood zones.</li> </ul>
September 17, 2006	Kenneth R. Wright and Carol Schloo-Wright	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impact on Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and other rural lands in San Diego County.</li> <li>• Project would set a precedent for taking public recreational lands for development.</li> <li>• Concerned about private property taking and decrease in value for industry profit.</li> <li>• Skeptical that the project will be used for renewable energy; instead, it will bring in dirty energy from Arizona and Mexico.</li> </ul>
September 18, 2006	Curt Baldwin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cites potential impacts along Scripps Poway Parkway including health and safety hazards from EMF and earthquake, existing visual character, property value, and corona noise.</li> <li>• Concerned about additional corona and the impact it will have on property value.</li> <li>• Suggests placing line underground along Scripps Poway Parkway.</li> </ul>
September 27, 2006	Jerry Hughes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see a cost analysis by a third party comparing the planned route through Anza-Borrego to a route that runs parallel to I-8</li> </ul>
September 28, 2006	Dinda Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the general environmental impacts and alternatives that are being studied.</li> </ul>
September 29, 2006	Elena and John Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discontent with the destruction of protected areas and the repeal of the mission of the California State Wilderness.</li> </ul>
September 29, 2006	Kristen Harms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDG&amp;E should adopt better plans for conservation, demand management and energy efficiency.</li> <li>• There should be more local renewable energy, based upon proven, not experimental, technology.</li> <li>• Current transmission lines should be replaced with new ones that can conduct more electricity.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
September 29, 2006	Sharon Lynch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests streets in her neighborhood to be identified on maps of the Inland Valley Link.</li> <li>• Requests consideration of underground alternatives through her neighborhood comparable to SDG&amp;E's routing evaluation through San Diego Country Estates.</li> <li>• This Link would be unnecessary if SDG&amp;E built power plants only in the U.S. under federal regulation, not in Mexico.</li> </ul>
October 2, 2006	Carol Pollock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be a catastrophe to allow the lines to run through State or national parks.</li> </ul>
October 2, 2006	Carolyn Dorroh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction may create new pathways for wildlife, resulting in increased predation of sensitive species in otherwise undisturbed habitat.</li> </ul>
October 2, 2006	David Garmon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finds SDG&amp;E's business model to be at odds with values regarding ABDSP.</li> <li>• Concerned about the project's use of rate- and taxpayer money, environmental impacts, and reliance on unproven methods of power generation.</li> <li>• Permanent impacts to visual and biological resources, character, and recreational use of ABDSP.</li> <li>• Encourages assessment of alternatives to attain energy reliability.</li> </ul>
October 2, 2006	Kathy & Earl Pratt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDG&amp;E has not yet secured generation to need the Proposed Project impacts to bighorn sheep, health and safety, and viewsheds.</li> <li>• Request mitigation for visual impacts by co-locating along interstates, away from Borrego Springs, Tubb Canyon, or ABDSP.</li> </ul>
October 2, 2006	Doug Westmoreland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests legible maps of the project to be made available to Imperial County residents.</li> <li>• Requests informational meetings in El Centro.</li> <li>• Impacts to dairy attraction in the west side of the Imperial Valley.</li> </ul>
October 3, 2006	Carrie Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about project experimentation with unproven generation technology .</li> </ul>
October 3, 2006	Christine McGrath	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflict with mission of Nature Conservancy land. Favors alternatives that avoid Conservancy land in Santa Ysabel Valley and Mesa Grande.</li> </ul>
October 3, 2006	Denis James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests running power lines along the U.S.-Mexican border, freeways/highways.</li> <li>• Supports new and repowered in-area and rooftop solar generation.</li> <li>• Related actions include continuation of transmission to counties north of San Diego and buildings.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E's cost evaluation omits decreases in property values.</li> <li>• Concerned that SDG&amp;E/Sempra are not revealing their true plans.</li> <li>• Concerned about impacts to wildlife and habitat, residences.</li> <li>• BLM should not modify the original utility easement through ABDSP</li> <li>• Environmental justice is an issue because the line impacts backcountry residents to benefit Los Angeles urban centers.</li> </ul>
October 3, 2006	John & Phyllis Bremer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central Link property owners of Agricultural Preserve land near Mesa Grande Road describe biological resources in that area. Because of geographical and development features, this area is isolated habitat.</li> <li>• Impacts to biological resources, recreational land use, and cultural resources.</li> <li>• Offer to show the EIR/EIS Team their property.</li> <li>• Request further time to review the PEA because of SDG&amp;E delays in distributing the document.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 3, 2006	Mark K. Bennett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternatives that avoid impacts to ABDSP include               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Better conservation programs</li> <li>— More local renewable energy</li> <li>— More efficient transmission lines</li> <li>— More local power generation</li> <li>— Less destructive transmission upgrades..</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Denis James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDG&amp;E should create an alternative for the west portion of the project area to the ocean.</li> <li>• References the Population and Housing section of the PEA for the Imperial Valley Link.</li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Denis Trafecanty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fact sheet countering SDG&amp;E's arguments in support of the project.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Stirling technology is unlikely to be viable. Instead, the project is designed to access power generated in Mexico.</li> <li>— Rates will increase to cover the cost of transmission construction.</li> <li>— Transmission towers inhibit firefighting efforts.</li> <li>— There are alternatives to reduce or avoid impacts of the Proposed Project.</li> <li>— Potential significant impacts to biological and visual resources in ABDSP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Fred Jee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants issues from Sun Desert Project, a previously proposed transmission line through ABDSP and accessing nuclear power, to be included in the EIR.</li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Gus Swiggers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative 9 is not analyzed in the PEA. Impacts to prime agricultural lands and scenic areas in Mesa Grande.</li> <li>• Asks whether the county is involved with permitting the project through these agricultural preserves.</li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Jennifer Hoggan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to route through Borrego Springs, Ranchita, and Warner Springs because of permanent impacts to habitat and living creatures.</li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Juli Zerbe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions need for additional power, given San Diego's decreasing population.</li> <li>• Wants to ensure that environmental impacts of Sempra's power plant in Mexico are being examined as a related project.</li> <li>• Asks whether there is any requirement that the project will carry only energy from non-fossil fuel sources.</li> <li>• Large amounts of private designated wilderness along the project route are represented by a few owners, resulting in little representation.</li> <li>• Favors the following alternatives: in-area generation, a more direct route, and undergrounding through Santa Ysabel to mitigate visual resource impacts.</li> <li>• Sight of power lines will impact viewsheds and cultural resources, leading to a decrease in tourism revenue for backcountry communities.</li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Kurt Livens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project appears to be routed to serve rapid development in Warner Springs and other backcountry communities, with cumulative growth-inducing impacts like development in Los Angeles County.</li> <li>• Transmission is inefficient.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E has political leverage in the Borrego Springs Supervisory District.</li> <li>• Suggests power lines parallel I-8 to San Diego, not through the back-country. Rejects SDG&amp;E's claim that wildfire pose a reliability issue for that alternative.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 4, 2006	Leslie Bellah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criticizes PEA plant surveys, which were scheduled after the productive season. Impacts to ABDSP viewshed and biological, and cultural resources.</li> <li>• Supports co-location with existing Imperial Valley-Miguel Substation line to avoid widening the disturbed ROW through ABDSP.</li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Nancy Bailey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the alternative to parallel I-8 and avoid ABDSP.</li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Rebecca Falk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not trust SDG&amp;E or Sempra.</li> <li>• Concerned about loss of wildlife refuges and open areas, especially ABDSP, to development.</li> <li>• Favors in-area, renewable generation alternatives to mitigate impacts on climate change.</li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	Sita Antel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions whether SDG&amp;E plans to access renewable energy through the Proposed Project or to access energy generated in Mexico. Requests analysis and regulation of energy sources distributed at Imperial Valley Substation.</li> <li>• Concerned about the impact to certain wildlife species. Proposed substation would adversely affect human health.</li> </ul>
October 4, 2006	James E. Lindemann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to habitat for listed species, designated wilderness, and recreational use of the desert by SDG&amp;E's proposed and alternative routes.</li> <li>• Favors the I-8 alternative.</li> </ul>
October 5, 2006	Bruce MacRobbie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A collection of photos of the project area, in particular the Anza-Borrego Link.</li> </ul>
October 5, 2006	Barbara Schmidt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of power lines would decrease property values.</li> <li>• Concerned about brain damage and birth defects due to radiation.</li> <li>• Cumulative visual impacts when co-located with existing lines along Scripps Poway Parkway.</li> <li>• Increased risk of fire.</li> </ul>
October 5, 2006	Jim Bell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 50-page plan for sustainable development of the San Diego/Tijuana region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Discusses infrastructure vulnerability to deliberate attack and natural phenomena such as earthquake and flood.</li> <li>— Favors development and distribution of energy-efficient technology such as earth cooling as well as distributed generation.</li> <li>— Includes economic projection of results of energy self-sufficiency.</li> <li>— Sustainable development mitigates climate change and impacts to communities and businesses.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

---

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

Date	From	Comments
October 5, 2006	Gregory Courson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 30-page document on the Proposed Project's impact on fire risk and firefighting efforts.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Adequate maintenance of fuel break along SWPL should be investigated.</li> <li>— All backcountry outside of desert has equally high fire potential.</li> <li>— Central East Substation, Santa Ysabel, and Mesa Grande areas have significant fire history.</li> <li>— Towers interfere with fire response air traffic.</li> <li>— Potential impact to firefighting operations such as backfiring and prescribed burn.</li> <li>— Firefighting strategy is terrain-sensitive, so routing should avoid strategic, topographic features such as the top of Mesa Grande and rock outcroppings.</li> <li>— Conductivity of smoke-filled air can delay firefighting crews at critical points near transmission lines.</li> <li>— Transmission lines can create fire-radio interference, towers can collapse in Santa Ana winds, access roads increase human access, locked gates can slow fire response.</li> <li>— Criticizes SDG&amp;E's probabilistic claim that separating the Proposed Project from SWPL increases reliability because of its disregard for absolute values.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Impacts to revenue from tourists near Julian and the Santa Ysabel casino.</li> <li>• Impacts to aesthetics and rural character, cultural resources, cattle behavior and health, soils, hydrology, water quality.</li> <li>• Concerned about method of removing flammable construction debris.</li> <li>• Concerned about effect of lightening on proposed towers.</li> <li>• Supports non-wires alternatives including distributed solar generation and conservation. Supports the San Diego Regional Energy Strategy.</li> <li>• Attachments: 2 news articles on wind-collapsed lattice tower and Volcan Mountain fire; photo showing high fire potential ridge near SR-79 and SR-76 junction where project is proposed.</li> </ul>
October 5, 2006	Laura Eidelson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that project conflicts with the San Diego Regional Energy Strategy developed in 2003.</li> <li>• Concerned that SDG&amp;E has no requirement to replace Stirling contract with other renewables, should that contract fail to produce viable technology.</li> <li>• Concerned about impact to scenic vistas and EMF, in Los Peñasquitos preserve and surrounding residential areas.</li> </ul>
October 5, 2006	Marsha Johnston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the high cost of building power lines and their inefficient transmission of power.</li> <li>• Offers non-wires alternatives including energy reclamation from industrial processes and economic and regulatory incentives for recycled energy.</li> <li>• Attachment: article "Are Worldwide Power Systems Economically and Environmentally Optimal?"</li> </ul>
October 5, 2006	Max Brian Siefker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the project because it will reduce cost of electric service.</li> <li>• Suggests underground power plants.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 5, 2006	Melody Herbert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public safety impacts due to cancer-causing effects of EMFs, hazardous construction materials, and fire.</li> <li>• Concerned about permanent damage to canyons and landscapes caused by installation.</li> <li>• Concerned about property damage, noise, air quality, relocation during construction.</li> <li>• The line as proposed is vulnerable to damage by human activities such as brush clearing as well during earthquake.</li> <li>• Suggests two alternatives for the Las Conicas neighborhood in Rancho Peñasquitos near MP 142.3, which is closer to the proposed route than nearby neighborhoods:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Putting the line next to or under State Route(SR) 56 to avoid impacts to residences and wildfire</li> <li>— Co-locating with the bike lane next to the SR-56 ROW.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Attachment: Figure 6B of NOP with the project's proximity to the Las Conicas neighborhood.</li> </ul>
October 5, 2006	Robert Nabours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the siting of the proposed substation due to construction and permanent impacts on native trees, wildfire, and hydrology.</li> <li>• Proposes upgrading the existing San Felipe Substation on S-2 because of easier construction access, level terrain, and proximity to proposed route along S-2.</li> </ul>
October 5, 2006	Tsu Min & Pi-Lan Fuh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about EMF impacts on residents of Park Village Drive, two public schools nearby, and senior citizens.</li> <li>• Opposes construction impacts of undergrounding segment under Park Village Drive.</li> </ul>
October 5, 2006	John Peterson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider southern route to Miguel Substation, underground options, or in Riverside to avoid ABDSP.</li> <li>• Finds SDG&amp;E's brief regarding south-of-Park alternatives to be inadequate due to traversal of Santa Ysabel and National Park land.</li> <li>• References letter from Ruth Coleman, Director of State Parks.</li> <li>• Many Native American cultural sites are located in ABDSP.</li> </ul>
October 6, 2006	Denis James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts to EMF, wildfire, emergency services, back-country community character, and visual and biological resources in Ramona.</li> <li>• Urges the citizens of Ramona to find alternatives including in-area generation, solar rooftop, and existing transmission upgrades.</li> <li>• Related actions include transmission interconnection to counties north of San Diego, like the cumulative development of the Lake Jennings area.</li> </ul>
October 6, 2006	Joan & David Shannon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about adverse effects on Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and private property.</li> <li>• Concerned about the loss of revenue for Borrego Springs businesses that will be impacted by loss of tourism.</li> <li>• Concerned about permanent impact on biological, visual, and recreational resources in ABDSP and Borrego Springs.</li> </ul>
October 6, 2006	John Bland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that his family heritage and historic ranch will be destroyed with the construction of the Central East Station due to impacts to visual setting.</li> <li>• Requests alternative siting of the proposed substation.</li> </ul>
October 6, 2006	Paul & Kathy Jorgensen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts to aesthetic quality and character of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.</li> <li>• Alternatives avoiding such impacts include routing outside ABDSP and undergrounding within highway ROW.</li> </ul>



**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 6, 2006	William L. Medina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests an alternative to underground the project along a bike path adjacent to the Ted Williams Freeway to mitigate impacts to wetland areas, to residences, to hydrology, and from hilly terrain.</li> <li>• Alternative provides better maintenance access than proposed route.</li> </ul>
October 6, 2006	Donald Armentrout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's difficult to understand why Project cannot be built in existing corridor. Is there a valid reason why existing designated corridor cannot be used?</li> </ul>
October 8, 2006	Dean & Catherine Oswald	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes routes through Borrego Valley and Tubb Canyon area, citing impacts to visual and biological resources..</li> <li>• Project would not be good growth in the valley.</li> </ul>
October 8, 2006	Martin Meglasson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that SDG&amp;E favors the project over alternative methods of energy procurement because Sempra would profit from energy trading using the project.</li> <li>• Local power generation should continue to be developed, like the Escondido power plant. This alternative would be consistent with the San Diego Regional Energy Strategy, Energy 2030.</li> <li>• References alternatives proposed by Border Power Plant Working Group.</li> <li>• Impacts to recreational land use.</li> </ul>
October 9, 2006	Michelle Earnshaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commenter disagrees with SDG&amp;E's statement of need because growth in the San Diego region is limited by amount of available land.</li> <li>• Concerned about growth-inducing impacts.</li> <li>• Renewable generation sources and technology are unconfirmed and not synchronized with the project.</li> <li>• Related actions include generation in Baja.</li> <li>• Transmission is inefficient, losing energy over distance.</li> <li>• Consider alternatives including the SWPL right-of-way and complete undergrounding.</li> <li>• Concerned about EMF, reliability, fire, and impact to viewsheds, community character, and property values.</li> <li>• Biased, incomplete information has been circulating in favor of the project.</li> <li>• Urges project team to use independent biologists instead of SDG&amp;E surveys.</li> </ul>
October 9, 2006	Elsa Chambers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about spoiling the beauty of the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.</li> <li>• Suggests putting the line underground within the Park.</li> </ul>
October 9, 2006	Laura Copic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lists non-wires alternatives including parking lot solar generation, peakers, in-area generation, demand-response metering, .</li> <li>• Feels that coastal link is unnecessary given related actions of Full Loop to SCE service territory; if built, it should be put under Highway 56, co-located with a potential third lane.</li> <li>• Existing transmission lines through Del Mar Mesa and Torrey Hills impact biological resources and urban residential land use.</li> <li>• References new technology to underground inexpensively and encourages as much undergrounding as feasible.</li> <li>• Suggests camouflaging of proposed towers and new technology to increase span width.</li> <li>• Mitigation for impacts related to wildfire may include providing additional emergency services.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 9, 2006	Mike and Jennifer Vildibill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see SDG&amp;E use existing roadways and rights of way to route power lines away from Scripps Ranch and Rolling Hills residences.</li> <li>• Presents four alternatives to alleviate impacts to Rolling Hills and Scripps Ranch area:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Scripps Poway Parkway to Pomerado Road to Miramar Road;</li> <li>— Use of land on periphery of Miramar Air Base;</li> <li>— Undergrounding along Route 56;</li> <li>— Undergrounding along Pomerado Road and Scripps Poway Parkway.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Impacts to public health and EMF, aesthetics, noise, and property values.</li> <li>• Finds the routing method to discriminate against their community by siting a high density of transmission infrastructure through residential land; SDG&amp;E failed to engage their community during the planning phase and did not return calls before agency intervention.</li> <li>• Proposed Project purpose is to connect Baja California generation to the Los Angeles demand center.</li> <li>• Attachments: Photo of existing lattice tower behind Rolling Hills residence.</li> </ul>
October 9, 2006	Robert & Agnes Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to recreational use of ABDSP.</li> <li>• Concerned about construction impacts on Kane Springs Road and Grapevine Canyon Trail .</li> <li>• At the scoping meeting, hotel staff incorrectly sent participants away, not recognizing the title of the meeting, SDG&amp;E's Sunrise Powerlink Project, but only the consultant.</li> <li>• Concerned about impact to long-eared owls at Tamarisk Grove Campground.</li> </ul>
October 10, 2006	Albert & Korene Barron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favors the proposed route because Anza-Borrego Desert State Park is the least populated area.</li> </ul>
October 10, 2006	Alex Hoefer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owner of Broken Oak Ranch.</li> <li>• Concerned about impacts to the historical and cultural resources, agricultural land use, landscape character of the San Felipe Valley and surrounding public lands.</li> <li>• Concerned about visual impacts, increased potential of fire, and ground scarring.</li> <li>• Encourages pursuit of routing and underground alternatives</li> <li>• Attachment: Maps and photos of Broken Oak Ranch and affected area.</li> </ul>
October 10, 2006	Gregory Courson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that solar generation cannot withstand the physical desert environment and will fail, leading to visual and biological impacts.</li> </ul>
October 10, 2006	Mike and Jennifer Vildibill (second letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests an underground alternative between MPs 139.1 and 139.9 to mitigate impacts to Rolling Hills and Scripps Ranch communities: transition to underground on Pomerado Road near Legacy Road, run north in the road ROW until Scripps Poway Parkway; continue west underground in Scripps Poway Pkwy ROW; transition to overhead west of Sunshine Peak Court. Both transitions are sited where existing overhead lines cross the road ROW.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E did not involve Rolling Hills Community in routing to same extent as areas along the proposed underground segments.</li> <li>• Adding a 230 kV line to an existing 437 kV corridor presents cumulative health impact from EMF, unsightliness, noise, negative impact to property values.</li> <li>• Attachment: Maps of suggested alternative.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 10, 2006	Sandra Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property owners along Tubb Canyon were not notified about the Proposed Project or alternatives.</li> <li>• Suggests that lines go underground, or co-locate along I-8 or other "busy areas."</li> <li>• LEAPS can be part of the a No Project Alternative to avoid impacts to visual resources and is also a cumulative project.</li> </ul>
October 11, 2006	Ken Wright	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favors in-area, clean generation.</li> <li>• Wants to see an upgrade of existing power infrastructures.</li> <li>• Utilize the existing pathways such as Green Path or I-80.</li> </ul>
October 11, 2006	Sandra Burnaman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts to rural landscape character, aesthetics, flora, and fauna.</li> <li>• Favors energy efficiency programs in urban areas. Wants to see a route that avoids the backcountry, Borrego Springs, Ocotillo Wells, and Anza-Borrego Desert State Park altogether.</li> <li>• Concerned about visual impacts to Kane Springs Rd.</li> <li>• Concerned about the impacts to aerial firefighters.</li> </ul>
October 11, 2006	Andrew Sefkow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commenter believes ratepayers prefer to spend on renewable, distributed, locally-generated power rather than fossil fuel generation and transmission infrastructure. References the California Solar Initiative and provides generation estimates using the Proposed Project budget.</li> <li>• If a wires project is approved, favors undergrounding through Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve.</li> </ul>
October 12, 2006	Donald Armentrout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urges analysis of placement along existing corridors on BLM land.</li> <li>• Objects to potential import of electricity from unregulated power plants in Mexico</li> </ul>
October 12, 2006	Robert & Margaret Barelmann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the application process in which alternatives are submitted in addition to the proposed route because it involves more property owners and reinforces a sense of need.</li> <li>• Proposed 500 kV segment and substation are evidence of related actions extending transmission elsewhere.</li> <li>• Stirling technology may not be available when the project is scheduled to come online.</li> <li>• Objects to routing through ABDSP.</li> </ul>
October 12, 2006	Tom & Laura Mauro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request lines go underground in the Scripps Ranch area to preserve community character, since the Rancho Peñasquitos and Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve lines are proposed underground.</li> </ul>
October 13, 2006	Edward Huffman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to and inconsistency with the purpose of public lands in eastern San Diego County.</li> <li>• This project is a step toward infrastructure development in other northern counties.</li> <li>• Favors an alternative along the U.S.-Mexican border or SWPL.</li> </ul>
October 13, 2006	Murray Burnaman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to visual resources and private property in Ocotillo Wells and recreational access to Kane Springs Road.</li> <li>• Favors alternative routes.</li> </ul>
October 14, 2006	Dwight & Cara Baker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about Central Link impacts to visual resources and community.</li> <li>• Favors underground alternative.</li> </ul>
October 14, 2006	Rebecca Falk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests adopting policy of reimbursing homeowners for surplus energy generated by their solar panels.</li> <li>• Attachment: Washington Post news article on Canadian solar incentives policy.</li> </ul>
October 14, 2006	Email: nbild@msn.com	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests underground option for the entire length of the project.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 14, 2006	Sherry Kempin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suspects the main project purpose is to import power from Mexico, rather than access renewable generation.</li> <li>• Favors local power generation.</li> <li>• Concerned about environmental impacts to Anza-Borrego Desert State Park and impacts to viewsheds.</li> </ul>
October 15, 2006	Geoff Mack	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed Project is vulnerable to various hazards due to its consolidated design. Favors solar power, local power generation, and other alternative programs because of distributed risk and because California has been the nation's leader in environmental regulation. References the Million Solar Roofs Initiative.</li> <li>• Concerned about general impacts to community and environment.</li> </ul>
October 15, 2006	Celia Lawley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts to Engelmann Oaks and California Oaks which can be found along Julian Highway.</li> <li>• Concerned about impacts to golden and bald eagles.</li> <li>• Favors incentives for rooftop solar generation.</li> <li>• Value of visual resources and character of undeveloped landscapes outweighs CAISO's evaluation of economic benefit of the project.</li> </ul>
October 16, 2006	Myrna Wosk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts to Imperial Valley air quality.</li> <li>• Imperial Valley substation is linked to poorly regulated Mexican power plants and will draw power from these resources.</li> <li>• Northern location of proposed substation indicates intent of interconnection to counties north of San Diego.</li> <li>• Recommends in-basin and renewable generation.</li> <li>• Attachment: map entitled "Imperial Valley–Central-Serrano/Valley."</li> </ul>
October 16, 2006	Nick Criss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Borrego Valley route would cross his Tubb Canyon property, an event not predicted in his due diligence before purchasing the parcel. This alternative would permanently preclude his intended residential use of the property and he will take legal action to recover financial losses if this route is approved.</li> </ul>
October 16, 2006	Rosie Schwab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the project as proposed and supports alternatives analysis. Asks why scoping meeting was not held in Boulevard.</li> </ul>
October 16, 2006	Todd Saier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urges undergrounding of proposed and existing lines in Torrey Hills.</li> </ul>
October 17, 2006	Jeff Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts to visual resources, agricultural land use, and residents that exist in western Imperial County.</li> <li>• Project conflicts with military fly zone restrictions.</li> <li>• Recommends multiple lower voltage lines with undergrounding on public land only, possibly between the proposed and western routes of the Desert Link.</li> </ul>
October 17, 2006	Joseph Henseler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that alternatives, such as solar, be evaluated as non-wires alternatives.</li> </ul>
October 17, 2006	Kurt Rasmussen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes an alternative route through Julian Highway and Banner Grade Road near Volcan Mountain and Scissors Crossing because of impacts to visual resources and public safety.</li> </ul>
October 17, 2006	Matt Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views SDG&amp;E as a utility monopoly and urges the CPUC to join back-country residents in protecting the character of the land.</li> <li>• Concerned about impact to biological resources around Lake Henshaw, noise, aesthetics, and public safety.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 17, 2006	Dennis and Adele Delgado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distrusts SDG&amp;E communication with the public on project description, for example, in claiming the project uses public ROW while it actually crosses private lands.</li> <li>• Impacts to rural San Diego County character, tourism revenue, viewshed.</li> <li>• Interconnection to counties north of the project area is a foreseeable related action; redundant with Los Angeles plans to build the Green Path project.</li> <li>• Prefers alternatives to rate increase to pay for transmission construction.</li> <li>• Sempra's energy market manipulation destroyed businesses; references subsequent litigation.</li> <li>• Project conflicts with ABDSP mission and charter.</li> <li>• Distributed generation is less vulnerable to hazards including terrorist attack, lightening, and fire. Supports improvements to Encina and other existing power plants.</li> </ul>
October 18, 2006	Alan Leppke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes project's placement in the desert.</li> </ul>
October 18, 2006	Elaine Tulving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests a route running south from the Salton Sea geothermal area.</li> <li>• Supports the southern route. A lone transmission line in backcountry is vulnerable to hazards.</li> <li>• Questions the viability of related geothermal and solar generation technologies.</li> </ul>
October 18, 2006	Jeff & Kim Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Related Mexican power plants have poor occupational health and safety standards relative to those of the United States.</li> <li>• Suggests placing power lines underground and along freeways, for example, Highway 56, to reduce impacts including those to residential land use and increase construction accessibility.</li> </ul>
October 18, 2006	Judith Withers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commenter is concerned about location of substation due to impacts to cultural resources, recreation, landscape character, and designated wilderness around unincorporated communities in the Central Link.</li> <li>• Proposed Project increases the risk of wildfire in the Central Link and poses a safety hazard to existing military air traffic.</li> <li>• Conflicts with the San Diego Regional Energy Plan.</li> <li>• Related actions include generation in Mexico and transmission connection to cities north of San Diego.</li> <li>• Supports distributed renewable generation as an alternative to avoid global warming impacts.</li> <li>• Recalls SDG&amp;E's participation in energy market manipulation.</li> <li>• Attachment: Union-Tribune article; photos of project area and Pines Fire damage.</li> </ul>
October 18, 2006	Kurt LeGarde	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commenter prefers the Proposed Project over alternatives near Banner Grade, Volcan Mountain, and Scissors Crossing areas because of impacts to wildfire and aesthetic and biological resources.</li> </ul>
October 18, 2006	Rajesh & Joyce Dias	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed Project will cause financial hardship by decreasing residential property value.</li> <li>• Project will impact recreational use of Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve.</li> <li>• Concerned about EMF impacts to children's health.</li> <li>• Suggests underground alternative along Highway 56 to avoid residences.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 18, 2006	Jan Krogh-Haugley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction and maintenance impacts to biological and visual resources.</li> <li>• Impacts to wildfire and air traffic.</li> <li>• Related renewable generation is untested or may impact seismic activity and water resources.</li> <li>• Impacts from related Mexican power plants.</li> <li>• In-area generation is sufficient and inexpensive.</li> </ul>
October 19, 2006	Joyce Peterson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes alternative routes C and D; Calculates 12% of total homes in/around Descanso will be lost due to construction of Sunrise Powerlink.</li> </ul>
October 19, 2006	Ray Mitchell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts to viewsheds and television and radio reception.</li> <li>• Favors underground alternatives.</li> </ul>
October 19, 2006	Renata Di Battista	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about increased fire risk, impact to visual and biological resources, and damage to archeological sites in ABDSP.</li> <li>• Concerned about impact to special-listed species.</li> <li>• Favors further research on renewable generation.</li> </ul>
October 19, 2006	Robert Staehle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests SDG&amp;E to describe its method of evaluating potential routes.</li> <li>• Requests certain statistics regarding impacts to visual resources, residences, noise levels, recreational and open land, and hydrology.</li> <li>• Requests further assessment of Stirling engines technology and public disclosure of SDG&amp;E plans for related generation if Stirling is offline.</li> <li>• Requests probability assessment of the of a terrorist attack on the Proposed Project in comparison with one on each non-wires alternative.</li> <li>• Suggests certain behavioral energy efficiency alternatives as well as distributed solar generation. Requests probability assessment of impacts on aircraft and wildfire.</li> <li>• Requests extension of scoping and outreach to property owners along the proposed and alternative routes.</li> </ul>
October 19, 2006	Shannon Davis & William Davis, Jr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts to wildlife and habitat.</li> <li>• Local terrain on SDG&amp;E's D Alternative is poorly accessible for construction.</li> <li>• Concerned that private property will be taken by eminent domain or purchased at SDG&amp;E's prices.</li> <li>• Increased impacts to wildfire.</li> </ul>
October 19, 2006	Victor & Mary Levine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential, undocumented health impacts resulting from EMF.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Audrie & Steven Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-wires alternatives include conservation, energy efficiency, local renewable energy, and upgrading existing transmission lines. This avoids impacts to public lands and residences.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Charlie Kurth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes conservation and renewable energy should be investigated as possible alternatives.</li> <li>• Concerned about impacts to biological recreational, cultural, and visual resources.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Constance Hughes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to recreation at ABDSP, air quality, acid rain, environmental justice at sites of generation, visual resources, wildfire, and emergency vehicle traffic.</li> <li>• Suggests alternatives including co-location with SWPL to avoid impacts to ABDSP, peaking generation, and federal designated corridors.</li> <li>• Best available technology alternatives may achieve project objectives without a new line or may increase transmission efficiency.</li> <li>• Related actions include generation the project would access, regardless of jurisdiction.</li> <li>• Cumulative and environmental justice impacts of transmission to counties north of San Diego.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests further evaluation of undergrounding as an alternative.</li> <li>• Recalls SDG&amp;E's participation in energy market manipulation.</li> <li>• Questions the reliability and reported operational cost of long-distance transmission lines.</li> <li>• Proposed Project may be inconsistent with certain policies .</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Dayon Higgins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commenter's home runs parallel to SR-56 on figure 6B. This ROW was not disclosed on title when purchased 6 years ago.</li> <li>• Concerned about construction impacts to health and safety, in particular, asthma and valley fever.</li> <li>• Supports solar rooftop incentives to homeowners.</li> <li>• Attachment: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website on valley fever.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Eric Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts to biological recreational, cultural, and visual resources.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Glenda Kimmerly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impact to bald eagles.</li> <li>• Concerned about impact to line from Santa Ana winds.</li> <li>• Encourages further progress in state energy efficiency and rooftop solar and in-area generation as a non-wires alternative.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Gloria Silva	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transmission lines and generation sources were excluded from the reliability analysis; Requests better documentation and clarification of economic analysis, including projected savings and population growth.</li> <li>• Suggests an alternative along the border, co-located with a potential border fence, turning north along Highway 805. Avoids impacts to biological, visual, and cultural resources on public land.</li> <li>• Growth-inducing impacts of providing infrastructure to improve reliability throughout southern California, outside the SDG&amp;E service area. SDG&amp;E's use of CAISO reliability analysis implies this is a project objective.</li> <li>• Cumulative impacts of the Green Path project.</li> <li>• Potential health impacts from EMF.</li> <li>• Related renewable generation may be competitively distributed by LADWP and other utilities, may fail to produce the estimated power, or may be unsynchronized with the Proposed Project schedule.</li> <li>• Requests state renewable energy goals to be included in the evaluation of alternatives.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Jennifer Voss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project will impact designated open space camping areas, including Tamarisk Grove Campground and Yaqui Primitive Camp, in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.</li> <li>• Project will impact wildlife travel corridors for in ABDSP.</li> <li>• Impacts to State Wilderness Areas. Proposed Project would set a precedent by reversing Wilderness designation.</li> <li>• Project will cause destruction of culturally significant sites in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.</li> <li>• Permanent impacts to visual and recreational resources.</li> <li>• EMF and noise impacts to visitors and wildlife.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	John Oldson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed project may be inconsistent with ABDSP policy.</li> <li>• Believes that SDG&amp;E's non-wires alternatives evaluation is inaccurate. Lists several alternatives.</li> <li>• Concerned that CPUC has relied too much on SDG&amp;E for alternatives analysis.</li> <li>• Requests extension of project schedule.</li> <li>• Requests investigation on which agencies should be responsible for utilities permitting and regulation.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
October 20, 2006	Kathleen & David Rubenson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favors co-location with I-8.</li> <li>• Impacts to recreational and visual resources in rural San Diego County, including the CNF.</li> <li>• Concerned that the low population density is resulting in a lack of substantial protests.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Martin Wang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to residents near Park Village Road and children at Park Village Elementary School. The proposed route through Park Village Road is inappropriate given the existing residential land use.</li> <li>• Requests clarification of methodology for route selection, environmental analysis, and mitigation monitoring.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Michael Voss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bifurcation of the application process may lead to incomplete environmental analysis.</li> <li>• Questions purpose and need for project, referencing various general proceedings filings.</li> <li>• Doubts that customers will save money by producing power in Arizona and transporting it to San Diego.</li> <li>• Impacts to visual and biological resources.</li> <li>• Proposed Project would set a precedent for developing public lands.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Peggy Hurley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests a non-wires alternative in which SDG&amp;E leases solar panels and rents rooftop space with a goal of 20% solar power by 2010.</li> <li>• Generation in Mexico is a related action.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Pippin Schupbach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed Project would set a precedent for taking public parks.</li> <li>• Impacts to visual, biological, and cultural resources.</li> <li>• Feels that money can be better spent on conservation and renewable energy programs.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Mike Hussey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-term impacts to visual resources in ABDSP and along Highway 78.</li> <li>• Concerned about impacts to air quality and impact assessment in the Ocotillo Wells area.</li> <li>• Long-term impacts to biological resources, including wildlife behavior</li> <li>• Concerned that the cultural and paleontological resources are not mentioned in the Desert Link of the PEA.</li> <li>• Concerned that ground failures from seismic activity could occur from digging and filling.</li> <li>• Impacts to public health and safety</li> <li>• Construction impacts to water and wells]</li> <li>• Project will cause permanent preclusion of and disturbance to existing land uses.</li> <li>• Project will create corona noise, which carries farther in the desert than elsewhere.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Patrick Shaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends an alternative south of Holly Oaks Ranch.</li> <li>• Terrain along this alternative is more accessible than the proposed route.</li> <li>• Proposed Project will have long-term impacts on public health in the populated Holly Oaks Ranch community.</li> </ul>
October 20, 2006	Lori L. Paul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of Borrego Valley Alternative to visual and biological resources adjacent to ABDSP, private property, town of Borrego Springs.</li> <li>• Impacts to local revenue from tourism.</li> <li>• Impacts to air traffic can cause outage and wildfire.</li> <li>• Reliability concerns about seismic activity, increased burden on Imperial Valley Substation.</li> <li>• Alternative along SWPL would experience greater security and safety from air traffic. Wildfire risk is mitigable.</li> </ul>



---

**Appendix C-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests additional time for biological surveys.</li> <li>• Project is expensive.</li> <li>• Schedule of project and related generation is unrealistic.</li> <li>• Inadequate noticing of property owners in the Tubb Canyon and Ocotillo Wells areas.</li> <li>• Inaccessibility of project staff and project maps.</li> <li>• Scoping meetings in the Borrego Springs region have occurred in the season of lowest residence. Recommends scheduling for March.</li> <li>• Discriminatory siting of project in backcountry and public lands.</li> <li>• Alternatives include distributed, renewable generation.</li> </ul>
October 21, 2006	Katalina Prince	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irrevocable ramifications associated with the project.</li> <li>• Need to acknowledge alternative to "link" and the social, psychological, environmental, mental, and economical damages the would be incurred.</li> <li>• Encourage SDG&amp;E to pursue solar design and alternative energy systems.</li> </ul>
October 21, 2006	Stephani Schupbach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to recreational values in ABDSP including remoteness and accessibility from urban centers</li> <li>• Construction impacts to biological resources</li> <li>• Investigate and publicize findings on renewable generation in ABDSP</li> </ul>
October 21, 2006	John Raifsnider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Proposed Project will destroy aesthetic, biological, and community resources.</li> <li>• The Proposed Project is contrary to emerging clean generation and distribution technology.</li> <li>• Suggests alternatives including solar, geothermal, wind and ocean wave technology.</li> </ul>
October 23, 2006	Robert & Margaret Barelmann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that native plants in the desert will not recover from soil compaction and increased project-related traffic.</li> </ul>
October 26, 2006	Eduardo and Carmen Estitt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EMF impacts to residents near Park Village Road in Rancho Peñasquitos.</li> </ul>
November 10, 2006	Barnaby Davidson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values and urges protection of the biological, visual, and cultural resources in Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.</li> <li>• EMF may affect humans and wildlife.</li> </ul>