

PAGE 1 OF 4

COMMENTS MUST BE EMAILED OR FAXED DUE TO THE 10/08/07 HOLIDAY!

Date OCT. 6, 2007

Billie Blanchard, Sunrise Powerlink Project Manager

California Public Utilities Commission

Lynda Kastoll, Project Manager, Bureau of Land Management

505 Van Ness Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

[www.bcb@cpuc.gov](http://www.bcb.cpuc.gov) sunrise@aspenerg.com / Fax # 1-866-711-3106

RE: Sunrise Powerlink and Modified Route D Alternative

Dear Ms. Blanchard and Ms. Kastoll,

It is my understanding that the public comment deadline has been extended to accept comments received by October 8, 2007. Please include my comments in the official record for the Sunrise Powerlink project and include my name on the list to receive notification when the Draft EIR/EIS is released for public comment.

Modified Route D Alternative, which interconnects with either the I-8 route, or the previously eliminated B-C route along the existing 69 kV powerline, both of which impact our rural community of Boulevard and many others, appears to have as many negative impacts to private properties, public lands and sensitive lands as the other ill-advised routes for this unneeded and unwanted project. I strongly oppose Modified Route D and all the other proposed routes, including the preferred and all the alternate routes. Please refer to SDG&E's own comments submitted to the CPUC on Modified Route D Alternative, dated June 14, 2007, for a list of some of Modified Rt. D's negative impacts. I agree with SDG&E on those impacts. The potential for new high power transmission lines, on this and other routes, to trigger fires is also a major concern for our high-risk area.



However, I strongly disagree with SDG&E on the need for the Sunrise Powerlink project itself. Sunrise will compromise San Diego's Regional Energy Strategy to increase the in-basin power generation to 75% in 2020. I support alternative goals of energy conservation through education and the use of more efficient insulation and equipment, upgrading the existing grid to eliminate bottlenecks, using energy generated at an upgraded and more efficient Encina Power Plant and a replacement for the South Bay Facility, implementing an aggressive solar roof campaign including commercial projects like Kyocera's solar tree parking lot and UCSD's solar roofing projects, and moving energy from appropriately located renewable

PAGE 2 of 4.

projects on the existing South West Powerlink when the current long-term energy contract runs out in several years.

Currently, renewable energy from Imperial Valley is being transmitted to SCE and PGE via the IID transmission grid. Ormatt just signed a deal to move new geothermal energy sold to SCE via the IID grid. IID has stated they have up to 1,000 MW of capacity to move more renewable energy north with just a few minor and affordable upgrades to their existing infrastructure. Overall, this would provide a more diversified distribution of energy, without having to invest in hundreds of miles of obnoxious and vulnerable powerlines through rural communities and sensitive lands. It would also save the ratepayers from bearing the burden of a \$1.5 billion dollar boondoggle. I also strongly resent having our rural communities bulldozed, and our property values slashed to accommodate an old school energy highway that connects to urban users in L.A. and which, according to the Utilities Consumer Action Network, represents almost \$800 million in profits to SDG&E and their shareholders.

Sincerely,

 name
 address

PAGE 4 of 4.

Under grounding the entire project was discussed and not excused as being a viable alternative, if the project is approved. Speaking from my own point of view I would be more than happy to pay an additional \$20-30.00 per month to keep this project free of the landscape for this and future generations impacted by it. Under grounding is required in other parts of the word.(Scandinavia)

The need for this project was questioned at our meeting.

In closing, a more effective, not yet developed form of carrying electricity from point A to B other than simply stringing large wire cables on tall metal towers creating visual pollution and possible health ramifications for generations, should be investigated together with not allowing any additional transmission lines in the most southern sector.

Very truly yours,

Gary C. Hoyt

Cc: Diane Jacob, Supervisor Second District.

County Administration Center
1600 Pacific Highway
San Diego, Ca. 92101

PAGE 3 of 4

October 6, 2007

Billie Blanchard, CPUC
Lynda Kastroll, BLM
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery St. Suite 935
San Francisco, Ca. 94104-3002

Re: Sunrise Power Link

Ms. Blanchard and Kastroll,

Apparently, you are examining the possibility of running another 500KV overland power transmission line through our community of Boulevard, close to the Mexican border.

My name is Gary Hoyt a member of the Boulevard Sponsor Group, that complies the general consensus of the local population and makes suggestions to regulatory commissions such as yours with the thoughts and findings from our meetings.

Our last meeting was held Thursday, Oct. 5. Some unique suggestions and concerns were brought forward by our community and members of other communities regarding the proposed 500KV power link.

One member of our community brought to our attention that an existing 500KV overland transmission line is currently running through his property. His **wife is dying of bone marrow cancer** possibly from the exposure of the 1-300 milligauss she has been exposed to for years from the existing 500KV electrical transmission line.

There were also standard concerns you have heard before, concerns that I will not share with you, standard objections but not beyond considering planning your project.

Our communities uniqueness is we are supporting one existing 500kv power line in close proximity to Mexico. Mexican blazes many times are simply left to burn themselves out that could easily spread to the U.S. and your two, one additional proposed, 500kv lines.

It could interrupt electrical usage to thousands of S.D.G.E.s' customers for *extended* periods of time in the event of a catastrophe, costing S.D.G.E. and users large amounts of money for reconstruction.

Running 500kv lines parallel to one another should be considered counterproductive and not in the users best interest.