

From: Vwdan0806@aol.com

To: sunrise@aspeneg.com

Sent: Fri Feb 22 14:43

Subject: Fwd: Comments on the EIR/EIS Proposed Sunrise Powerlink Project

I have reviewed the EIR/EIS for Sunrise Powerlink Project, and I have three major concerns that may not be covered by the document.

1. The EIR/EIS has extensive data on fires over the past 50 years. Using that data to see how specific routes would have fared over that same period of time. For example we know that "Southwest Powerlink" has been shut down over 20 times in the past few years, would the Modified Alternate D portion of the I-8 route have been shut down just as the "Southwest Powerlink." I am suggesting that it would. If one would go off air so would the other, in most cases. This poses a big reliability concerns for me, and many others. By putting two major feeders in close proximity to one another do we cause the total Powerlink network to be vulnerable to failure more often that it has to be.
2. Any of the Southern Routes over taxes an already economically strapped area with a second link line. This looks like hindering the poor to benefit the wealthy. Socially it could appear this plan is a path of least resistance. Often times the under privileged do not have the means to fight large business.
3. If, the worst case scenario happen, I would suggest that under-grounding the Powerlink is the best solution to minimize the impact on the surrounding population. I am also aware that this may be too costly, and other means may be necessary to make the over all project more acceptable to local inhabitants. Any time the line is near a populated area like the Buckman Springs, and Hyde Park Lane the "latticework" overhead structures should be scrapped and "single concrete poles" should be used instead.

The above concerns along with the reasons that are personal, move me to support a combination of the "Non-wire renewable alt." and "Non-wires all source alt."

Dan Lawrence

P.O. Box 370

Campo, CA 91906

Home: (619)478-2327

Cell: (619)972-3681