

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

Date	From	Comments
Private Citizens		
November 27, 2006	S. Ruckdashel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved to Descanso to get away from freeway noise. • Oppose the Project as it will force her out of her dream home. • Requests full consideration to be given to alternatives. • Urges Commissioner Grueneich to reject SDG&E's Sunrise Powerlink project and not to impact Descanso.
December 15, 2006	Denis James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that once permission is granted for the SRPL, up to six more lines will be added in the same corridor. • Story of line expansion in a December 24 article in the Ramona Sentinel. • Urges the lead agencies to reject the proposal.
December 23, 2006	Norman Bild	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the SRPL will hinder firefighting capability by making it impossible for aircraft to navigate near the transmission route.
January 6, 2007	Annette Parsons and Jim Clover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose siting any new utility towers near any of the Pacific Crest Trail, particularly following for 10 miles in the San Felipe Hills, as proposed. • Pacific Crest Trail is already threatened by impacts from development and off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. • Access roads for the Proposed Project would increase OHV use in previously inaccessible areas and would increase impacts to the trail's character and physical environment, including soil and vegetation. • Value the few opportunities to travel away from development; recreation in a natural setting is important to preserve mental health. • If the Project is built, cross the trail perpendicularly only.
January 10, 2007	Diane Greening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Proposed Project. • Project would destroy visual resources in ABDSP and change the character of Peñasquitos Canyon. • Impacts to noise in ABDSP and Peñasquitos Canyon. • Construction impacts to habitat include introduction of invasive species. • Project would carry power from generators in Mexico that create more air pollution than those permitted in America. • Supports in-area generation, in particular, solar modules on parking structures in Sorrento Valley.
January 28, 2007	Mary Westmoreland Manseau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the proposed transmission line corridor is in a flash flood zone, and that mitigation to protect transmission towers from flash floods would have serious impacts on adjacent properties. Details are provided about the flash flood history of Coyote Wash.
January 29, 2007	Constantine G. Pappas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the property owner of the southwest corner parcel at the intersection of San Vicente Road and Wildcat Canyon Road, Ramona. • Objects to the transition of the 230 kV line from underground to overhead located at San Vicente Road just west of Wildcat Canyon Road, then continuing overhead across San Vicente Road to the north side. • Requests that this line be underground because the basis for elimination of the underground alternative is erroneous. The segment is not in the Barnett Ranch Open Space Preserve as stated, nor are there biological resources along the segment. • Suggests that the 230 kV tower as proposed will adversely affect the development of the property, which is presently zoned residential, one unit per two acres.

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

Date	From	Comments
January 30, 2007	Andrew Sefkow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protests the Sunrise Powerlink Transmission Project, and urges the CPUC deny SDG&E's application. • Opposition stems not from NIMBYism, but from the belief that public money is better spent on renewable, distributed, locally-generated power rather than miles of fragile power lines. • Suggests that the new cost savings estimates make the case against the Project stronger, and expects the ratepayer savings to evaporate in the end. Believes that foregoing the small savings is a small price to pay to preserve a state park, a city preserve, countless scenic corridors and neighborhoods, and ensure electric reliability for San Diego. • Suggests that gas-fired power plants and miles of environmentally destructive power lines are 19th Century technology, and believes that SDG&E will not build renewable power out in the desert. • Suggests that with the same \$1.3 billion, incentives could be provided to install solar panels within the City of San Diego resulting in the same number of megawatts of electricity and averting the need for power lines. Calculates that the \$3.2 billion California Solar Initiative will result in a cost per MW of just over \$1 million, and at the same rate, SDG&E's \$1.3 billion could generate over 1,200 MW of power, which is more than what the Sunrise Powerlink is even capable of carrying while producing no new power. • Opposes new power lines, especially through Los Peñasquitos Canyon, just so a private company can increase its bottom line.
January 31, 2007	Mark Polinsky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is vehemently opposed to any Sunrise Powerlink proposal, especially anything that goes anywhere near Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP).
February 1, 2007	Thomas M. Larkin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that lead agencies reevaluate the applicant's project objectives, which, as stated, predetermine feasibility of alternatives. Requests lead agencies revise Basic Project Objectives to the following: maintain reliability of power; maximize local energy production; minimize construction of new towers outside of existing corridors; minimize shareholder costs; minimize new construction and adverse environmental effects; maximize non-wires and system solutions; develop and encourage local solutions to meet the State's renewable source mandate; and utilize existing transmission lines to deliver renewables from the Imperial Valley. • Refutes logic that the "need" for future 230 kV circuits from CE Substation is "uncertain", because if it were the case, then there is no need for the 500 kV portion of the Project in the first Place. • Claims that applicant is improperly segmenting the environmental review process, and that this segmentation leads to a piecemeal approach that ignores whole-Project effects. Believes that each step of this flawed process limits the range of analysis and pre-ordains the next approval. Provides detailed examples. • Refutes the logic of eliminating the Valley Rainbow alternative. Believes that this alternative should be compared to the SRPL in the EIR/EIS. • Refutes logic of discussion on page 23 of Scoping Report, which rejects alternatives on the basis that they don't meet the applicant's need for additional import capacity, since import capacity is not a stated Project objective. • Requests inclusion in the EIR/EIS a combined preferred alternative that includes in-area all-source generation, LEAPS or Valley-Rainbow, and use of existing SWPL to transmit Imperial Valley renewables. • Believes that EIR/EIS schedule is unrealistic and fails to provide enough time to fairly evaluate a new range of alternatives. Suggests postponement for 6 months so as not to hurry through important analyses.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 2, 2007	Jaqueline Ayer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends that Figure 10 be re-drafted to show the following: the existing Talega/Escondido line as well as the Escondido and Talega Substations since they are part of the LEAPS alternative, the Serrano Substation since it is part of the LEAPS alternative, and the “Greenpath” alternatives that CAISO is pursuing. • Comments that the summary report eliminates the Serrano/Valley Central 500 kV alternative citing substantial impacts, even though nearly all of it crosses urban and rural areas and probably uses existing corridors while crossing only five miles of Forest Service land. In contrast the report trivializes impacts of the LEAPS TE/VS line, which will forge an entirely new 30-mile corridor through pristine National Forest land. Believes that this uneven discussion of impacts is wholly inconsistent with CEQA and NEPA requirements.
February 4, 2007	Susan Carnevale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is opposed to the Project, particularly the alignment that goes through ABDSP and other environmentally sensitive areas. • Decries the rapidly disappearing natural areas in San Diego County, and believes that the Project will create a visual blight and potential fire hazard in ABDSP. Believes that going forward with the project is treating our parks as placeholders for future development rather than protected areas. • Believes that conservation of existing energy resources and exploration and development of alternative energy sources should be implemented before expanding traditional energy sources, and urges the lead agencies to consider options other than the Proposed Project.
February 4, 2007	Terry Frewin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a frequent visitor of ABDSP, and is strongly opposed to the Proposed Project. • Requests avoidance ABDSP and designated Wilderness areas.
February 4, 2007	David and Margaret Molthen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are landowners on Miller Mountain, and are adamantly opposed to LEAPS Project 11858 as it would impact the pristine nature on their property.
February 4, 2007	Patricia Stuart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes any transmission route for the Project. • Believes that the applicant ought to focus on available power rather than on expected thermal plants from the Valley. Suggests that the applicant also support solar power systems. • Warns the lead agencies that the applicant has bigger plans than simply providing power to San Diego as suggested, and requests that the agencies put a stop to the Project.
February 5, 2007	Alex Bourd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the segment of the Project along Park Village Road. Believes that the proposed underground line is too close to Park Village Elementary School, and expresses concern about EMI exposure to children.
February 5, 2007	Bill Hoffman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the only reason for the applicant to run the Project line through ABDSP is to transfer its costs to the citizen and the environment. Believes that this is an unacceptable practice.
February 5, 2007	Grazyna Krajewska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that in-basin solar generation would be competitive with power delivered from the desert. References report by Butler et al. • Suggests that using many short power lines rather than one very long line and diversifying the energy portfolio both serve to improve reliability.
February 5, 2007	Susan P. Meyer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recounts a visit to the Superstition Mountains in Arizona where power lines litter the landscape, turning it into an ugly place. • Pleads with the lead agencies to protect ABDSP, which is a sacred place to her, so that future generations may understand what beauty means. • Believes that we ought to show the rest of the country that we have integrity by protecting that which we love and of which we are proud.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 5, 2007	Martha Sullivan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that the lead agency oppose construction of the Project through ABDSP. • Believes that the Project would cause irrevocable environmental damage to a place that provides comfort in an age of rampant industrialization and materialism. • Believes that the source of power for the proposed line will ultimately be unregulated Mexicali.
February 5, 2007	Elena Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports only the non-wire alternatives, and is firmly opposed to the Proposed Project. • Believes that the reliability concerns that the applicant claims are insufficient to warrant the destruction of open spaces. • Believes that the applicant's energy solution is prehistoric, and requests consideration of future-oriented energy technologies.
February 5, 2007	Carol A. Wiley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expresses strong opposition to the Proposed Project, especially because of its routing through ABDSP, sensitive areas, and wilderness. • Believes that the reason for designating natural areas as State Parks and wilderness must be honored. • Believes the Project is unnecessary and asks the lead agencies to oppose it.
February 6, 2007	Steve and Betty Ball	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recount a family camping experience in ABDSP the prior month, on which the Proposed Project route was followed. Appreciate the long-distance views in the park, and note that the Project would have negatively impacted the pleasure they experienced on that drive. • Believe that siting a power line through a long-established State Park and through the Cleveland National Forest will have a negative impact on the visual beauty of those places. • Suggest pursuing alternatives to the route and alternatives to a power line such as renewable power sources, and oppose power lines in State Parks and National Forests.
February 6, 2007	Alanson G. Burt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that the transmission line be run along the U.S.-Mexico border, then up the coast via underwater lines like those in Japan.
February 6, 2007	Aurele and Linda Gilleran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that the Project objective is not to deliver clean energy to nor meet the realistic energy needs of San Diego, but to provide Sempra access to cheap, fossil-based fuel in Mexico for ultimate delivery to the profitable LA basin energy market. • Support the Non-Wires Alternatives. Propose that the applicant invest an amount equivalent to the cost of the Proposed Project into a rebate/incentive program designed to promote in-basin all-source generation. The benefits of this program will be to achieve the publicly stated objectives of the SRPL, promote national security, lead to the return to public use of tens of thousands of square miles now devoted to power lines, support the Governor's State initiatives, and guarantee California's role as a leader in the innovation and production of green energy. • Urges agencies to reject the Proposed Project and to insist that only a non-fossil alternative be approved.
February 6, 2007	Roger Gornichec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observes that all of the special interest groups exhibit NIMBYism with regards to the SRPL. Observes further that historically, it is the most organized and most vocal groups whose interests prevails in decisions over projects of this magnitude. • Requests that the EIR/EIS Team recommend, and the Lead Agency approve, the best overall proposal, not the proposal most favored by the most organized and vocal special interest group.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 6, 2007	Roberta Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Requests no major lines be routed through Warners and Santa Ysabel in order to keep the backcountry pristine.
February 6, 2007	John B. Greenhalgh	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Believes that the line should be installed along the border because there are already lines there.• Finds it unfortunate that the big corporations only care about making billions and don't care about the impact on communities or the environment.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 6, 2007	Paul Jacobsen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that putting a power line through ABDSP would be a tragedy for the Park System, Julian, and the backcountry. Believes that it would set a dangerous precedent of industrial use of our dedicated parklands.
February 6, 2007	Sharon & Don Lynch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that the best alternative is no transmission line, but if a transmission line is approved, plead with the lead agencies to choose either the I-8 or the West of Forest Alternatives. • Believe that the lead agencies should not ignore the existence of already available electricity offered from a competitor with a South Power Station in Chula Vista. • Suggest an alternative to the rejected West of San Vicente Underground Alternative, which is an above-ground line between mile markers 122 and 126, that would spare the Holly Oaks community the health hazard and eyesore of a transmission line. Map included.
February 6, 2007	Adeline Mullen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Sierra Club's analysis of the Proposed Project. • Opposes a power line through ABDSP and Cleveland National Forest. • Urges lead agencies to reject the proposal.
February 6, 2007	Ted Mullen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Favors the Non-Wire Alternatives, and prefers publicly supported neighborhood PV stations. • Believes that transmitting solar power represents an environmental crime and is furthermore illogical based on the comparable solar potential in North County. • Suggests that the Attorney General look into why the Encino Power Station wasn't upgraded as necessary. • Believes that since California is the 7th largest global economy it should discontinue the use of Third World electrical distribution systems.
February 6, 2007	Berna Rasmussen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a former resident of San Diego, and expresses a deep affinity for ABDSP. • Was a founding member of the Sierra Club's Anza-Borrego Committee during the 60s, and was Membership secretary for the Desert Protective Council for many years. Recounts efforts by SDG&E during the late '60s to gain the Committee's support for a transmission line through ABDSP. • Opposed then and still opposes power transmission through the Park. Believes that de-designation of wilderness in a State Park should never be allowed for development of any kind.
February 6, 2007	Ryan, Maryann & Patrick Shaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are residents of Holly Oak Ranch. • Strongly disagree with the decision to reject the underground alternative at the Barnett Ranch Open Space Preserve. Believe that while construction may be damaging to the ecosystem initially, in the long run, the ecosystem could be restored. Believe that in this case, residents would not be at risk of possible health consequences of routing the power line adjacent to their community. • Support other options including south of the Barnett Preserve and the I-8 Alternative.
February 6, 2007	Heather Thomson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that, on all alternatives, cultural resources are non-renewable. Questions what mitigation is proposed for the countless archaeological sites that will undoubtedly be impacted?
February 6, 2007	Salvador Yepiz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests an underground line on Creelman or no line at all.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 7, 2007	Tim Cardoza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the need for an additional major transmission line to SD County has not been demonstrated. • Supports in-basin generation as it is less economically and socially costly. • Believes that San Diego County residents are nearly unanimously opposed to the Project. • Believes that the value of open spaces and homes far outweigh the potential benefit of this project.
February 7, 2007	Shannon Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finds the maps obscure and lacking in the detail property owners need to identify impacts. • Identifies endangered species and species of special concern along Alternate route D.
February 7, 2007	William E. Davis Jr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that Alternate route D north of Barret Lake Substation use Milk Ranch Road to reach Japutal Valley Road. • Expresses concern for his property if the existing 69 kV line is expanded. • Questions when California will join the other seven states that allow electrical customers to put power back into the system.
February 7, 2007	Glenn E. Hachadorian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expresses disappointment that Caltrans can reject a route alternative along SR 56 without reasonable consideration. • Notes that taxpayers have invested millions in the environmental impact analysis for this route, and they would like to leverage that investment by routing the coastal link along that route instead of through LPCP and the Rancho Peñasquitos residences. • Suggests that taxpayers should not have to pay twice for the impact analysis. • Requests that the SR 56 Alternative be reviewed at the highest levels of state government for consideration, including the Governor's Office.
February 7, 2007	Denis James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that allowing SDG&E to install underground wires would cause a very large traffic problem and would interfere with the mobility of emergency vehicles. Finds above-ground wires problematic because they interfere with helicopter access. • Supports augmentation of current transmission wires combined with installation of solar panels. • Believes that SDG&E's monopoly power and bottom-line motivation run counter to the needs of the ratepayers.
February 7, 2007	Barbara Kennerly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wonders if there might be a way to camouflage towers as trees if the transmission line is approved.
February 7, 2007	Sheryl Lynn Nielsen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes the Proposed Project is wrong. • Expresses concern over wildfire in Dehesa, Crest, and Harbison Canyon, having lost two homes in the 2003 Cedar fire.
February 8, 2007	Anonymous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows a map of existing high-voltage transmission lines from Mexicali power lines to the Imperial Valley Substation, and notes that the Proposed Project begins at this substation far from geothermal or solar future projects.
February 8, 2007	Shannon Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that the Cleveland NF 5-year plan be respected. Includes correspondence with Cleveland NF Supervisor Terrell. • Lists 4 rare and endangered species that would be impacted if Alternative D were to be approved. • Believes utilities compound the dangers in times of fire. • Opposes routes A, B, C, and D. • Believes that rural residents, who are at risk of losing their land with these alternatives, pay taxes and get fire-inspection burn permits to prevent fires and are therefore part of a healthy forest plan.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 8, 2007	Judy Haldeman	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supports LEAPS as a less expensive and less invasive alternative to the Project.
February 8, 2007	Laara K. Maxwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Requests that a wireless alternative be chosen for the sake of future generations.• Believes that transmission towers are equivalent to vandalism.
February 8, 2007	Adrian McGregor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expresses concern over the health effects of EMF, the risk of wildfire from high-voltage transmission lines, the electrical interference experienced in proximity to high-voltage lines, the noise pollution caused by transmission lines, and the effects of high-voltage lines on wildlife.
February 8, 2007	Rudy Monica	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opposes the Project, but if it must be built, only supports underground alternatives.
February 8, 2007	John Raifsnider	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supports Non-Wires Alternatives and No Project Alternative.• Believes that transmission lines represent 19th Century technology.
February 8, 2007	John Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses comments to BLM.• Is a resident of Leucadia where 2.5 miles of power lines were recently moved underground by SDG&E. Notes that this greatly enhances the aesthetics of the community, and expresses gratitude to SDG&E.• Is a Sempra shareholder, yet opposes putting power lines through ABDSP. Favors only underground alternatives, and requests that BLM revoke SDG&E's ROW for all power lines in the park.• Describes ABDSP as a sacred place where power lines would be out of place.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 8, 2007	Sam & Astrid Webb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that Frederick Olmsted's prophetic vision on protecting the fragile desert of ABDSP be honored by rejection of the Proposed Project.
February 8, 2007	Doug Wescott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the Project violates the intent and spirit of the California Wilderness designation and the State Parks mission. Believes that, since wilderness de-designation has never been done in the State, a terrible precedent will be set by doing so for this Project. • Opposes both above- and below-ground alternatives that pass through ABDSP, or any other State Park. • Requests that the lead agencies consider the importance of protecting natural habitats, such as those in ABDSP, at a time when suburban areas increasingly encroach upon them.
February 9, 2007	Jo Ann Bernard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes SRPL through ABDSP and the Santa Ysabel Valley. • Recalls fond memories of recreating in San Diego's backcountry. • Believes that it would be a travesty to desecrate a wilderness preserve with power lines and towers. • Expresses concern for future generations' enjoyment of two of San Diego's prize possessions: the mountains and the desert.
February 9, 2007	Denis James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions why residents of the region should pay to destroy the landscape, impair property values, and impede firefighting from the air and ground in order to receive power from Mexico, Yuma, and elsewhere. • Expresses disappointment that transmission is favored over PV because profits can only be made from transmission.
February 9, 2007	Susan Lopez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Project through San Diego County's backcountry. • Supports alternative routes along the I-8, I-15, and I-5 or along the U.S.-Mexico border, or in-area generation.
February 9, 2007	Mary L. G. Manning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Proposed Project, and recommends No-Wires alternatives. • Believes that the West of Forest Alternative will adversely affect the community of Harbison Canyon, a rural community with minimal fire-fighting capability and highly dependent on aerial firefighting clearance. • Understands that the West of Forest Alternative will undermine fire safety in the community.
February 9, 2007	Kathy Pierce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Project as the owner of an adversely affected property.
February 9, 2007	Kay Siebold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the project through her family's property near La Cresta. Expresses concern about change in the property's value.
February 9, 2007	Henry M Warzybok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the SRPL through ABDSP. • Favors a parallel to the SWPL south of the park. • Urges the lead agencies not to destroy the viewshed.
February 10, 2007	Carol Emerick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculates that if ratepayers spend \$200/month for electricity, the same investment could be made to install PV panels that would meet the same energy needs of San Diego. • Notes that among the benefits of this renewable alternative would be a return to ratepayers on their investment in the form of eliminating future electricity payments and the avoidance of blemishing ABDSP with power lines.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 10, 2007	Skip Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forewarns of the extreme potential for loss of life and property due to wildfire in the region of SWPL Alternatives D, I-8, and BCD designations D-32 through D-48. • Recounts the damages and loss of life from the Inaja, Cedar, and Boulder fires, and lists the communities that were affected. • Notes that the Santa Ana wind conditions exacerbate the potential for wildfire in these areas.
February 10, 2007	Skip Miller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that State Parks, National Forests, Wilderness Preserves, and Conservation Areas were intended to be natural open spaces not to provide avenues for future development. • Finds it unfair and unacceptable that urban developers and future urban residents can benefit at the expense of rural residents, property owners, ranchers and farmers, and recreationists. • Supports the non-wire alternatives as the only acceptable options to the Proposed Project, and believes that any required transmission ought to be carried out through existing infrastructure. • Believes that the cost of energy ought to be borne by the end user, not the natural environment.
February 10, 2007	Betty Moss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Proposed Project primarily because of the fire hazard they represent. • Expresses concern that there will be loss of local wells due to dynamiting during the construction of the transmission line. • Disapproves of the hours chosen for the Boulevard Scoping Meeting, as they conflicted with resident's work schedules. Notes that there were also not enough Comment Forms to accommodate all of the meeting attendees.
February 10, 2007	Whitney Nielsen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expresses concern that firefighting activities will be impeded by the transmission line. • Notes the beauty of Harbison Canyon, and opposes power lines through the area.
February 10, 2007	Mary L. Stewart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions the logic in protecting the wildlife resources of ABDSP over those of Boulevard since the same species occur in both places. • Opposes the transmission line through Boulevard, where there are people and property that will be devalued, and requests that the line go through ABDSP instead, where the wildlife won't mind. • Believes that the ideal route for the Project is to run the line completely through Mexico.
February 11, 2007	Mr. and Mrs. Kevin M. King	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urge the lead agencies to protect ABDSP and reject the Proposed Project. • Believe that the Proposed Project would degrade the viewshed and compromise the natural, cultural, and recreational resources of ABDSP. The resources that would be compromised by the transmission line include designated wilderness, Golden eagles, which have been reported in Grapevine Canyon, Bighorn sheep, whose critical habitat would be bisected, Native American archeological sites, the historic route of the Mormon Battalion, and the Butterfield Overland Mail line. • Claim that such degradation is unnecessary because the Project goals can be achieved in a less costly way with in-basin renewable generation and conservation and by upgrading the Green Path.
February 11, 2007	Bill Nielsen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the power line through beautiful Harbison Canyon. • Believes the SWPL route is the best option, but it should connect Miguel and Elliot Substations.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 11, 2007	Sandra Wood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the Proposed Project is unnecessary and dangerous to plant, animal, and human health. • Requests that SDG&E get out of rural California communities and stay out.
February 12, 2007	Gary C. Crocker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the Proposed Project is unnecessary. • Believes that the detrimental effects of the Project to the nearby communities are too great and that there are better solutions to meeting the region's power needs, including renewable technology.
February 12-23, 2007	Jane M. Abdel-Rahman Mohammed Abdel-Rahman Melody Arnold Valerie A. Bebout Claudia Burris Rachel Charter John & May Ellen Clapp Roberta L. Dawson Pat & Dave DeWitz Lisa M. Duclo Janice Florence Ron Florence Jr. Jeff Gerkins Wade Griffis Deirdre Hamlin Dana James Susan Krantz Laurie Larabee-Baker Suzanne M. Lutz Richard McCormick Johannes J. Merkler Shelly Moak Chris Nagel Andrea Smith Kimberly Sass Richard Sever Aaron & Jo Steele Alice M. Stolte Deb Vaca Ronald K. Williams Joshua Willis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the Proposed Project, and especially the West of Forest SWPL Alternative, due to its enormous negative environmental impact. • West of Forest Alternative goes through Sycuan Peak Ecological Preserve, within ½ mile of Crestridge Ecological Preserve, through designated open space, and private properties. • Express concern over the high fire risk of this route. Terrain is very steep, rocky and windy; fire would travel up and down steep mountain-sides; puts area at increased risk. Closest fire station is 8 miles away. • Concern with the health effects of EMF. Current laws say must be at 230 feet from schools and hospitals because of health concerns. These concerns exist in homes located near lines. • Property values would dramatically decrease for property owner's and anyone with a view of the lines, which can be seen for miles. • Favor the I-8 corridor if the Project must be built. This route has already been impacted by the freeway and rights of ways, and will have the least impact on private land owners. • Believe that the applicant has failed to prove that the Project is necessary, and support the Non-Wire alternatives. • Reliable wind and solar options are currently being used successfully. Would allow San Diego to act responsibly as opposed to continuing to rely on and produce dirty power in Mexico where there are few regulations. • Do not allow 1.4 billion dollars of taxpayer money to take over and destroy private and government lands forever and risk health of thousands. • Project makes no sense. Do the right thing and say no to SRPL.
February 12, 2007	Nathan & Adrianna Howe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As property owners who would lose their home if Alternative Route D is accepted, are opposed to this route and the SRPL Project generally. • Believe the project would be devastating to wildlife, cause increased pollution drainage into Barret Lake Reservoir, decrease property value, have health effects, promote continued reliance on fossil fuels, be grossly expensive, and be incapable of providing reliable energy due to unproven Stirling Engines and unforeseen forest fires.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 12, 2007	Edward P. Huffman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly objects to the proposal for the SRPL. • Has recommended in previous correspondence that the line be routed adjacent to the SWPL. • Believes that the Central South Alt Substation and the Proposed Central East Substation will forever alter the quality of San Diego's Backcountry. Based on the Notice, as many as six transmission lines will eventually cut across the landscape. • Believes that the project will eventually facilitate the transmission of power from Mexico to Los Angeles at the cost of the backcountry and for the benefit of Sempra and its stockholders.
February 12, 2007	Lillian & William Montejano	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form letter submitted, see comments above with the list of commenters. • No consideration for those with a view; never asked people across the canyon. Do not bring project to neighborhood, destroying property value.
February 13, 2007	Louise M. Phillips	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that, if SDG&E has \$1.4 billion to spend on meeting San Diego's power needs, installing PV systems throughout the county is a far better solution than a transmission line. • Notes that building unsightly power lines is a rather arcane method in light of the current state of solar power technology, and suggests that SDG&E may end up with a surplus of electricity to sell to other areas even when current customers have satisfied their peak needs in summer heat. • Notes that geothermal resources in Imperial County are not large enough for such a large voltage line, so the project is unwarranted.
February 13, 2007	Ragina Pitti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports only the No Project Alternative or the Non-Wire alternatives.
February 13, 2007	Miriam K. Plotkin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the lead agencies to support the Non-Wire alternative or the No Project Alternative.
February 14, 2007	Richard Durrell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recounts the severe damage caused by fires in the Harbison Canyon and Crest areas. • Believes that running the transmission line through Harbison Canyon and Crest would put these communities in extreme danger by limiting the ability to fight fire by air.
February 14, 2007	Anthony & Patricia Ulm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that the line will compromise aerial firefighting ability in rural San Diego County. • As victims of the 2003 Cedar fire, oppose the Project and support tax credits for alternative electrical generation.
February 14, 2007	Daniel V. Wise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes SDG&E is trying to put the blame on others for their own planning and economic inconsistencies. Points to the recently revised cost savings estimates as an example. • Supports the Resource Bundle Alternative. • Believes that the CPUC has a critical decision to make on whether it will guide the state into a new era of technological growth and progress by making it financially viable for independent power producers to enter into the electric energy market. • Provides details about the economic benefits of solar energy generation.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 15, 2007	Clare Billet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that there are no acceptable routes for the Sunrise Powerlink, even if SDG&E could afford to put the entire line underground. • Believes that routing a high-voltage line near residential areas or through irreplaceable natural areas are equally unacceptable alternatives. • Asserts that forcing communities to choose between protecting their quality of life and protecting the quality of their environment is a false choice that diverts our attention away from the real choice: between a transmission line and no transmission line. • Contends that the applicant ought to invest in local, decentralized, and sustainable energy solutions. • Believes that a no-wire solution will negate the infrastructure costs and efficiency losses of a transmission line. • Notes that centralized energy production and transmission poses an enormous homeland security risk that could be avoided with a local, decentralized solution. • Believes that negotiation between the applicant's consultants and state agencies over the routing of the line has been unacceptably inconsistent and represents a policy of bias. As an example, when Caltrans suggested that the SR 56 ROW route was impossible, the consultants discontinued pursuing this alternative, but when State Parks suggested that the ABDSP route was unacceptable, their opposition has been disregarded by the consultants.
February 15, 2007	John B Greenhalgh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that an above-ground line doesn't make sense. Supports an underground line, and believes that ratepayers should be charged \$0.50 per month in order to pay the additional cost of an underground line. • Believes that a unique part of California will be lost if an above-ground line is approved.
February 15, 2007	Lawrence Maxwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Project through ABDSP because it would be unprecedented in recent times in California to so directly encroach on the values of a park. • Urges the lead agencies to encourage conservation and renewable energy generation.
February 15, 2007	Glenn Stokes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests that lead agencies require applicant prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a powerlink is the only alternative that will address the three stated objectives. • Urges the agencies to consider strongly the following: that failure to develop electric power within the service area will increase dependence on imported power and the concomitant risk of power outage; that the applicant has made no guarantee about the percentage of renewables the line will carry nor that the line will help the applicant meet its renewable power goals; that as demand for power increases, the price of power also increases, and the future price of power cannot be reliably predicted. • Opposes routing a transmission line through ABDSP for the following reasons: business leaders and government agencies ought to be following the Governor's environmental lead; it is in violation of the California Public Resources Code to irreversibly damage a protected area. • Believes that other non-wire alternatives ought to be considered, including the following: ocean wave generation; mandatory conservation with fines for violations. • Questions where the next transmission line will be sited if the precedent is set now to allow the Sunrise Powerlink in ABDSP.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 16, 2007	Sylvia, Harold & Brent Cavins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are victims of the 2003 fire in Crest. • Believe that the Proposed Project will hinder the use of B-8 Bombers to fight fires in the area. • Strongly oppose the project.
February 16, 2007	Jeanne A. Curry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Proposed Project especially because of the increased risk of fire.
February 16, 2007	Christine and Bryan Rowson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly protest Alternative D. As disabled seniors, it would be an extreme hardship to relocate, and believe it would be discriminatory to reduce the value of their property. • Dispute the claim that Alternate D is in the least fire risk area, as they lost a home during the 2003 Cedar fire. • The NOSRSM is inaccurate in claiming that there are no private land occupants north beyond the 8-mile marker on Boulder Creek Road, as 8 properties are located there. • If Alternate D is selected, request that the transmission line be installed east of the existing line. • Protest the discrimination shown toward homeowners in their area.
February 17, 2007	Alma T. Russell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the SRPL should be underground along a freeway where a route is already extant, not through a residential area like Harbison Canyon.
February 18, 2007	Barnaby Davidson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finds it appalling that a transmission line through a State Park is even under consideration. • Questions why the project is being considered when in February of this year the CPUC said that the SRPL would be unnecessary. • Expresses concern over degrading the values of the park, including wildlife, education, and astronomy research.
February 18, 2007	Fred Emery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks the CPUC for its consideration of so many alternatives. • Believes that the non-wire alternatives are the only ways to avoid irrevocably damaging ABDSP.
February 18, 2007	Cynthia Priest Lynn Snyder Brian Harrington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the Project route through Japatul Valley due to a belief that it will have extremely negative impacts.
February 19, 2007	John Flynn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that SDG&E customers will pay a high price for building the Project, that it will damage California's pristine desert, and that San Diego County has all of the solar energy needed to meet its needs. • As a retired Marine, knows from experience that the transmission line will be very easy to sabotage.
February 19, 2007	REDACTED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As property owners, oppose the Route D Alternative. • Their property supports one of the oldest Engelmann Oak woodlands in San Diego County south of Santa Ysabel. • Suggest an alternative path for the route to follow. Maps are provided.
February 19, 2007	Linda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that there is no reason to buy power from the Mexicans as they have no air quality standards. • Supports Non-Wire alternatives.
February 19, 2007	Mac McElligott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the public does not support SDG&E because it works against the communities instead of with them. • Protests the Proposed Project due to its interference in people's lives, its potential health effects, and its potential effect on property values. • Supports an all-underground alternative.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 19, 2007	John H. McManus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that ABDSP ought to be protected from development for future generations. • Supports SWPL Alternative, and believes that the fire risk for operating two lines is overstated based on the original evaluation for the existing route and the fact that the CAISO continues to manage the now operating 500 kV system.
February 19, 2007	Conrad Rohrer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expresses concern that the transmission line in the San Felipe Hills would parallel the federally designated Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail. • Having experience hiking this trail, desires to keep the natural state of the trail unencumbered by degrading influences. • Requests that alternate routes be considered.
February 19, 2007	David E. Weflen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that on map D-41, route D crosses over two occupied dwellings. Requests that, if route D must be used, it be shifted to the west ½ mile as to avoid the dwellings.
February 20, 2007	William E. and Judith H. Cropp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciate the view from their home, and if the Project is approved, their view from three sides of their home would be destroyed. • Are concerned about the loss of aerial firefighting ability.
February 20, 2007	Bill & Shannon Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe the deadline to comment is too short for communities to assess potential impacts and respond. Found maps to be too general and vague. • Express concern over health effects, terrorism, and non-compliance with the Cleveland National Forest Land & Resource Management Plan. • Express concern over endangered species residing within the CNF, and over birds mistaking tower lights for stars causing collisions and a large bird death toll. • Oppose the Project and all Alternative routes.
February 20, 2007	Dan Desmond	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not support the West of Forest Alternative as it would heavily impact the community. • Supports the Project as proposed.
February 20, 2007	Suzanne Gaul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Project as a whole, and specifically the West of Forest Alternative. • Doubts that SDG&E will properly maintain the line due to a history of poor maintenance on extant lines already on her property. Photographic documentation is included. • Expresses concern about fire danger and the inability to fight fires aerially. • Expresses concern over health effects of the high-powered transmission line. • Expresses concern over property value impacts. • Supports the I-8 corridor. • Proposes detailed. modifications to West of Forest Alternative if it must be used. • Supports Non-Wire Alternatives.
February 20, 2007	John Gibson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a property owner, does not support the West of Forest Alternative as it would heavily impact his properties. • Supports the Rancho route and the route through the open space preserve as it would not impact residential parcels. • Supports the Project as proposed, as it impacts the least amount of private property. • As a second choice, supports the Boulevard route.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 20, 2007	David Gottfredson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes any alternative that de-designates ABDSP wilderness. Believes that wilderness is intended for preservation for future generations and shouldn't be used as a land bank from which to withdraw when it is convenient. • Believes that removing state wilderness from protection would set a precedent of unimaginable magnitude. • Questions the applicant's logic in making its goal to avoid putting the line in an already impacted viewshed by seeking out pristine viewsheds in which to build it. • Believes the project is a thinly veiled attempt to import unregulated electricity from Mexico to Los Angeles.
February 20, 2007	Victor A. Levine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asks the lead agencies to consider whether the solution is consistent with the problem as SDG&E has defined it. • Questions how carefully the applicant studied the necessity of the Project and its effects on people and the environment? • Notes that the applicant fails to identify so-called experts that were consulted in defining the region's future energy need.
February 20, 2007	Susan Meyer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is unsatisfied with the list of new alternatives, as they represent a choice among evils. Believes that a real solution will involve in-area solar generation. • Is disappointed that the consultant hired to design a way to bring energy to San Diego is a team that seems intellectually and emotionally detached from nature. • Opposes degrading public land. • Believes that defacing ABDSP is demeaning to donors. • Challenges the team to be innovative and to protect.
February 20, 2007	Christine & Bryan Rowson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that alternative D on Index Map d-41 deliberately jogs to encompass privately owned property at D-40, D-41, and D-42. Note that this appears to be a ploy to obtain the few private properties that sit in the middle of National Forest land. Request the route be adjusted to avoid these properties. • Believe that the applicant ought to compensate property owners for impacts to property values.
February 20, 2007	Shirley & Harold Withers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that the risks of the Project are too great, and that wind and solar wireless technology can fulfill the power need.
February 21, 2007	Tim Butrum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As an avid hiker, enjoys Mount Gower Open Space Preserve. Believes that a power line would spoil the view, and supports the Oak Hollow Road Underground Alternative.
February 21, 2007	Noelle Collins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the applicant has failed to demonstrate a need for the Project. • Believes that the Project will be damaging to natural areas, create hazards for built environments, and that the public does not support it.
February 21, 2007	Cynthia Dorst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands the need to bring power to San Diego, but believes it is unnecessary to bring it through pristine open spaces. Suggests routing the line along I-8 or along the border. • Requests that, if the project must go through Ramona, the Oak Hollow Alternative be considered as it would be less disruptive to residents. • Expresses concerns about health effects and the destruction of the viewshed.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 21, 2007	Barbara Fansler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands the need to bring power to San Diego, but believes it is unnecessary to bring it through rural communities. • Enjoys the wildlife and trails in BLM land, State Parks, National Forest, and in managed areas of San Diego Country Estates. • Supports only the Oak Hollow Alternative if the line must be built.
February 21, 2007	David R. McCoy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Project because it would destroy the beauty of CNF, the towers and access roads would impact wildlife, it would devalue ranch land, and it will be expensive.
February 21, 2007	Geneva Middlebrook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enjoys Mount Gower Open Space Preserve, and believes that an above-ground line would be detrimental to the wilderness and pristine views. • Support the Oak Hollow Road Underground Alternative.
February 21, 2007	John Pecora	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submits comments on the proposed LEAPS project.
February 21, 2007	Thomas A. Reid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expresses concern about the extreme fire risk in Crest as evidenced by the 2003 Cedar fire, during which firefighters left the scene and allowed 300 homes to burn because the area was indefensible space. • Opposes the West of Forest Alternative due to its potential effects on property values, and the visual and auditory impacts the line may have. • Supports only underground lines through Crest and Harbison Canyon.
February 21, 2007	Christine & Bryan Rowson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concur with Nathan Weflen's comments (below).
February 21, 2007	Norman D. Severe Psy.D Aimee Severe Mary Pelowitz Guy Pelowitz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is adamantly opposed to the Proposed Project as a property owner and a defender of ABDSP. • Favors the No-Wire and I-8 alternatives.
February 21, 2007	Nathan Weflen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes Alternative D because it impacts roadless National Forest and proposed Federal Wilderness land. • Lists endangered, rare, and unique species, communities, and artifacts that would be impacted by Alternative D.
February 22, 2007	Andy Ahlberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the transmission line proposed through ABDSP. Believes that to threaten this area would be irresponsible by causing physical harm and destroying the viewshed. • Believes that future generations will suffer the loss of this natural area.
February 22, 2007	Jane Alexander	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposes above-ground power lines through San Diego Country Estates. • Favors the Oak Hollow Underground Alternative.
February 22, 2007	Debra Ann Conn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a resident of Harbison Canyon and victim of the 2003 Cedar fire, believes that having a transmission line through the community will increase vulnerability to large damages from wildfire due to difficulties in aerial firefighting.
February 22, 2007	Debbie A. DeGarmo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Oak Hollow Underground Alternative because it would reduce the visual impact of the towers and overhead lines from the perspective of the Mount Gower Open Space Preserve. • Expresses concern about wildlife, especially birds, should the overhead lines be approved.
February 22, 2007	David B. Donahue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is strongly opposed to the power line through ABDSP as a retired State Park Superintendent and member of CSPRA.
February 22, 2007	Michael D. Green	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a California State Parks Department Training Officer and member of CSPRA. • Strongly objects to the proposed line through ABDSP. Reminds the lead agencies that these lands were set aside by preceding and wiser generations to protect them from the very activity proposed.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 22, 2007	Alex Hoefer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the SRPL. Supports the No Project Alternative or a No Wire Alternative. • Is concerned about underutilization of existing Encina Plant and rumors of importing energy from Mexicali.
February 22, 2007	Albert Lewis & Family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value the rural character and peace of Descanso, and are strongly opposed to a tower in the Boulder Creek or Eagle Peak areas. • As owners of an off-grid solar home, support solar power initiatives.
February 22, 2007	Sharon Lynch (plus 93 signatures in support of the comments noted to the right)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holly Oaks Community pleads that either the I-8 Alternative or the West of Forest Alternative be chosen for the Southwest Inland Section. This would spare Cleveland National Forest and ABDSP and the 90-family community of Holly Oaks Ranch. • Best alternative is no Powerlink. Powerlink may be approved, attached petition with 93 signatures in support of I-8 or West of Forest alternatives.
February 22, 2007	Jennifer Massa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests elimination of above-ground alternatives through Ramona.
February 22, 2007	Jeffrey L. Merzbacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciates riding horses in the Mount Gower Open Space Preserve daily, and supports the Oak Hollow Road Underground Alternative.
February 22, 2007	Darci Moore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposes the transmission line through ABDSP as a member of CSPRA. Believes that this and other projects threaten the integrity of our State Parks. • Believes that approving this project is a slippery slope toward marring the entire system of parks, and that it robs future generations of experiences in nature.
February 22, 2007	Linda Polese	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Project through ABDSP, and suggests the existing I-8 Corridor. • Believes that the Project would be a blight on the park. • Urges elimination of alternatives through Borrego Springs, Tubb Canyon, and Volcan Mountain. • If the project must proceed, favors underground lines.
February 22, 2007	Larry Pustinger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports only the Non-Wires Alternatives as superior in reliability and as consistent with meeting the renewable energy goals of the State. • Believes the applicant has failed to prove a need for the project. • Expresses concern that the project will expand to Riverside County on additional circuits out of the Central East Substation.
February 22, 2007	Phyllis Ragsdale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a State Parks employee, believes that the Project would create an unsightly distraction in ABDSP.
February 22, 2007	Gaylee Rogers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the lead agencies to turn down the SRPL proposal as it would destroy some of the most beautiful open space in the world. • Supports conservation and local renewable energy generation.
February 22, 2007	Jan Ryan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the Mount Gower Open Space Preserve should stay an Open Space Preserve. • Supports the Oak Hollow Underground Alternative.
February 22, 2007	Tom & Mary Tanner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the power line through ABDSP, which would defile a wilderness area with obtrusive structures that would disrupt the intent of wilderness. • Believes de-designation of wilderness is wrong, and that Parks were intended in perpetuity.
February 22, 2007	Dick Troy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges those involved to find another route for the project, as one public good shouldn't have to be sacrificed for another.
February 22, 2007	Bob Wohl	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the lead agencies to oppose the Project through ABDSP. • Notes that wilderness would be impacted by the lines, and that the Park is a treasure that should not be impacted with power lines.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 22, 2007	Myrna Wosk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expresses concern over health effects of border communities in Imperial County when unregulated power is generated in Mexico as a result of this Project. • Believes that de-designation of wilderness for commercial enterprise sets a bad precedent.
February 23, 2007	David H. Batchelder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Central Link Alternatives Retained because they would reduce visibility of the lines, reduce agricultural impacts, and reduce fire risk to private property. • Believes Retained Alternatives are superior to the Loop for reasons of difficult terrain and associated visual impacts. • Requests modification of the Loop if it is retained. Includes detailed modification of route. • Requests omission from consideration as an access road his private road, Green Oaks Drive, as it is being considered out of convenience rather than necessity.
February 23, 2007	Michael & Barbara Bertin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that running a high-voltage line through the Santa Ysabel Valley and Mesa Grande Area endangers residents due to the increased fire risk. Describe the conditions that make firefighting difficult including single-lane dirt roads. • Believe the SRPL would multiply the fire danger many times over. • Urge lead agencies to reject this dangerous project.
February 23, 2007	Terry G. Brann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that the Proposed Project will have an unacceptable impact on a desert natural resource that is California's jewel. • As a former State Park ranger assigned to ABDSP for 2 years, believes that power lines would destroy the experiences sought out by the park's visitors.
February 23, 2007	John & Phyllis Bremer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Non-Wire Alternatives. • Are concerned that SDG&E did not disclose intention for six 230 kV circuits from the CE Substation until a data request was made. Believe that this ought to foster suspicions about the actual parameters of the SRPL. • Are Williamson Act landowners, and include annual Christmas Bird count tables to demonstrate avian abundance on the property. • Believe the area is volatile and a power line would create undue fire risk. • Question the logic and wisdom in approving the SRPL on the contingency that solar resources be developed in the Imperial Valley, as these resources do not yet exist, and the technology is still in the development phase. • Present evidence that their property value is already being impacted by the very proposal of the SRPL.
February 23, 2007	Wesley & Celeste Cater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the Project through ABDSP. • Believe that donors to the AB Foundation gave donations to hold the Park in trust in perpetuity for public use.
February 23, 2007	Tian Du Chen Huang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the Proposed route through Park Village Rd will impact the community and may cause unpredictable health problems. • Points out that there is an existing vacant ROW in Fig 6A for the line to bypass Park Village Rd, and that this route passes through an area with a much lower population density. • Expresses concern with an underground line including health effects due to proximity of housing and earthquake damage. • Expects medical and property insurance costs for the community to increase due to the increase risks of the line.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 23, 2007	David Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the power line through ABDSP as it would have a severe negative impact on the wildness and beauty of the park.
February 23, 2007	Nancy H. Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that power lines are offensive intruders to wilderness and to recreationists. • Urges the lead agency to not allow business interests to take over the land so carefully put aside for aesthetic, health, physical, and cultural values.
February 23, 2007	Jösan Feathers P.E.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The easement granted to the Proposed Project would fragment critical habitat for bighorn sheep, and impact other wildlife during the construction phase. Believes that the soil and habitat disturbance caused by construction of the line, construction of permanent and temporary access roads, and line maintenance would be an unacceptable cost to pay so that a company can gain. • Believes that it is unconscionable to consider de-designating wilderness to allow construction of the power line. • Supports local, renewable power generation. Strongly supports Non-Wire Alternatives. Outlines a solar energy feasibility plan. • Believes that it is the applicant's intention to import unregulated energy from Mexico to larger markets in Riverside, Orange, and LA Counties.
February 23, 2007	John Flynn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposes the Project to bring solar energy from Arizona and Nevada to San Diego.
February 23, 2007	Mr. & Mrs. John Francois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the Project, specifically the West of Forest Alternative. • Note that this alternative would impact residents, public safety officials, and the environment. • As users of a PV system in their home, support this cost-effective approach to energy generation.
February 23, 2007	Gustavo & Patricia Guzman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the West of Forest Alternative as it would be in too close proximity to structures on their property. • Support the Project as proposed through ABDSP. • Express concern about the line in proximity to their community, including its effects on health, its obstruction of views, its affecting an open space preserve, its affecting threatened and endangered species, and its jeopardizing of the safety of residents and firefighters during a fire.
February 23, 2007	Margaret Hurley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that it is greed that drives the applicant to destroy the back-country rather than buy power from an existing plant. • Believe that the Project links dirty power in Mexico to Los Angeles. • Supports the I-8 Alternative. • Questions whether SDG&E has an existing long-term contract with coal-powered sources and how the PUC's new prohibitions will affect the utility. • Urges the lead agencies to recommend that the applicant purchase the South Bay Power Plant and drop the SRPL Proposal.
February 23, 2007	Glenda Kimmerly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to Project Objective #3 as solar and geothermal resources are not specific to the Imperial Valley. • Expresses concern about depreciation of property values and requests attention to this matter by the EIR/EIS team. • Believes that future phases of the Project would have great cumulative environmental impacts. • Supports conservation, efficiency, demand response, and in-area generation. • Requests that the thousands of acres in the Imperial Valley proposed to be impacted by solar dishes be analyzed in the EIS/EIR.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 23, 2007	Sheila A. Leaming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a regular visitor to ABDSP, believes wilderness is a precious resource not to be sacrificed easily.
February 23, 2007	Charles Lyden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a retired State Park ranger and member of CSPRA opposes the Project through ABDSP, and believes that Parks ought to be preserved in their natural state. Believes that local generation of power is possible using tidal energy.
February 23, 2007	Scot Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urges that a programmatic EIR/EIS be completed for this project, since it is clear that the SRPL proposal is a small fragment of a larger project being implemented by SDG&E, which includes the LNG terminal, pipeline, and plants proposed and under construction in Baja and the Full Loop project in Southern California. Believe that the California Energy Action Plan II and SD Regional Energy Strategy provide a blueprint for providing future energy needs sustainably. Points out that SDG&E did not meet its energy efficiency goals for 2006, achieving less than one-third of its targeted reductions, and that Sempra's CEO has publicly doubted global warming. Believes that the company's model is not sustainable and should not be encouraged or promoted by the lead agencies. Questions the accuracy of the route description on pp 4-5 of the Notice, and describes in detail a major inaccuracy of the described route.
February 23, 2007	Moretti Family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As property owners of sensitive environmental habitat, oppose the Proposed Project. Express concern over health effects of EMF, as research is inconclusive. Believe that inconclusive is not good enough. Express concerns over arcing from the line to structures on the property during weather events. Express concern over line maintenance, which will cause a great deal of erosion and property damage, and when done by helicopter can spook livestock that may damage fences. Express concern over fire susceptibility, property value, loss of use, and loss of visual resources.
February 23, 2007	John, Adam, and Marsie Mott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urge lead agencies to oppose the Project to ABDSP. Note that the California State Parks Foundation has identified the SRPL as one of the four greatest threats to California State Parks. Believe that the Project will have negative impacts on biological, natural, recreational, archaeological, cultural, and historic resources.
February 23, 2007	Neena Rahman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Values the Green Belt through the West Chase community of Park Village in Rancho Peñasquitos, and provides photographs of children playing there. Believes that if the proposed underground line is installed in the green-belt, the community that has enjoyed it for 30 years will be destroyed, property values will be diminished, and quality of life will be impacted. Expresses concern about EMF from the lines proximity to Park Village Elementary School. Support local, renewable energy generation, but if the Project must be approved, support a route along Route 56 or Miramar Marine Base.
February 23, 2007	Joan Rosen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the Project through ABDSP, and believe it would set a dangerous precedent and threaten other Parks.
February 23, 2007	Kenneth Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a former Park Ranger stationed in ABDSP, is opposed to the Project, as it would take away the essence of what the Park is about. Visually, environmentally, archaeologically, and for security reasons, believes that the Project is damaging and ought not to proceed.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 23, 2007	Max & Alma Stults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Alternative D because it would affect 6 or more families, and because it would make firefighting difficult.
February 23, 2007	Patricia A. Turse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urge that the Project be re-routed to avoid ABDSP and all its amenities.
February 23, 2007	Slawomir & Lorraine Ulanicki	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support an entirely underground alternative. • Threaten legal action if an above-ground line is placed anywhere on the west side of Julian or the mountains.
February 23, 2007	Aaron Weflen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges lead agencies to reject Alternative D because the route would destroy his family's two ranches, which both lost structures in the 2003 Cedar fire and have not yet been rebuilt. • Believes that no compensation is enough for the loss of family history.
February 24, 2007	Eveline Bustillos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Project through ABDSP. Believes that wilderness is not expendable, and once destroyed, it can never be restored.
February 24, 2007	Michael Bustillos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the lead agencies to deny the Proposed Project route through ABDSP. • Supports the I-8 Alternative or a route north along Hwy 86 to I-10 to I-15.
February 24, 2007	Cynthia M. Buxton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes Alternative D. • Has extensive experience in the Cleveland National Forest, and believes that a thorough review of this Alternative would necessitate conversations with a number of people possessing vast local knowledge of the area. A list of names is provided. • Notes that the route passes over "punch bowl" ponds, which are habitat for the locally threatened golden eagles. Lists a number of other rare, threatened, and unique species and communities that would be impacted by Alternative D. • Notes that Native American archaeological resources and numerous other historical and cultural resources would be impacted by Alternative D. • Believes that a need for the power line has not been proven, and that SDG&E has ulterior motives to import energy from Mexico. • Encloses photographs.
February 24, 2007	Jeanne & Robert Foreman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have enjoyed camping and hiking in ABDSP for more than 25 years, and oppose the Project through the Park most particularly designated Wilderness areas.
February 24, 2007	Mitchell W. Gaul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expresses absolute opposition to the entire Proposed SRPL Project, and is adamantly opposed to the West of Forest Alternative, which passes through his property in a designated open space preserve, and the proposal of which has arguably already decreased his property's value. • Lists issues that he deems imperative to address in an EIR/EIS, including a demonstration of the need for more power, an investigation into local, clean energy generation, a study on the impacts of power generation in Mexico, generation of unbiased appraisals of lost property, and evaluation and mitigation of wildlife impacts. • Requests more accurate, detailed, and readable maps be produced with the next report.
February 24, 2007	John & Lora Grisafi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As residents of Guatay, request elimination of Alternative C through Guatay because it would require removal of at least 10 single-family homes and as many as 5 local businesses of this small community. Believe that the fiscal impact to the community would be damaging. • Express concerns over visual impacts and health effects. • Support the I-8 Alternative as it impacts fewer dwellings.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 24, 2007	Susan C. Grove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposes the Project through ABDSP. • A member of CSPRA, believes that State Parks are intended to be protected from development in perpetuity.
February 24, 2007	Cheryl Kelly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Non-Wire Alternatives, although if a transmission line is inevitable, supports the I-8 Alternative. • Opposes a substation in Santa Ysabel. • Believes that if the line passes through the Tulloch land, it should follow the existing 69 kV line through the corner of Cleveland NF as in Figure 5.
February 24, 2007	Barbara Levin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a victim of the 2003 Cedar fire, and as a property owner whose land is directly in the path of the SRPL, would be devastated if she lost her home again.
February 24, 2007	Drew Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the lead agencies to reject the Project through ABDSP.
February 24, 2007	Patti May & Family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest running the transmission line along Route 56. • Oppose the Proposed Project.
February 24, 2007	Pam Nelson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Non-Wire Alternatives only. • Believes that the Proposed Project is dangerous, expensive, environmentally damaging, inefficient, and ugly. • Believes that SDG&E has not done its part in helping consumers transition into a more responsible direction of locally produced renewable energy.
February 24, 2007	David & Jackie Nichols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose the Project through ABDSP. Believe that the towers and power line would spoil the natural beauty of this area. • Express concern about health effects of EMF, acid rain from exposed cable, noise pollution, and interference with communication devices. • Support upgrading existing plants or building local power plants.
February 24, 2007	John Ruddley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the Project through ABDSP. • Notes that development has been encroaching on open spaces throughout his life, and believes that this Project would be destructive.
February 24, 2007	Gordon Shackleford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Non-Wire Alternatives. • Notes that the Project itself produces no power but is essentially an expensive power cord. • Questions the viability of the Sterling Energy Project and the accessibility of geothermal resources in the Salton Sea. • Suggests a series of probing questions that the EIR/EIS ought to address regarding these two so-called sources of renewable power. • Notes that California will no longer allow long-term electricity contracts with out-of-state coal-fired plants, which ought to free up capacity on the SWPL. • Does not believe that renewable energy resources have been proven to exist in Imperial County.
February 24, 2007	Clark M. Shimeall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the Proposed and Alternative routes that pass through ABDSP should never be considered. • Favors in-basin solar generation.
February 24, 2007	Cynthia C. Soller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is vehemently opposed to the Project. • Supports local renewable power.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 24, 2007	Denis Trafecanty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Wires Alternative – Don't need Sunrise Powerlink. Need a hard look at in-area all-source generation, energy efficiency. • Imperial Valley – Asthma is a significant health problem for the Imperial Valley. Dairy farmers are concerned that it [project] will impact the fertility of their cattle; impact to dairies should be investigated further. Other dairies interested in moving to Imperial Valley so lines will affect economy of Imperial Valley. • ABDSP – What research has been done to determine impact to Big Horn Sheep? Have you consulted experts? Problem will still occur with an underground line because of number of roads that will scar the park. Consider effects of permanently scarring the Park. Land donated to the Park to keep it in a natural and pristine state. Will you let company run dirty power from Mexico through heart of park? • Why is transmission line proposed so far to the north of in-basin San Diego? Could it be that Investor Owned Utility has "eyes set to the north" (Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange County)? Identifies need to consider nesting birds, affects on cattle, fire and helicopters in the back country, and potential loss of air rescue operations because of the project. • Landowners concerned with another devastating fire like the Cedar fire. What studies done to address potential for fires and line interference in controlling fires? • Need for power is in-basin and not in back country. Basin needs energy but 150 miles of transmission line is not the answer. • Attached signed petition gathered at Earth Day event that demonstrates opposition to the project.
February 24, 2007	David Voss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciates the number of alternatives being considered, but asks the lead agencies to look beyond the choice between transmission lines and to the real choice between transmission and local solar, conservation, and renovation of Encina and South Bay Plants. • Believes that the Project looks nice to the shareholders, but urges the lead agencies to speak for the people and the environment. • Finds any alternative that enters or borders State Parks, Wilderness areas, Roadless areas, or National Forest unacceptable. • Supports Non-Wire alternatives.
February 24, 2007	Michael & Jennifer Voss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believe that the impacts of the Proposed SRPL through ABDSP are tremendous, and strongly oppose the project. • Note that 90% of State Wilderness is located in ABDSP, and believe that the Project violates the State Wilderness Act. • Believe that Wilderness is not a commodity to be traded for energy security. • Express concern about noise and EMF having adverse effects on humans and wildlife.
February 24, 2007	Martin Wang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the retained Coastal Link Alternatives. • Expresses concern about traffic and the health and safety of school children.
February 25, 2007	Donna Tisdale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes the impacts of geothermal activities in Imperial County, including that: geothermal wells create hazardous conditions with residual brines that have high levels of metals such as arsenic, lead, and barium; that these high levels require that these brines be treated as hazardous waste; and that there can be groundwater contamination. • Understands that geothermal leases were not renewed when federal subsidies were removed, and questions what is different this time around with the Sunrise proposal.

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

Date	From	Comments
February 26, 2007	Michael Durrant, DPM, MPH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a long-time recreationist in Borrego Springs, believes that ABDSP is the most beautiful desert in the west, and wants it to remain that way for his children and generations to come.
February 26, 2007	Joe Tatusko & Maureen Kirby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are homeowners and recreationists in the Borrego Springs area. Request that the SRPL not pass through ABDSP or Highway 78.
February 27, 2007	Michael & Susan Finnane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believe that the Project is unnecessary and wrong because it destroys sensitive land and puts wildlife at risk. Reminds the lead agencies that many people have spent a great deal of time and money to preserve the quality of Borrego Valley, and urges them to reject the proposal.
February 27, 2007	Pat McArron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes that the SRPL would impact the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail. Suggests this issue be investigated further.
February 27, 2007	Peter M. Shapiro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is highly incensed at the pressure tactics and bullying of SDG&E, and finds them to be an abuse of power. Loves the rural character of Borrego Springs. Implores the CPUC to reject the Project through ABDSP.
February 28, 2007	Add Dermody	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions the necessity to deface ABDSP. Has fond memories of the Park, and is shocked at the behavior of SDG&E, whose bottom line should be the common good.
February 28, 2007	Larry Luers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes the Project through State Parks and other protected areas.
February 28, 2007	Nancy Zadrozny	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expresses concern about the overhead utility lines, as they will impact the natural beauty of the Mount Gower area. Requests consideration of underground lines.
March 1, 2007	Bill Evarts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urges lead agencies to permanently reject the proposed Borrego Valley route for the SRPL. Expresses that the loss of property and the family memories associated with that property would be devastating to his family. Has a deep rooted family history of Parks preservation, and opposes violating ABDSP. Believes that it is irreplaceable, and that compromising any part of it for private corporate profit or convenience is lunacy.
March 1, 2007	Patric T. McArron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes that the SRPL is not the only solution to the problem and that other alternatives have not been thoroughly explored. Believes a transmission line would be environmentally devastating, and it does not eliminate Southern California's dependence on imported electricity. Believes that it is inexcusable not to make use of advanced energy technology.
March 2, 2007	Charles Petrach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-location with Interstate 8 would have least impact on environment and private property.
March 3, 2007	Charles Petrach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiteration of comment above.
March 5, 2007	Betty Backus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public response to Proposed Project at the scoping meeting and State Parks meeting in Borrego Springs was overwhelmingly negative, especially because of ABDSP impacts. Confused that SDG&E publicly advocates the Borrego-Valley alternative route through Tubb Canyon despite EIR/EIS Team recommendation for elimination from EIR/EIS analysis. Recommendation was based on careful research. Inadequate public notification of SDG&E intention to drill and test on watershed land.

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

Date	From	Comments
March 5, 2007	William L. Bretz, PhD & Lesley A. Barling, MS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As residents of the Crest-Dehesa-Granite Hills-Harbison Canyon Sub-region, oppose the West of Forest Alternative due to constraints of the route and because its construction and operation would harm the best public interest. • Note that the Alternative passes through an ecological preserve whose ecological character would be disrupted and degraded if a transmission line were to transect it. • Note that the Alternative passes through a BLM parcel that has high-quality habitat for Redtail hawks and Golden eagles. • Contend that the Alternative line would disturb a Golden eagle nest site, a Redtail hawk nest site, habitat for other raptors and pallid bats. • Believe that the Alternative would be intrusive to users of the California Hiking and Riding Trail. • Note that the Loveland Substation is in the Loveland Reservoir watershed. • Note that the Alternative would impact an approved subdivision, conflict with the Subregional Community Plan, and possibly conflict with the SD County General Plan. • Believe that the Alternative would increase the risk of wildfire in the subregion. • Note that there are substantial mapping errors upon which the choice to retain this route was made. • Encourage the Team to include a complete analysis of Non-Wire and System Alternatives in the EIR/EIS. • Believe that the SRPL meets the needs of a private corporation and not those of the public. • Encourage the Team to develop a full analysis of global warming effects of the Proposed Project in the EIR/EIS. • Urge elimination of the West of Forest Alternative. • Believe that the scoping process has been flawed, giving landowners insufficient notification of meetings and encouraging sluggish and flawed press coverage. Note that the scoping meetings provided information to property owners that was less detailed than necessary, which hindered public involvement.
March 5, 2007	Tina and Peter Myrdal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property owners at Borrego Springs South Slope, southeast of Tubb Canyon, on SDG&E Borrego Valley Alternative. • Buyers canceled escrow when alternative route was publicized. • Cannot sell or use property until December 2008 because SDG&E holds eminent domain to survey. • Alternative would conflict with certain planned developments in this area. • Impacts to visual resources, Glorietta Canyon, and wildlife in south section of Borrego Springs.

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

Date	From	Comments
March 5, 2007	Robert L. Staehle and Lori L. Paul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owners of 54.67 acres at Tubb Canyon adjacent to Anza-Borrego Desert State Park near Borrego Springs, California • Support New In-Area Renewable Generation Non-Wires Alternative but suggests an additional regulatory measure to encourage in-basin solar generation. Requests a reliability estimate based on more widespread solar generator installation, given such regulatory measures. • Reference Robert Staehle's comment published in the November 2006 Scoping Report. • Request analysis of scenarios under which Stirling solar generation fails to provide power due to technological or regulatory infeasibility. Analysis should identify whether potential generation is owned or operated by Semptra Energy subsidiaries, is located in Mexico, or would generate revenue for SDG&E. • Analysis should include economic forecasts of expandability options. • Analysis should identify SDG&E plans to import power from generators in Mexico in the context of regulatory barriers. • Reference Enron market manipulation. Identify current SDG&E staff who are Enron former employees. • Suspect SDG&E's advocacy of the Borrego Valley route, despite EIR/EIS team recommendation for elimination, is driven by plans for expansion to the north. • Proposed Project is inconsistent with State Wilderness designation. • Survey activity would impact Bighorn Sheep population and their water source around Tubb Canyon. • There are listed species on private land that SDG&E plans to survey. It is easier for SDG&E to overcome property owners' environmental concerns than to route on public or tribal land. • Attachments: 2/15/07 letter from UC Davis Wildlife Health Center concerned about direct and cumulative impacts of the Proposed Project through Tubb Canyon to biological resources. 2/13/07 letter from Esther Rubin concerned about survey impacts on Bighorn Sheep during lambing season in Tubb Canyon. USFWS "Recovery Plan for Bighorn Sheep in the Peninsular Ranges, California." excerpts.
March 6, 2007	Donna Rea Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urges the lead agencies to oppose the Proposed Project through ABDSP. • Believes that the transmission lines will do irreversible damage to the viewshed, terrain, and habitat.
March 8, 2007	Bill Powers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWPL has been highly reliable; G-1, N-1, and N-2 situations are unlikely to trigger reliability shortfall in San Diego. • 230 kV HTLS line is reasonably priced and can resolve congestion at Miguel Substation. • 1/31/07 Jim Avery/SDG&E said even though local generation might be more cost-effective, the Proposed Project would provide other benefits.
March 9, 2007	Bruce R. Bowen and Junona A. Jonas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose SDG&E's request for SDG&E's Borrego Valley Alternative to be carried forward for environmental analysis because it is inconsistent with Wilderness designation and Park Plan and would impact Bighorn Sheep. • Oppose any new route through ABDSP. • Skeptical that any existing corridor can be restored to wilderness condition. • SDG&E should stop surveying around Tubb Canyon. Property is currently part of plans for desert resource protection zone along Tubb Canyon Road to be submitted for County approval.

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

Date	From	Comments
March 9, 2007	Bill Powers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Criticizes the 10/2006 ISO letter regarding SWPL alternatives because there is no evidence suggesting double outages of SWPL east of Boulevard, during combined transmission load above 1900 MW, or during total import above 2500 MW are probable. SDG&E can operate the existing SWPL at 1900 MW.• Most outages along SWPL occurred further west than 10-20 miles into San Diego County.• SDG&E has not yet responded to UCAN's 1/19/07 data request for outage data with geographical context.• N-2 situation is equivalent to simultaneous SWPL and Proposed Project outage.• Assess the second SWPL according to SDG&E modeled Case 212, but account for SDG&E's planned new 230/139 kV transformer at Miguel, not included in Cases 212 modeling.
March 10, 2007	Ron Webb	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• References December 13 San Diego Union Tribune article, "SDG&E says its power line won't be buried." Opposes SDG&E's statement in relation to Santa Ysabel Valley, Lake Henshaw, and ABDSP.• References transmission line constructed in Lakeside, which had visual impacts.• Values the recreational resources of the Santa Ysabel Valley because its forest was impacted relatively little by the 2003 Cedar Fire.• Fire risk is extremely high in the Santa Ysabel Valley; the Project would impact fire-fighting aircraft operations. Favors undergrounding in this area.
