

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Name	Organization	Comments
<b>Scoping Meeting, February 5, 2007 (12:30 – 2:30 pm) – El Centro, CA</b>		
Susan Lamoureux	Castle Eurasia Corporation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciates attempt to route along existing ROWs and property lines.</li> <li>• Anticipates sending route alternatives to segment in southern portion of Imperial Valley Link to avoid bisecting private property.</li> </ul>
Charles Williams		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favors Desert Western Alternative; DoD should allow it. Proposed undergrounding in Ramona area would cost almost as much.</li> <li>• Emphasizes expandability including additional 230 kV lines from San Felipe and involving Citizens Energy, SCE, and IID.</li> <li>• Favors LEAPS Alternative because it follows an existing canal.</li> <li>• Critical of Stirling technology; it is peaker generation.</li> <li>• NIMBYs should pay for the Project.</li> </ul>
Richard Van Leeuwen	Bull Frog Farms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciates the 3 Imperial Valley Link alternatives that would avoid the dairy, but Bull Frog Farms alternatives would have to be 5 miles away to eliminate EMF impacts to cattle.</li> <li>• Both Bull Frog Farm alternatives increase EMF impact to calf and breeding facilities compared to the proposed route.</li> <li>• Impacts to residences on Boley Rd.</li> <li>• Project in this area would deter growth of the agricultural industry.</li> <li>• Favors the non-wires alternatives.</li> </ul>
Denis Trafecanty	Protect Our Communities Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Project because it would benefit San Diego with impacts on El Centro business, air quality, and recreational resources.</li> <li>• Opposition to the Project is regional.</li> <li>• Favors in-basin generation and energy efficiency measures.</li> <li>• The Project is not needed to supply power demand. References San Diego 2030 report.</li> </ul>
Mary Helen McCombs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air Quality impacts from power generating stations in Mexico.</li> <li>• Favors southern San Diego generation projects.</li> <li>• Favors other ways of meeting RPS.</li> <li>• Favors non-wires alternative to avoid impact to ABDSP and additional impact to Imperial Valley.</li> </ul>
Benjamin Kwon	Castle Eurasia and Zen Media Corporations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans to develop along the freeway in Imperial County independent of San Diego.</li> <li>• Values new Imperial County image, which the planned development would build.</li> <li>• Route should use BLM de-classified land west of I-8.</li> <li>• Favors solar energy, which has a lease on BLM land.</li> <li>• BLM should be paid for the long-term cost of the Project.</li> </ul>
Brad Poiriez	Imperial County Air Pollution Control District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address both imported power from another State and from Mexico.</li> </ul>
Doug Westmoreland		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imperial Valley alternatives have greater impact on agricultural land use than Proposed Project.</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, February 5, 2007 (7:30 – 9:30 pm) – Rancho Peñasquitos, San Diego, CA</b>		
Bill Hoffman		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lines through ABDSP should not be underground, but overhead around Ocotillo Wells to avoid geological impacts.</li> <li>• Favors non-wires alternatives, especially modular solar generation because of reduced cost and distributed risk.</li> <li>• Prefers SWPL alternatives to avoid impacts to ABDSP, in particular, Interstate 8 Alternative.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Keith Ritchey	West Chase Homeowner's Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urges retaining the State Route 56 Alternative because it is possible for Caltrans to allow undergrounding if analysis favors the route in other respects.</li> </ul>
Constantine Pappas		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property owner objects to rationale for eliminating West of San Vicente Road Underground Alternative because the land it would cross is not designated open space preserve. It is zoned residential.</li> </ul>
Grazyna Krajewska		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favors non-wires alternatives.</li> <li>• References report by San Diego Region Renewable Energy concluding the cost of solar energy generated in desert would be comparable to in-area solar energy due to the cost of transmission.</li> <li>• Increased reliability of distributed generation.</li> </ul>
Laura Copic		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is already transmission capacity to access new renewable generation in the Imperial Valley.</li> <li>• Green Path North should be an alternative.</li> <li>• References the California Solar Initiative.</li> <li>• Favors in-basin non-wires resource bundles.</li> <li>• Local generation reduces load on existing transmission infrastructure.</li> </ul>
Denis Trafecanty	Protect Our Communities Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Proposed Project because it would harm landowners who would not benefit from it.</li> <li>• Requests maps showing in-area generation.</li> </ul>
Tad Hurst	United States Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association San Diego Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interstate 8, BCD, and Route D Alternatives would impact major landing zones.</li> </ul>
Dave Lawhead	California State Parks, Colorado Desert District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends retaining SDG&amp;E ABDSP North Side of SR 78 and SR 78 West of Anza Alternatives in combination with Partial Underground 230 kV ABDSP SR 78 to S2 Alternative to consolidate impacts.</li> <li>• Prefers non-Park alternatives.</li> </ul>
Helen Dominguez		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Proposed Project and Black Mountain to Park Village Road underground through Park Village Road in San Diego due to public health impacts to a community park and elementary school.</li> <li>• Direct impacts to residences from MPs 144 – 145.</li> <li>• Impacts to canyon, community, and socioeconomics.</li> <li>• Impacts from hazardous materials.</li> <li>• Prefers first the MCAS Miramar, then the Pomerado Miramar Alternatives.</li> </ul>
Lorene Joosten		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes project impacts to ABDSP, Santa Ysabel, and Los Peñasquitos Canyon.</li> <li>• EMF impacts to children at home or in parks rather than at school, which is legally protected from transmission line projects.</li> <li>• Favors in-basin generation because it would eliminate EMF impacts to residences.</li> </ul>
Geoffrey Smith	Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Desert Protective Council California Wild Heritage Campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4,000 acres of open space in urban area.</li> <li>• Value the diverse resources of San Diego backcountry as a public good.</li> <li>• Question the need for the Project because of lack of coordination on a regional infrastructure level and potential for expandability.</li> <li>• Favors non-wires alternatives.</li> </ul>

### Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Name	Organization	Comments
Mike Vildibill		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disappointed at elimination of Pomerado Scripps-Poway Parkway Alternative.</li> <li>• Concerned about future expansions west from the proposed substation; growth-inducing impacts of establishing a new corridor.</li> <li>• Proximity of proposed lines to homes in Poway.</li> <li>• Recommends undergrounding in existing overhead corridors to mitigate cumulative impacts of co-located lines.</li> </ul>
Alex Bourd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Project along Park Village Rd due to health impacts to children in a residential area.</li> <li>• CPUC should consider residents' opposition as much as DoD opposition.</li> <li>• Supports alternatives through Miramar.</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, February 6, 2007 (2 – 4 pm) – Wynola/Julian, CA</b>		
Ed Huffman		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Project.</li> <li>• Supports SWPL alternatives because reliability is equally a risk anywhere in San Diego backcountry and SWPL is a much shorter route.</li> <li>• Concerned about reasonably foreseeable expansion to Riverside and Orange County from the proposed substation.</li> </ul>
Jeanette Hartman	People's Powerlink	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Diego County has substantial potential to generate electricity without new transmission lines.</li> <li>• Infrastructure in place to implement non-wires alternative; provided list of agencies and organizations that support or promote non-wire alternatives to energy generation.</li> <li>• Support inclusion of non-wire alternative; believe preferable to proposed project.</li> </ul>
Norman Feigel	Bloomdale Ranch Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative impact of expansion in 300' ROW that could include two additional lines.</li> <li>• Access roads would create new impacts outside the established ROW.</li> <li>• Project would create a barrier to firefighting services but ranchers face the same risk to herd cattle to safety.</li> <li>• Impact on Williamson Act land and policy inconsistency.</li> <li>• Biological impact including Golden Eagle electrocution.</li> <li>• Visual impacts to Santa Ysabel Valley; references Route 395 through Tehachapi.</li> <li>• Recommends underground option for all of Santa Ysabel Valley; if not an option, do not use this route.</li> <li>• [See also summary of written comments in Appendix C2]</li> </ul>
Jim Davis		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Project.</li> <li>• Supports non-wires Resource Bundle No. 2.</li> <li>• Visual impacts to viewshed from San Felipe to Ramona.</li> </ul>
Katy Moretti	Santa Ysabel Ranch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ranch land has equally sensitive resources and has been preserved compared with ABDSP.</li> <li>• Impacts to Williamson Act land and firefighting near backcountry residences, EMF impacts to sensitive residents.</li> <li>• Impacts to resident community and public land.</li> </ul>
Pat Straube		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to Williamson Act land, tourism, back country character.</li> <li>• Objects to discussion of alternatives to an unnecessary project.</li> <li>• Requests the lead agencies to stop the project.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Name	Organization	Comments
David Lewis		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feels helpless in opposition to the Project.</li> <li>• Requests analysis of impact of grading for proposed substation, construction impacts to area wider than access roads, and runoff and hydrological impacts to sensitive ranch land.</li> </ul>
Denis Trafecanty	Protect Our Communities Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project is not needed.</li> <li>• Green Path is an alternative.</li> <li>• Related renewable generation would use unproven technology.</li> <li>• Proposed route allows expansion to Los Angeles.</li> <li>• Air quality impacts would be concentrated in Imperial Valley, not the San Diego load center.</li> <li>• Supports in-area generation and demand response, which would be sufficient to satisfy energy demand in San Diego.</li> <li>• Significant visual impacts to Santa Ysabel Valley, sensitive species, agricultural preserves, cultural resources.</li> </ul>
Tina Moretti-Plunkett		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to the Project because of inconclusive impacts to public health, wildlife, and cattle.</li> </ul>
Sandra Moretti		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values the land as source of livelihood.</li> <li>• Cumulative impacts to landowners who have already given easements to utilities with poor compensation.</li> </ul>
Donna Sherrill	Sherill Orchards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to agriculture, economy, tourism, route through Santa Ysabel, including underground options and substation.</li> <li>• Project would not benefit back country residents.</li> <li>• Supports local generation and energy conservation measures.</li> <li>• Supports route along U.S.-Mexico border.</li> </ul>
Rowlynda Moretti		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to impacts on family ranch land and lack of benefit for impacted residents from Project.</li> </ul>
Art Kratz		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transmission loses and wastes electricity.</li> <li>• Renewable generation cannot produce a high enough voltage to operate the new line.</li> <li>• Wants to keep the county as it is.</li> </ul>
Curt Nelson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to all alternatives except the non-wires alternatives.</li> <li>• Impacts to private and public lands.</li> <li>• Requests thorough analysis of impacts compared to benefits over as much time as possible; skeptical that the Project offers benefits.</li> <li>• San Diego population is decreasing and per capita energy use is not growing.</li> <li>• Critical of Proponent motives for proposal; Proponent profits from project cost to ratepayers San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce does not represent the opinions of the business community because the committee does not take input from membership; suspects members of the committee have questionable motives.</li> </ul>
Tom Larkin		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to SDG&amp;E's land use objective; location in rural communities and parks is not preferable to location in urban areas.</li> <li>• Criticizes objective limiting local energy markets.</li> <li>• Supports analysis of Valley-Rainbow (V-R) alternatives in the context of satisfying need for Project; V-R is a shorter route.</li> <li>• Finds the project schedule to be unrealistically short.</li> </ul>

---

#### Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Name	Organization	Comments
David Van Cleve		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Diego Country Estates resident, former employee of ABDSP and in Santa Ysabel Valley.</li> <li>• ABDSP is of international importance for its natural resources.</li> <li>• Impacts to wilderness are unacceptable.</li> <li>• Supports underground 230 kV through ABDSP and alternative route along the U.S.-Mexico border.</li> </ul>
Francesca Bertolini		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References Brockovich's movie; SDG&amp;E has earned worldwide distrust.</li> <li>• Recommends SDG&amp;E to seek alternatives to improve its public image.</li> </ul>
Alanson Burke		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References transmission connecting nuclear power plants to island load centers in Japan.</li> <li>• Recommends route along U.S.-Mexico border to the ocean. Border patrol roads can be shared for construction and maintenance.</li> <li>• Recommends offshore transmission to minimize legal and environmental impacts.</li> </ul>
Glen Drown		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumming Trust and the Tulloch Family Partners Property impacted from Santa Ysabel to MP 113 Construction infeasible at Central South Alternative Substation due to terrain and Cleveland National Forest boundaries; invites Team to tour the area.</li> </ul>
Claudia Costanzo		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property owner in Mesa Grande; values preserving the land without development.</li> <li>• Supports co-location of infrastructure to minimize visual impacts and share costs of road maintenance with federal agencies.</li> </ul>
Christie McGrath		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about cost and potential long-term SDG&amp;E profit from the Project.</li> </ul>
Donna Lewis		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about poor compensation to impacted private property owners.</li> </ul>
Ken Childs on behalf of Diane Jacobs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family ranch near Santa Ysabel.</li> <li>• Project would permanently impact back country character, visual resources, and pristine land.</li> <li>• Need for project should be determined before alternatives discussion.</li> </ul>
Travis Scott		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• References rule prohibiting transmission line construction in San Diego Country Estates; suggests such a rule should apply to backcountry.</li> <li>• Supports alternatives along the U.S.-Mexico border.</li> <li>• EMF impacts to sensitive individuals, e.g. with metal implants.</li> <li>• Impacts on wildfire; references Cedar Fire.</li> <li>• Cumulative increases to ROW width with additional lines.</li> </ul>
Debbie Westcott		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Diego resident.</li> <li>• Values the back country for recreational resources.</li> <li>• Supports alternatives that avoid back country.</li> </ul>
Bobbi Green		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appeals for protection of Julian residents against the Project.</li> <li>• Suggests use of public land instead of back country.</li> </ul>
Ken Gordon		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests installation of "story poles" to mimic locations of proposed towers to publicize visual impacts.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Name	Organization	Comments
<b>Scoping Meeting, February 6, 2007 (7 – 9 pm) – Ramona, CA</b>		
Daniel Wise		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Former SDG&amp;E strategic analyst.</li> <li>• Concerned about SDG&amp;E economic analysis filings and long-term planning feasibility.</li> <li>• Supports in-basin generation alternatives, including developing San Diego solar on multiple levels. References Million Solar Roofs Initiative.</li> <li>• Improve independent energy production market rules to make such investments more attractive.</li> </ul>
Glenn Younger		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocates for the consideration of the Creelman Alternative because it would be shorter, use open space, use an existing corridor, and have less construction impact.</li> <li>• San Vicente Alternative would impact traffic, residents, public safety, and air quality due to traffic congestion. It would be more expensive than the Creelman Alternative due to undergrounding costs associated with road construction.</li> </ul>
Mark Kiefer		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor public outreach because first notice was condemnation and eminent domain notice.</li> <li>• There is demonstrated need for the Project, but need more information including procedure for taking property, public health and safety, sources of generation, timing of generation, expandability to counties to the north.</li> </ul>
Denis Trafecanty	<b>Protect Our Communities Fund</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quotes letter from a former Navy pilot concerned about emergency services access from Santa Ysabel.</li> <li>• Impacts to aerial firefighting service in Santa Ysabel Valley.</li> </ul>
Joan Gansert		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the south power line because of visual and environmental impacts; opposes power line or generation projects to benefit Orange County.</li> <li>• References a conference between SDG&amp;E and agency officials agreeing that new transmission lines would not be needed.</li> <li>• Supports the South Bay Repower Project and in-area generation.</li> </ul>
Richard Zelmer		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criticizes alternatives analysis for implying the Project is needed.</li> <li>• Visual impact of Project or alternatives to San Diego Co.</li> <li>• Favors alternative generation over transmission.</li> <li>• Favors undergrounding along roads regardless of cost.</li> </ul>
Warren Coon		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports non-wires or No-Project Alternatives first, then underground along roads for its entire length.</li> </ul>
Travis Scott		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient public outreach, except to property owners.</li> <li>• Impacts from Elsinore Fault in overhead versus underground options</li> <li>• Grading impacts of proposed substation.</li> <li>• Questions need for the Project.</li> <li>• Impacts from future expansion.</li> <li>• Supports SWPL alternatives to avoid impacts to Park and Forest land.</li> <li>• EMF impacts to sensitive individuals.</li> <li>• Co-location with U.S.-Mexico border fence, option of energizing the fence.</li> <li>• Opposes overhead segment along SR 79.</li> </ul>

---

#### Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

---

Name	Organization	Comments
Diane Conklin	Mussey Grade Road Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciates the public outreach from the CPUC Environmental Division on this project.</li> <li>• References changes in SDG&amp;E economic savings estimates.</li> <li>• Concerned about air pollution and reliability resulting from reliance on Mexico and overseas generation.</li> <li>• Skeptical about Stirling solar generation technology and renewable power objective of the Project.</li> <li>• Include analysis about impacts on global warming.</li> <li>• Supports stand-alone renewable energy option under non-wires alternatives.</li> </ul>
Michael Hardcastle-Taylor		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creelman Alternative would reduce construction and maintenance impacts to residences.</li> <li>• Avoid ABDSP, county preserve, San Diego Country Estates; supports the Interstate 8 Alternative, undergrounding options, and system alternatives in Orange County.</li> </ul>
Jacqueline Ayer		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transmission component in LEAPS may be determined unnecessary; LEAPS schedule does not satisfy SDG&amp;E objectives.</li> <li>• Lack of environmental analysis in certain issue areas would force the EIR/EIS team to independently evaluate impacts.</li> <li>• LEAPS would impact pristine Cleveland National Forest.</li> <li>• Part of the Full Loop Alternative should be retained as identical to the LEAPS alternative.</li> <li>• Suggests including Talega and Escondido Substations in the System Alternatives figure.</li> </ul>
Nancy Gaczy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appeals for the agencies to listen to the opposition of people and property owners.</li> </ul>
Norman Johnson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skeptical of project need and SDG&amp;E savings estimates; references SDG&amp;E refusal of South Bay Repower Project. Repower would be cheaper and limit impacts compared with the Project.</li> </ul>
Salvador Yepiz		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a new natural gas-fired power plant project 30 miles east of Yuma.</li> </ul>
Usha Zelmer		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that more money should be spent on alternatives and searching for more non-wire alternatives.</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, February 7, 2007 (1 - 3 pm) – Boulevard, CA</b>		
Janis Shackelford		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWPL alternatives do not meet reliability requirements due to fire risk; risk is equal throughout San Diego County.</li> <li>• Project and alternatives that involve new transmission line would not reduce energy costs.</li> <li>• Skeptical of SDG&amp;E cost estimates.</li> <li>• Requests that Non-Wire Alternatives be considered in combination with one or more System Alternatives, particularly LEAPS plus Non-Wire.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Name	Organization	Comments
Donna Tisdale		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preventing landfills and the Project have been effective election issues.</li> <li>• Appreciates scoping meeting in Boulevard.</li> <li>• Boulevard residents should not have the burden of providing corridor for a new 230 kV line to benefit urban load centers.</li> <li>• Impacts on environmental justice and ranch land in potential geothermal source areas.</li> <li>• SWPL was historically intended to access geothermal sources but generation did not develop when gas prices fell.</li> <li>• Interstate 8 Alternative was not suggested by Boulevard locals.</li> <li>• Supports in-basin generation, renewable generation, and reconductor alternatives.</li> <li>• Is concerned about groundwater resources, since blasting can reroute water from fractured rock aquifers.</li> </ul>
Jack Driscoll		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWPL already carries coal-fired power from New Mexico.</li> <li>• SDG&amp;E refused to contract for South Bay Repower Project generation.</li> <li>• Recommends tidal wave generation in San Diego because it is a renewable source.</li> </ul>
Kelly Fuller		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the non-wires alternatives.</li> <li>• Use existing infrastructure to access renewables in Imperial County because it would be cheaper. References SDG&amp;E cost estimates.</li> <li>• Transmission project to access renewables will default to fossil fuel-generated energy if renewable generation is not constructed in time.</li> <li>• Requests analysis of energy conservation measures as an alternative; references state loading order.</li> </ul>
Robert Maupin		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWPL crosses agricultural property.</li> <li>• EMF from SWPL caused a bone marrow disease in his wife and transmission line EMF generally causes the disease in Europe.</li> <li>• Criticizes SWPL outage during San Diego power shortage last year; suspects it was profit-motivated.</li> <li>• Concerned about environmental justice.</li> <li>• Arizona BLM would not permit new transmission projects because it is public land.</li> </ul>
Bill Shepherd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes alternatives through Boulevard.</li> <li>• Supports northern routes; Bighorn Sheep would relocate and survive.</li> <li>• Impacted residents would not benefit or receive compensation.</li> </ul>
Mary Shoedfer	Boulevard Fire Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70 years of accumulated fuel could lead to fire taller than proposed towers.</li> <li>• Fire Department is all volunteer and short staffed; references Cedar Fire.</li> <li>• No need for Project.</li> <li>• Health impacts due to proximity to residences.</li> <li>• Visual impacts of towers.</li> </ul>
Shannon Davis		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Project.</li> <li>• As an expert on critical wildlife habitat, notes that numerous species' habitat would be impacted by the project, including Bighorn Sheep, Flame Bush, Burmese Copper Butterfly, Gnatcatcher, Southwestern Flycatcher, Tecate Cypress, and Arroyo Toad.</li> <li>• Opposes route D as a property owner along that route, and expresses concern over wildfire in the area.</li> <li>• Questions how water drainage qualities will be protected.</li> </ul>

### Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Name	Organization	Comments
Gary Hoyt		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions why CPUC has not mandated that the lines be underground. Understands that underground lines are mandated in Europe, and believes that they should be mandated here.</li> <li>• Questions whether there might be new technologies available to improve transmission without unsightly towers.</li> <li>• Believes that the Project benefits the company while impacting communities, and that communities should be compensated for the extensive losses they will suffer.</li> </ul>
Lorrie Ostrander		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expresses concern that well water will be affected.</li> <li>• Is concerned that while community members pay the high price of power, they will lose a tremendous amount if the lines go through the community not only because the lines are ugly, can cause fires, and can impact wildlife, but because construction and maintenance crews will rip up the roads, and drive too fast by the schools.</li> </ul>
Denis Trafecanty	Protect Our Communities Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that power should be generated in San Diego, where it is needed.</li> <li>• Urges the Team and the CPUC to consider that if the Greenpath North goes in, the SRPL is not needed.</li> <li>• Believes that the Stirling Systems argument is a bait and switch, since the technology has not yet been proven.</li> <li>• Favors the No-Wires Alternatives.</li> <li>• Asks the public to join Protect Our Communities and sign a petition.</li> </ul>
Mary Stewart		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is tired of animals coming before human beings. Believes that the animals have more than enough room. Believes that the real concern is when a company takes a person's home.</li> <li>• Recalls that the last power project through Boulevard did not lower electric bills as promised, and it was not a cure-all for electricity problems as promised.</li> <li>• Believes that Boulevard has had just enough of this crap.</li> </ul>
Vern Denham		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that electricity from Mexico is politically unreliable.</li> <li>• Notes that any "junior" terrorist can jeopardize the towers and threaten reliability.</li> <li>• Questions whether the 69 kV right-of-way is going to be used, or whether new right-of-way will be acquired.</li> </ul>
Theresa Shepherd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that there should be enough sun and wind to generate power without the use of transmission lines.</li> </ul>
Bob Smith		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the line will cause a fire hazard.</li> <li>• Notes that 50 houses, the number that would be displaced by the C route, is 10 percent of the population of residents.</li> <li>• Suggests that nuclear power be considered.</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, February 7, 2007 (6:30 – 8:30 pm) – Alpine, CA</b>		
Mike Thometz	MERIT, Quail Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is not convinced that the Project is needed. Believes that its necessity should be proven before routes are prematurely decided upon.</li> <li>• Believes that SWPL is the best route for the SRPL. Believes that with a major brush-clearing effort, fire could be avoided, and this would have benefits for border enforcement as well.</li> <li>• Finds the maps to be confusing and illegible, but also unnecessary when the line should clearly be routed along the SWPL.</li> <li>• Is concerned that the solar facility is unproven, and that the Park will be impacted. Believes that Non-Wire Alternatives should be the main focus of the analysis.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Name	Organization	Comments
Gordon Shackelford		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is a homeowner with a PV system.</li> <li>• Questions the viability of the Stirling Project and the accessibility of the geothermal resources in Imperial County. Believes that if and when renewables turn up in Imperial County, the existing SWPL has more than enough capacity to accommodate transmission of those resources.</li> <li>• Suggests combining Non-Wires and System Alternatives.</li> <li>• Is curious about the fate of the SWPL and how it relates to the SRPL plans after the recent PUC decision to ban coal power coming into the state.</li> </ul>
Cindy Buxton	Sierra Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urges the community not to be tricked into making a choice between two undesirables, but to oppose the Project altogether.</li> <li>• Recently took a kid--who had never been off the pavement--hiking in a now pristine area near where the power line would go; and the kid was so stoked that he went back two days later.</li> <li>• Is outraged that people's property and public goods will be taken away by a power company.</li> </ul>
Roger Caldwell		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a landowner in Crest, believes that it is absurd that someone would try to put a power line up such a steep section of canyon with boulders the size of dump trucks (WF Alt through Harbison Canyon).</li> <li>• Believes that this alternative is not safe. Notes that the existing 69 kV ROW has never been properly maintained.</li> </ul>
Mary Manning	<b>Harbison Canyon  Community Board  Harbison Canyon Lions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that at WF18, there is no fire station within 40 miles, and fire prevention is done by the community, so the only fire protection available is aerial firefighting. This will be jeopardized by the power lines.</li> </ul>
Suzanne Gaul		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is opposed to the SRPL Project, specifically West of Forest route D.</li> <li>• Notes that the power company doesn't maintain the existing line, the terrain is very dangerous, and subcontractors have changed the water flow numerous times.</li> <li>• Is concerned that her whole property will be taken.</li> <li>• Supports the No-Project and Non-Wire Alternatives.</li> <li>• Makes specific suggestions for rerouting D.</li> </ul>
Brian Jennings		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hopes that ABDSP will be preserved for future generations.</li> </ul>
Nancy Jennings		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that the goal of the Park is to preserve this beautiful area for future generations.</li> </ul>
Paul Healy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes all Alternatives except for the No-Wire Alternative. Believes that San Diego County has suffered enough environmental damage from all of the other lines that crisscross the area.</li> <li>• Believes that the money would be better spent on solar panels on rooftops.</li> </ul>
Jeff Myrick		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is concerned that putting the lines through Harbison Canyon will eliminate firefighting capabilities, so by using the West of Forest Alternative, it will be putting Harbison Canyon and Crest at increased risk of wildfire.</li> </ul>
John Flynn		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worked for SDG&amp;E for five years, 1980-1985, trying to convince the company to go solar. When he left the job, he was told that the company would not go solar until it could put a meter on the sun.</li> <li>• Believes that San Diego County should be focusing on solar power. Notes that the SRPL Project would provide few jobs to local residents, no benefit to the environment or climate, no benefit to the public purse. Notes that fossil fuels are only getting more expensive as they become more scarce, and we should be using readily available renewable energy.</li> </ul>

### Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Name	Organization	Comments
William Bretz		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes the scoping documents were vague. Requests information on the width of corridors, what happens when the route goes along a property line, what's the setback for people not being able to make use of their property, how close can you live to a high-powered transmission line.</li> <li>• Finds the WF route problematic as it passes through the Sweetwater and along Crest Ridge Ecological Preserves.</li> <li>• Supports Non-Wire Alternatives, and believes that the business practices of SDG&amp;E that include forcing the public to bear the costs of the project are irresponsible.</li> <li>• Is curious about the Federal West Wide Energy Corridor Program, and whether the EIR/EIS will consider it.</li> </ul>
Lesley Barling		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is confused by a discordance between the maps and text of the Notice regarding System alternatives.</li> <li>• Believes that some routes are being retained to serve as straw men, begging to be discarded, and wonders if there are better routes that are not being considered.</li> <li>• Notes that the reliability concerns of collocation with SWPL should also be concerns for D and West of Forest, because they are only a few miles from SWPL in a lot of places.</li> <li>• Supports the Non-Wire alternatives and would like to see them be emphasized.</li> </ul>
Denis Trafecanty		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Project.</li> <li>• Notes that firefighting will become impossible if the line goes in.</li> <li>• Is concerned about cross-border pollution from Mexican plants.</li> </ul>
Randy Rusch		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions, with the shutting down of South Bay Power Plant, whether SRPL is an attempt to get power from Mexico to L.A. and beyond.</li> <li>• Is concerned about the drying up of private wells during construction, about fire, and about the disturbance to the flight plans of the area.</li> </ul>
Patricia Akers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the No-Wire alternatives should be the central focus of the EIR/EIS.</li> <li>• Believes that the EIR/EIS should include a social analysis of how Projects like the SRPL pit communities against one another, which represents an inappropriate tactic by the company.</li> <li>• Believes that SDG&amp;E is being allowed to take a conservation ethic away from communities and replace it with a wasteful ethic in which San Diego will continually rely on imported energy.</li> </ul>
Kathe Myrick		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the West of Forest Alternative. As a victim of the Cedar fire, is concerned about the fire danger in the area, and the firefighting hindrance the line will cause.</li> </ul>
John Elliott		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that if the Project is to go forward, it must be the Preferred route because the route is the one that impacts communities the least.</li> <li>• Alternatively, suggests using the SWPL corridor.</li> <li>• Believes that putting the line through communities is unacceptable.</li> </ul>
Raymond Lutz		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the process is progressing in the wrong order. Believes that most of the routes are bogus red herrings, and that there has been no discussion of whether the project is necessary. Requests documentation that the project is necessary.</li> </ul>
Shannon Davis		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urges Alpine to get involved in planning group meetings.</li> <li>• Believes that none of the Alternatives are good, and notes that NIMBY-ism is not the motivating issue, but that the planning groups oppose the Project entirely.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Name	Organization	Comments
<b>Scoping Meeting, February 8, 2007 (2:30 – 5 pm) – Borrego Springs, CA</b>		
Mike Hussey		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that none of the alternatives are good.</li> <li>• Believes that the transmission line will ruin Ocotillo Wells.</li> <li>• Favors putting wind turbines on ocean piers.</li> <li>• Questions where the thermal solar farm will obtain its necessary 36 billion gallons of water per year.</li> </ul>
Diana Lindsay	<b>Anza-Borrego Foundation and Institute</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that aesthetic and ethical costs should be included in the Project objectives.</li> <li>• Believes that de-designation of wilderness is a slippery slope.</li> <li>• Does not support undergrounding in the Park as it would have enormous impacts.</li> <li>• Believes that the total real costs of the project should be compared to the Non-Wires and System Alternatives.</li> </ul>
Ray Mouton	<b>Anza Borrego Foundation Institute</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that donors have contributed 35,000 acres to the Park, and that the SRPL completely devalues the donor's gifts.</li> <li>• Notes that EMFs will destroy researchers' ability to use telemetry for monitoring Bighorn Sheep herds.</li> </ul>
Lou Bahar		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports renewable energy, and opposes the Project through the Park.</li> <li>• Requests a reevaluation of the stated need for the additional power.</li> </ul>
Violet Devoe		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the cost of the proposed and alternative routes should be compared to the cost of preserving the park for future generations.</li> <li>• Supports the I-8 route.</li> </ul>
Nick Criss		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based the purchase of his property on the announcement of the preferred route, and is perturbed by the capricious nature of the process that allows for a sudden change of route.</li> <li>• Wants to know at what stage of the process he can be sure that the route through his property has been officially rejected.</li> <li>• Requests that the CPUC intervene in court proceedings between SDG&amp;E and residents of Tubb Canyon, who disallowed the company access to their land, once it is finalized that the route through Tubb Canyon has been rejected.</li> </ul>
Bill Collins		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is concerned with SDG&amp;E being allowed access to his land for studies if the route through Tubb Canyon is going to be eliminated.</li> <li>• Is concerned that the company will accidentally destroy his water line.</li> </ul>
David Garmon		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be devastated if the beauty and peace of the Borrego Valley were destroyed by this Project.</li> <li>• Questions the validity of the fire based collocation risk of the SRPL and the SWPL.</li> <li>• Suggests exhausting existing local options like the Chula Vista plant before proceeding with the transmission project.</li> </ul>
Lori Paul		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As an absentee landowner, finds it difficult to come out to Tubb Canyon each time SDG&amp;E wants access to her land.</li> <li>• Notes that the area is experiencing severe drought conditions, and surface springs in Tubb Canyon are sensitive to trucks driving on access roads, and asks that SDG&amp;E not be granted access to her land.</li> </ul>
James Rickard		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the proposed Project route is wrong, and favors the SWPL and West of Forest Alternatives because it is not in natural protected areas.</li> <li>• Supports System Alternatives.</li> <li>• Believes that the real reason for the SRPL is to transmit power from Mexico.</li> </ul>

---

#### Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Name	Organization	Comments
Monty Tam	Pacific Crest Trail Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the retained alternative routes because they each impact the National Scenic Trail.</li> <li>• If the project must be approved, request that the SWPL parallel and the I-8 routes be considered.</li> <li>• Strongly suggests that the Team contact the Forest Service.</li> </ul>
Jay Price		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that the route up S-2 is indefensible and should be officially eliminated.</li> </ul>
Lane Sharman		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the Project will be a scar of colossal distortion on the Park.</li> <li>• Believes that the loss of energy in transit is a travesty to the spirit and movement behind energy efficiency and emission management.</li> </ul>
Betty Backus		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports solar panels and environmental education of youth.</li> </ul>
Larry Pustinger		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that the technology for generating solar power is not yet ready even though SDG&amp;E is in such a rush to get a transmission line approved. Believe that their claims of renewable energy are unjustified, and asks the commission to take this seriously.</li> <li>• Notes that one day we will be able to manufacture electricity in clean and efficient ways, but we will never be able to manufacture land.</li> </ul>
Judith Withers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that there are major fire-induced erosion problems in San Felipe where the proposed Central East Substation would be.</li> <li>• Supports the No-Wires Alternative and the Path 44 Upgrade Alternative.</li> <li>• Notes that San Diegans may receive cheap power, but they'll pay for it with their precious ABDSP and surrounding wilderness.</li> <li>• Believes that California, through the acts of the Commission, needs to send a message that energy needs need to be met in a decentralized manner.</li> <li>• Believes that there is nothing America cannot do given the right leadership, and asks the Commission to provide that leadership.</li> </ul>
Glenn Stokes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that SDG&amp;E ought to be able to come up with some way to turn a profit from local solar. Wants to see credible studies that local solar is infeasible before the project is allowed to go forward.</li> </ul>
Robert Barelmann		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is grateful for the elimination of the Borrego Valley Alternative.</li> <li>• Opposes the Project through ABDSP, the desert jewel.</li> <li>• Believes that we all have the responsibility to our children and grandchildren to preserve our Parks.</li> </ul>
Larry Hogue		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that ABDSP ought to be given the same consideration as a Yosemite or a Grand Canyon.</li> <li>• Opposes option D through wild lands.</li> <li>• Supports a wireless local plan.</li> <li>• Will burn candles before he sees power lines in Anza Borrego.</li> </ul>
Donna Matson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions whether the Project might affect Swainson's Hawk, which stops in Anza-Borrego on its migration to Canada.</li> <li>• Thinks that the V-R Devers-Miguel via Imperial is a good route, and supports solar panels so that transmission is a non-issue.</li> </ul>
Susan Browne		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points to the IPCC's recent climate change report stating that climate change is unequivocal, and then to Sempra's statement that global warming is debatable.</li> <li>• Is fearful for this company being allowed to build the SRPL, and wonders if it can be trusted to make good decisions about where to purchase the energy that will traverse the Park.</li> <li>• Noting that Arizona and Mexican plants are coal powered, thinks the wrong issue is being discussed at the scoping meetings.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Name	Organization	Comments
Myrna Wosk		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports non-wire solutions. Believes that the Imperial Substation is too easy an entry for Mexican power which has cross-border pollution effects.</li> <li>• Notes that if wilderness is de-designated, then everything is up for grabs.</li> </ul>
Ted Caragozian		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the proposed power route is an absolute violation of the precious refuge of the Park.</li> <li>• Understands that Sempra has been nailed for colluding with another energy company to illegally fix the price of natural gas during the energy crunch, ripping off consumers to the tune of \$2 billion and settling for around half a billion.</li> <li>• Doesn't buy the company's talk of renewable power, and believes that the backcountry shouldn't have to bear the brunt of over-consumption and greed.</li> <li>• Hopes the public servants will serve the people instead of dirty big business by opposing power lines through the Park and the rural backcountry.</li> </ul>
Josan Feathers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that the most destruction of wilderness would occur during the construction phase of the project when heavy equipment would make new roads and grade miles of undisturbed land.</li> <li>• Believes that granting the company the right to use the access roads in perpetuity is appalling, and is a license to pollute waterways and introduce exotic species each time its trucks pass.</li> <li>• Notes that photovoltaic technology is improving in leaps and bounds.</li> </ul>
Kelly Fuller		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes there are premature conclusions in the scoping document, including that the easement is 100-feet wide so will have no impact when there are often 24-foot wide pinch points that will have to be expanded, and in some cases there are serious legal questions as to how wide easements really are.</li> <li>• Supports Non-Wires alternatives.</li> </ul>
Sam Webb		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that protecting new land in exchange for using Park land is an unacceptable way to make up for taking away wilderness land. Parks should be protected as assets for future generations.</li> </ul>
Cliff Webb	Stirling Energy Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that there is a critical need for the transmission line.</li> <li>• Notes that the technology being proposed has been in development for 20 years, and holds the world record for efficient conversion of solar to electric energy.</li> <li>• Notes that the technology is dependent on a central station setting, and can produce three times the energy that an equivalent PV system can produce at one-fifth the cost.</li> <li>• Clarifies that the technology uses no water, has no combustion products, and has no dangerous heat transfer fluids.</li> <li>• Notes that construction would begin in mid 2008.</li> </ul>
Merle Vogel		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that there is no commercial example of the Stirling system at the scale being proposed, and asserts that Stirling won't be able to deliver the electricity. Questions what the fate of the SRPL will be once this takes place, and whether dirty plants in Mexico will provide power.</li> </ul>

---

#### Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

---

Name	Organization	Comments
Carolyn Morrow	CASE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After careful research, believes that the line is not needed.</li> <li>• Questions why Green Path North is not one of the alternatives being considered.</li> <li>• Notes that towers would impede firefighting efforts, which puts San Diego at risk.</li> <li>• Believes that the health effects of high-power lines has been understudied, and asks that the CPUC provide the public with any studies relating to health issues.</li> <li>• Supports in-county generation, conservation, and green energy.</li> </ul>
Adrian McGregor		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that California will no longer import dirty energy.</li> <li>• Notes that washing the lines is done by helicopters and that it contaminates the land around them.</li> <li>• Notes that there are surging temperatures around power lines, which can lead to more fires.</li> <li>• Notes that ozone dust is also a problem.</li> <li>• Believes that putting the lines through the Park is discrimination against seniors with pacemakers, since they cannot be near high-powered lines.</li> </ul>
Esther Rubin	Conservation Biology Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that any line through the park will go through critical habitat of Bighorn Sheep. Notes that biologists don't know what impact this will have on the herds, but it could cause abandonment of habitat, disruption of movement patterns, severing of the population with consequent negative effects on the gene pool. Suggests that introduction of exotic plants could displace key foraging habitat.</li> <li>• Urges the PUC to support wireless options.</li> </ul>
Sara Feldman	California State Parks Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75,000 members are concerned with threats to State Parks, especially the threat posed by the SRPL.</li> <li>• Asks the lead agencies to thoroughly consider all of the alternatives in a fair and thoughtful manner in order to specifically avoid de-designation of protected Wilderness and destruction of ABDSP.</li> </ul>
David Hogan	Center for Biological Diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Non-Wires and System Alternatives to encourage energy efficiency and conservation, and to provide clean, secure energy.</li> <li>• Believes that SDG&amp;E's alternatives don't advance public interests.</li> <li>• Believes that the second scoping notice doesn't anticipate necessary evaluation of the viability and cost of Imperial Valley renewables or the current and future capacity of existing or other planned transmission lines. Notes that the Notice neglects the cumulative impacts of the full loop.</li> <li>• The organization opposes all of the routes.</li> </ul>
Craig Maxwell		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions whether, if money needed to be saved, would we put a power line through Yosemite Valley, or stretch a line from El Capitan to Half Dome.</li> </ul>
Denis Trafecanty		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that the jet propulsion lab rejected Stirling systems because their prototypes did not work. Believes that the project is a bait and switch.</li> <li>• Is concerned about smog in ABDSP.</li> </ul>

**Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Name	Organization	Comments
<b>Scoping Meeting, February 9, 2007 (1 - 3 pm) – Temecula, CA</b>		
Paul O'Neal	NRG Energy, Incorporated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NRG Energy owns and operates 2,000 MWs of electric generation in California; 1,200 MWs in San Diego County.</li> <li>• During energy crunch, NRG, other independent producers, and SDG&amp;E managed to supply all region's energy needs.</li> <li>• NRG in partnership with Impex Corporation is proceeding with a permit to construct a 750 MW power plant near Sycamore Canyon Substation on Miramar Air Station. NRG will also repower Encina Generating Station in Carlsbad.</li> <li>• These new facilities will replace existing power generation by year 2011. New in-basin generation is important to maintain grid reliability in San Diego.</li> </ul>
Ray Stinnett		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests CGIT Bus Underground alternative because it is efficient and progressive technology. Its cost is comparable to that of the Project.</li> <li>• Suggests undergrounding along I-15 to avoid impacts to residents. Use project budget to investigate more alternatives and new technologies.</li> <li>• Consider fuel cells powered by natural gas within California.</li> <li>• Skeptical of the LEAPS Project; references failure of Taum Sauk Dam.</li> <li>• Objects to impact on communities that would not benefit from the project.</li> </ul>
Barbara Dye		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate public noticing.</li> <li>• Opposes any route that crosses a community.</li> <li>• Supports co-location with freeway to avoid impacts to communities and forest.</li> <li>• References impacts from a downed power line near Julian and ABDSP; Central Link route poses a fire hazard.</li> <li>• Lists communities that would be impacted by alternatives.</li> </ul>
Pam Nelson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generation should be near population centers, not in the desert. Supports the non-wires alternatives.</li> <li>• Transmission is too dangerous and inefficient, with great impacts.</li> <li>• Users should be responsible for local generation and energy conservation.</li> </ul>
Gregory Weiler	Castle Eurasia and Zen Media Corporations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Proposed Project intersection with Interstate 8, a master planned community has been in scoping with the County. Suggests routing alternatives to east or west of property.</li> </ul>
Joshua Hunter	Castle Eurasia and Zen Media Corporations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BLM did not communicate with SDG&amp;E about planned community in time for proposed route to mitigate impacts.</li> <li>• Development project already has political support as a revitalization effort.</li> <li>• Developers are already in negotiation to contract for building. Suggests routing alternative and potential for accommodating public need and future growth.</li> </ul>
Laura Hunter	Environmental Health Coalition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciates public involvement effort.</li> <li>• Supports non-wires, in-basin generation alternatives, but oppose South Bay Re-power Project for feasibility reasons.</li> <li>• Supports including renewable generation in any non-wires alternative.</li> <li>• Suggests measures to remove regulatory barriers to renewable energy development in the region including net metering cap and limitations on direct access.</li> <li>• Select an alternative that would best mitigate impacts to climate change; rising sea levels is a particular hazard to coastal San Diego.</li> </ul>

---

#### Appendix C-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings

Name	Organization	Comments
Benjamin Kwon	Castle Eurasia and Zen Media Corporations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development project is moving forward to application with potential partners and builders.</li> <li>• The Project is needed and the Corporation is ready to negotiate.</li> <li>• Renewable energy generation would require leasing of BLM land; there are plenty of potential solar resources.</li> <li>• Supports renewable energy alternatives as a way to promote the community development project.</li> </ul>
Greg Nelson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports in-basin generation because most infrastructure already exists.</li> <li>• Currently uses a solar and wind system at residence to produce all energy consumed.</li> </ul>
Kathy Pierce		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On behalf of property owners (mother and neighbors Dr. and Mrs. David Moulton) opposes the LEAPS Alternative because private property would be impacted by LEAPS Project.</li> </ul>
Sandra Stinnett		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the Project, wires alternatives, and generation alternatives because of impacts to nearby neighborhood.</li> <li>• The Project has been rejected by other potentially affected neighborhoods and is now potentially to be routed in Elsinore.</li> <li>• Fire hazard.</li> <li>• Poor public noticing and education about potential environmental impacts, particularly about LEAPS.</li> </ul>
John Sterra		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BCD and Interstate Alternatives would impact ranch homes near Boulevard at MPs 18-0 and BCD-0. Should stay north of Interstate 8 to avoid conflict with new development.</li> <li>• NASA and English research on EMF impacts on cancer.</li> <li>• Requests cost comparison of different kinds of generation.</li> <li>• Encourages investment in renewable generation technologies.</li> </ul>
John Guzman Sr.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposes the LEAPS Project due to fire risk; Lakeland is at risk for high wind conditions.</li> <li>• Poor public noticing; neighborhood association was not informed of meeting.</li> <li>• Recommends undergrounding in this area, particularly along the Cleveland Ridge.</li> </ul>
Betty Johnson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look at the Valley Rainbow Project EIR/EIS and related documents since that project's denial.</li> </ul>
Denis Trafecanty		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocates in-area generation alternatives and renewable generation in San Diego.</li> <li>• Stirling technology was rejected by Sandia Labs in New Mexico; it would be a poor investment.</li> <li>• Distrust of SDG&amp;E's objective to access new renewable energy; references excessive energy market profits.</li> <li>• Expansion from proposed substation to counties in the north is a foreseeable action.</li> <li>• Impacts from power plants in Mexico.</li> </ul>
Jennifer Porter	San Diego Regional Energy Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working to continue Self-Generation Incentive Program; requests that it should be considered in the non-wires alternatives.</li> </ul>
Jim Douley		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project does not generate power.</li> <li>• Recommends generation projects along coastal San Diego, near load centers.</li> </ul>
Dick Guthrie		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resident near wilderness area that the Project would border.</li> <li>• Interested in accessing electricity from the Project.</li> </ul>