

---

**From:** WKBRR@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of William Benson <WKBRR@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 29, 2025 1:00 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
William Benson  
35 S Morrison Ave San Jose, CA 95126-3118 WKBRR@HOTMAIL.COM

---

**From:** chainringbob@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bob Berends  
<chainringbob@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 1, 2025 8:49 PM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Bob Berends  
5354 Joseph Ln San Jose, CA 95118-2832  
chainringbob@yahoo.com

---

**From:** abien@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Annie Bien <abien@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 26, 2025 5:07 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Annie Bien  
29 Tiffany Pl Brooklyn, NY 11231-2996  
abien@verizon.net

---

**From:** jcarlinsv@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Carlin Black <jcarlinsv@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 25, 2025 6:36 PM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Carlin Black  
5881 Castano Dr San Jose, CA 95129-3062 jcarlinsv@gmail.com

---

**From:** seaglass103@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Patricia Blevins <seaglass103@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 25, 2025 7:17 PM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Patricia Blevins  
1248 Bryan Ave San Jose, CA 95118-1808  
seaglass103@sbcglobal.net

---

**From:** gayleboesch@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Gayle Boesch  
<gayleboesch@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 28, 2025 2:35 PM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Gayle Boesch  
1518 Shasta Ave San Jose, CA 95126-2533 gayleboesch@gmail.com

---

**From:** littleredrt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cynthia Boman  
<littleredrt@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 25, 2025 6:59 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Cynthia Boman  
7374 Pegasus Way San Jose, CA 95139-1241 littleredrt@gmail.com

---

**From:** littleredrt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cynthia Boman  
<littleredrt@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 26, 2025 5:41 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Cynthia Boman  
7374 Pegasus Way San Jose, CA 95139-1241 littleredrt@gmail.com



---

**From:** braverma@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Phil Braverman  
<braverma@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 26, 2025 1:26 PM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Phil Braverman  
300 Ribbonwood Ave San Jose, CA 95123-4452 braverma@hotmail.com

---

**From:** aaronbrinkerhoff@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Aaron Brinkerhoff  
<aaronbrinkerhoff@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 26, 2025 8:03 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Aaron Brinkerhoff  
5 Newcastle Ct San Rafael, CA 94903-4231 aaronbrinkerhoff@gmail.com

---

**From:** sbrooks@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Stephanie Brooks  
<sbrooks@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 30, 2025 1:00 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Stephanie Brooks  
3453 Bon Air Ct San Jose, CA 95117-2901 sbrooks@bayareanutrition.com

---

**From:** meadowlarkltb@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lynn Buck  
<meadowlarkltb@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 30, 2025 8:41 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Lynn Buck  
PARK WATSON PI San Jose, CA 95136  
meadowlarkltb@sbcglobal.net

---

**From:** sburchinal@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Burchinal  
<sburchinal@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 27, 2025 10:33 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Janet Burchinal  
2223 Bello Ave San Jose, CA 95125-4908  
sburchinal@yahoo.com

---

**From:** sburchinal@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Janet Burchinal  
<sburchinal@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 28, 2025 10:36 PM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Janet Burchinal  
2223 Bello Ave San Jose, CA 95125-4908  
sburchinal@yahoo.com

---

**From:** schotzekatze@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Lisa Burton  
<schotzekatze@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 25, 2025 10:11 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Lisa Burton  
275 Burnett Ave Spc 108 Morgan Hill, CA 95037-2633 schotzekatze@hotmail.com

---

**From:** bigladysue@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Susan Butler-Graham  
<bigladysue@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 28, 2025 10:30 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project. We who live in San Jose have been fighting to protect this land and this wildlife corridor for years.

Sincerely,  
Susan Butler-Graham  
1671 Fairwood Ave San Jose, CA 95125-4939 bigladysue@yahoo.com



---

**From:** abeicamarillo1949@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Abe Camarillo <abeicamarillo1949@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 28, 2025 4:20 PM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Abe Camarillo  
985 Montebello Dr Apt D102 Gilroy, CA 95020-4845 abeicamarillo1949@gmail.com

---

**From:** soupuno@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Allan Campbell  
<soupuno@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 25, 2025 11:04 PM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Allan Campbell  
3162 Isadora Dr San Jose, CA 95132-1920 soupuno@aol.com

---

**From:** seezcandi@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Candise Canto  
<seezcandi@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 24, 2025 1:01 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Locating the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek for the additional 1.2-mile-long transmission line that will be needed if the terminal is built on the site under the project as proposed. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project – a cost that would be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space to ensure the environmental and economic vitality of the greater San José area. Santa Clara County voters agree and have consistently and overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. The highest incidence of bobcats, badgers, coyotes, deer, and other animals being killed by cars is right around this location, proving that animals are desperately trying to get across Monterey Road to the safety of Coyote Creek on the other side. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Candise Canto  
398 Avenida Manzanos San Jose, CA 95123-1412 seezcandi@yahoo.com

---

**From:** bccanup@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Canup <bccanup@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 25, 2025 9:02 AM  
**To:** Power Santa Clara Valley  
**Subject:** Please choose the Environmentally Superior Alternative for the Power Santa Clara Valley project

Dear California Public Utilities Commission,

Please preserve the environmentally important Coyote Valley! The Draft EIR for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project identified Alternative Combination 1 (AC-1), which locates the Grove terminal at the PG&E Metcalf Substation, as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The CPUC should choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Putting the Grove terminal at the Metcalf Substation instead of on an orchard in Coyote Valley would significantly reduce the environmental impacts of the project. There is no reason to bulldoze an orchard, dig a trench along nearly a mile of the Coyote Creek Trail, and bore a tunnel underneath Coyote Creek. All of this would increase the cost of the overall project to be passed on to the public.

Coyote Valley forms a critical landscape linkage for wildlife to migrate between the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range. Numerous scientific studies support conserving all of Coyote Valley as protected open space. Santa Clara County voters have consistently demonstrated their support for conservation of Coyote Valley.

The Coyote Valley orchard that would be the site for the terminal under the project as proposed is right next to Coyote Creek, which is the backbone of the wildlife corridor through Coyote Valley. Animals that depend on the creek corridor to be able to migrate from the Santa Cruz Mountains to the Diablo Range would be subjected to noise, nighttime lighting, human activity, and other disturbances from the construction and operation of the energy facility.

Monterey Road, where this orchard site is located, is already a wildlife roadkill hotspot. Putting a 6-acre energy facility in the path of these animals heading for the safety of Coyote Creek will only make this problem worse.

Please choose AC-1 as the preferred path forward for the Power Santa Clara Valley Project.

Sincerely,  
Barbara Canup  
7058 Via Del Rio San Jose, CA 95139-1137 bccanup@gmail.com