
From: samnaifeh@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sam Naifeh <samnaifeh@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 27, 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,
Sam Naifeh
2059 New Brunswick Dr San Mateo, CA 94402-4043 samnaifeh@sbcglobal.net

From: utkarsh.nath@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Utkarsh Nath
<utkarsh.nath@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Monday, August 18, 2025 10:33 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,
Utkarsh Nath
34462 Alberta Ter Fremont, CA 94555-2907 utkarsh.nath@yahoo.com

From: ngokayla369@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kayla Ngo <ngokayla369@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 3, 2025 7:42 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,
Kayla Ngo
366 Sun Ridge Ln San Jose, CA 95123-6507 ngokayla369@gmail.com

From: christal@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christal Niederer <christal@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 11:09 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,
Christal Niederer
6272 Sager Way San Jose, CA 95123-4643
christal@creeksidescience.com

From: nihipalim001@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Michele Nihipali <nihipalim001@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 7:46 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,
Michele Nihipali
54 -074 Kamehameha Hwy # A Hauula, HI 96717-9691 nihipalim001@hawaii.rr.com

From: Inoori@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Laila Noori
<Inoori@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2025 11:54 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,
Laila Noori
363 Aklan Ct San Jose, CA 95119-1600
Inoori@hotmail.com

From: harryober3@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Harry Oberhelman <harryober3@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2025 6:07 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,
Harry Oberhelman
1092 Culligan Blvd San Jose, CA 95120-2835 harryober3@gmail.com

From: jandjoda@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of John Oda <jandjoda@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 8:11 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,
John Oda
2000 Post St San Francisco, CA 94115-3500 jandjoda@aol.com

From: kitodoherty@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kit Odoherty
<kitodoherty@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 7:42 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,
Kit Odoherty
330 Mirada Rd Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-1312 kitodoherty@gmail.com

From: poliverio@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Pamela Oliverio
<poliverio@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 3:44 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.

We are already going through so much disruption in our local, state, and national lives. Do the right thing and choose AC-1

Sincerely,
Pam Oliverio
28 Bassett St. Apt. 231
San Jose, CA 95110

Sincerely,
Pamela Oliverio
28 Bassett St Apt 231 San Jose, CA 95110-2459 poliverio@me.com

From: do1949@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Denis O'Neal <do1949@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 7:21 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,
Denis O'Neal
431 Valley Oak Dr Morgan Hill, CA 95037-9229 do1949@gmail.com

From: onealk888@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kathy ONeal <onealk888@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 6:40 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,
Kathy ONeal
431 Valley Oak Dr Morgan Hill, CA 95037-9229 onealk888@gmail.com

From: parkladydi1@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diane Palacio <parkladydi1@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 6:31 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,
Diane Palacio
44 Ellington Ave San Francisco, CA 94112-3621 parkladydi1@sbcglobal.net

From: rparadies@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Richard Paradies
<rparadies@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 8:10 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,
Richard Paradies
17890 Crest Ave Morgan Hill, CA 95037-4239 rparadies@gmail.com

From: divy.pari@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Divya Pari <divy.pari@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 6:13 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. For the good of the environment and for the good of all!

Sincerely,
Divya Pari
1518 Los Rios Ct San Jose, CA 95120-4823 divy.pari@gmail.com

From: sim.park@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Sim Park <sim.park@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 1:29 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,
Sim Park
431 Danna Ct San Jose, CA 95138-1326
sim.park@yahoo.com

From: smitspat@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Smita Patel <smitspat@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2025 10:18 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,
Smita Patel
82 Coburn Ct San Jose, CA 95139-1214
smitspat@gmail.com

From: jpearson@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Pearson <jpearson@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2025 3:52 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,
James Pearson
7370 Church St Apt C Gilroy, CA 95020-6165 jpearson@garlic.com

From: jennarose788@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Jenna Perez <jennarose788@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 4:51 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,
Jenna Perez
5984 Santa Teresa Blvd San Jose, CA 95123-4238 jennarose788@gmail.com

From: peckos@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of James Petkiewicz <peckos@everyactioncustom.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 8:28 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,
James Petkiewicz
916 Wren Dr San Jose, CA 95125-2952
peckos@me.com