

From: Jeff Sykes <sykes@earthlink.net>
To: sunrise@aspeneg.com
Sent: Fri Apr 11 11:46
Subject: Fwd: Sunrise DEIR

Dear PUC,

I am writing about the proposed Sunrise Power Link project and the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

After reviewing the Draft EIR and hearing the comments made by opponents I'm not sure where to start. One thing is very clear to me and that is that most of the opposition is opposed to various parts of the project because they are concerned about an impact to themselves or their particular cause. For example the Rancho Penasquitos Concerned Citizens (RPCC) sent out an email on Sunday January 24, 2008 encouraging their members to go speak at the hearings. Specifically they were asked to speak in favor of the Coastal System Upgrade Alternative and almost as an after thought to speak against the entire project itself. What this tells me is that their real concern is only what happens from I-15 west. They really don't care about the rest of the project as long as it doesn't affect them. The Mussey Grade Association is in the same position, all they really care about is stopping any additional lines through the existing easement across their area. This seems to be a prevailing sentiment amongst many people these days about all infrastructure projects. My lights, water and sewer work so why should I have to be inconvenienced so someone else can have the same services? Fortunately in the past that attitude either didn't exist or was ignored, otherwise we all could be living without plumbing, lights, roads, schools, hospitals, railroads, homes, stores and etc. Where has the tolerance for the "common good" gone? Hopefully you will be able to see that the majority of the opposition actually is opposed to anything and will be able to make a decision that takes into account the future needs of all of the present and future residents of San Diego and Southern California.

In light of the above I look at the preferable alternatives as listed in the DEIR ES.6 for Sunrise and wonder how any of them could be more palatable or more cost efficient than the proposed plan. If the opponents don't want a power line how would anyone ever expect them to accept In-Area Generation? A few new power plants! Where? And in whose backyard? Let's see, Chula Vista wants to get rid of their power plant and so does Carlsbad, doesn't seem like putting in new power plants is going to be met with anything other than great opposition. Maybe different groups, but if the current project is any indication there will be as much if not more opposition. And what about the fuel to run the new plants, what would that be and will it reduce carbon emissions? And won't there be a need to place the power plants near the load and/or build additional transmission lines? Which neighborhoods will be affected by these activities? Won't they be opposed? How much success is SDG&E having with the two new peakers at Pala and Margarita, E6.1.5? If peakers aren't acceptable how do you propose to get large generation facilities approved?

It appears we all want renewables but willing to pay the price either for the cost of the installation, environmental cost or the aesthetic cost. If we don't want power lines out in remote areas of San Diego why would anyone think we would be willing to accept solar panels on our roofs, E6.1.17? Not very many of us do it now to reduce our electric bill to zero why would hundreds of thousands do it just to benefit everyone else? Do you think the members of RPCC would willingly make their homes unsightly just so some of the back country areas wouldn't have to have electric lines? Not very likely, particularly when they may not be receiving the direct benefit of the installation as some of the proposal may suggest. For example according to testimony by Bill Powers at this week's hearing it looks like the cost of one of his solar initiatives is \$5.9 million without batteries. His other plan would be even more expensive.

So if we can't place the solar panels on the roofs of homes where would they go? And let me qualify that, where would they go that would be acceptable from every possible environmental perspective? Does that place exist? If so why wasn't it located in the DEIR? If there actually is an acceptable place, will there still be a need for additional transmission lines? I would certainly hope that this state wouldn't make a decision to kill one project on the hopes that some future project, as yet undefined, could maybe meet our present and future needs. There are way too many ifs in that equation and too much risk that our demand will outpace the supply and jeopardize our health, safety and economic well being. These types of projects take several years to build and apparently even more years to get approved. We can't wait until the lights are out to figure out the solution. We would be in the dark for too long.

Wind energy, E.6.1.17, another great plan. That is until you run into the environmental opposition. They don't like them because they may kill birds, they need additional transmission lines and most importantly they don't like what they do to the view shed particularly along the ridgelines. Well where does the wind blow enough to generate electricity? Probably not where the power is needed and certainly not down in holes where the windmills can be hidden from view. I remember a newspaper article several years ago when there was some exploring for wind sites in San Diego County and the wind farm was going to be built out on the Campo Indian reservation. Here is a portion of the article that was in the June 23, 2005 edition of the San Diego Union by Anne Krueger, the Fuller she refers to is Kelly Fuller of the Sierra Club; "...Two(wind sites) are in McCain Valley, another is on Shockey Truck Trail in Campo and a fourth is on Table Mountain near Jacumba. The Sierra Club has taken no position on the Campo site, but opposes the other three sites, Fuller said."

With that kind of support what would ever make us think that a group that portends to support renewable energy would ever actually support a project or at least not fight it in court when a proposal comes forward? What do you think they would say about windmills in the ocean off our coast? Do you see any chance of that happening in the foreseeable future?

There appears to be this common thread, the environmental groups all say they support renewables but have yet to see a specific project that they do support, no project is just quite right or in the absolutely perfect location. Or if one group does support it another one will fight it. There will always be at least one thing wrong with a project or site. In wrestling it is called tag team.

I am concerned for the future of my children and grandchildren and part of that concern is that if these attempts to stop all infrastructure projects are successful how will people live here? Do we really want to entertain going backwards? We can't stop change, San Diego doesn't look like it did 50, 75, 100, or 150 years ago and in most ways that is a good thing. There are certainly more trees, other vegetation, animals and water here than when this area was settled by the Europeans. Is that bad? I think it's been good as would the majority of those who live here. We aren't all ready to stop progress just because some of us are trying to create memories of a time or place that is didn't exist or has been softened by the passage of time. I wouldn't trade today for 1769, when San Diego was discovered, any more than I would want to drive a Model T and I don't think you would either. However, there are some among us that are trying very hard to get us back to those times.

Please don't let the alarmists and the selfish ones among us stop what are needed infrastructure projects.

Jeff Sykes