

Powerlink environmental impacts, costs and overhead vs. underground AC and DC alternatives approach \$1 billion, all of which can readily exceed \$6 billion in habitat damages and economic degradation, by insisting on overhead high power lines. Apparently these are losses to habitat, viewshed and commercial real estate values that have not been evaluated previously evaluated, and which may be approximately 4 times the value of the entire Sunrise Powerlink project, which incidentally could make direct burial high-voltage DC less than 1/4 the cost of overhead 500 kV AC high power lines.

Conclusion

We have identified 4 ways that the cost difference between underground DC and overhead AC can be distorted to dismiss the much safer and vastly less damaging underground DC option.

1. By ignoring the impact of causing several billion dollars in damages and disregarding the environmental restoration costs, with an aggregate loss of approximately \$6 billion.
2. Massively exaggerating the cost of DC conversion by approximately 400%, instead of comparing the difference between AC and DC converter stations, erroneously added \$500 million to the cost of the completely underground DC alternative, as well as evaluated a previous generation of DC technology, not current equipment.
3. Ignoring cancer risks associated with overhead high power lines as biologist are beginning to uncover some of the mechanisms associated with such cancers, may be reflected as a tendency to spend billions to conceal this issue and related costs. Perhaps if there is no alternative to getting electricity without overhead AC power lines, then possibly no alternative will ever need to be considered. That may well be one theory firmly held by utility companies, even if it works completely against

their long-term financial interests. However when the medical losses are calculated, the costs of remedying overhead high power lines would undoubtedly be in the many trillions of dollars.

4. The avoidance of local renewable resources, such as 2.5 megawatt wind turbines, which are currently lower in cost, as well as an indefinitely sustainable alternative to imported oil and natural gas, which can charge hybrid vehicle batteries, as well as hydrogen fuel cells, while such turbines are naturally illegal in San Diego County, except on Indian reservations, due to an 80 foot height restriction on wind turbines that need to be over 360 feet in height. The alternative being offered by SDG&E is the creation of the \$1.4 billion overhead Powerlink utilizing 676 new pylons that cause over \$5 billion in environmental and property value damages instead of changing 2 digits in a county rulebook or comparing the full economics of an underground cable. It's well known that laws and regulations are rarely written which have not been influenced, designed and paid for by corporate interests, nevertheless consideration still needs to be provided to minimize the blatantly destructive, wasteful and illegal aspects of such projects. What's peculiar is that most corporate interests and their allies, while fairly clever and occasionally pleasant in demeanor have rarely examined their own interests adequately to notice that greater consideration of environmental and human benefit is in their own long term financial and growth interests. They have been taught that benefits cost them money and that destructive acts save money, and in return they have successfully convinced many others of this devastating myopic philosophy by constraining the terms of the discussion and the economic analysis, by avoiding any cost analysis of the destructive impacts of their narrowly defined objectives and through substantially unconstrained demands. This is not a poker game, where the winners take it all and the losers pay the bill. The information behind decisions affecting millions of people and the wilderness of a region has been well concealed or

Powerlink environmental impacts, costs and overhead vs. underground AC and DC alternatives

avoided and apparently is not about to become a part of the discussion or openly evaluated.

We understand that there is a strong tendency to protect planning efforts that have already been invested in this project, which have been dedicated to overhead AC high power lines regardless of the increased costs of the overhead lines, the large scale environmental degradation, the increased health risks including cancer related deaths that may rival auto fatality rates, as well as an extraordinary loss of real property values and uses, all of which would also create a massive impact on our site and projects. Naturally we don't expect to be able to overcome a real lack of public information, the perceived financial incentives of any industry, or anyone's willingness to be deceived in the short term; even though it would be appropriate for the utility companies to publicly divulge all such information on television in concise public service commercials, just as has been required of the tobacco industry. However it is simply our intention to stop efforts to attack our life's work and prevent a valuable nature preserve from being needlessly devastated.

While our nature preserve offers all the same characteristics as those listed above, which have been all considered worthy of preserving in the 36 enumerated examples; however no consideration has been offered here. Naturally we would appreciate understanding the reasoning process. No doubt there is little interest on anyone's part in taking responsibility for unnecessary destructive efforts, even if it's accomplished in an incremental fashion through subcontractors, and it's rare that we ever see anyone who can find the personal time or willingness to actively pursue the authorization they need to consider a more beneficial alternative. So please let us know if we need to begin implementing more practical defense efforts to avoid having many decades of our labor and financial investments in this anthropological-nature preserve devastated through your efforts.

Instead of addressing this as a legal matter with attorneys who have little interest in the issues, or trying to enforce compliance with a deadline designated to cause damages, even if those damages are denied, it would undoubtedly be vastly more cost effective to consider addressing the environmental and health impacts in a productive way, by utilizing the electrical engineering talents at the disposal of SDG&E and by working with research groups to help create more advanced habitat restoration techniques, then to begin with the restoration of existing damages throughout the region, and perhaps by helping to advance therapeutic medical research to assist with related cancers. Naturally we understand that you may have more pressing objectives and that any constructive response needed to address issues such as environmental damages may not be possible, even if it were to also save money. I understand that the issues mentioned here are not about to be evaluated on a voluntary basis, no matter how much money is saved, how much wilderness is preserved or how many cancers are avoided.

I'm sorry that these issues could not have been more conveniently mentioned in a short paragraph, unfortunately the review process for this project has completely avoided any consideration or evaluation of a number of unnecessarily costly and extraordinarily damaging issues, and as a result there is no responsible representation for the people of the State of California to evaluate efforts proposing such extreme damages against ourselves and thousands of others, none of which is required to build a transmission line in our area or even on the southern or the northern boundary of our property. We are **not** opposing the creation of a power line; we are opposed to the extraordinary lack of consideration, seriously incompetent engineering decisions, massive environmental damages, as well as the high cost of this very low capacity system that does not even reflect the future electrical needs of the San Diego area, nor provide sufficient capacity to encourage a sustainable energy independent region, and

Powerlink environmental impacts, costs and overhead vs. underground AC and DC alternatives that is a costly tragedy for the millions of people of this region that far exceeds the proposed \$1.4 billion construction costs.

We of course appreciate all your beneficial efforts related to this project and thank you for you for any consideration of these issues which you might be able to offer.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several loops and a horizontal line extending to the right.

C B H
PO Box 1032
Hemet, California 92546

:sunrise-alternatives-rightofway-april2007