

***Comments Received Between the NOP and
Supplemental Scoping Comment Periods
(December 4, 2013 - January 20, 2014)***

Devin Brookhart

From: Orsaba, Lisa <lisa.orsaba@cpuc.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 31, 2013 6:41 AM
To: rhhawkins@fs.fed.us; Rica Nitka; John Porteous
Subject: FW: Sill Hillri Alternative proposed SDG&E Master Permit

From: Cindy Buxton [iokuok2@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 30, 2013 10:16 PM
To: Will Metz; Joan Friedlander; Bjorn Fredrickson; jaheys@fs.fed.us; Orsaba, Lisa; kay taff; Richard Halsey; Nathan Weflen; allen greenwood; Molly Bigger; Renee Owens; eddie harmond; donna tisdate1; kelly@kellyfuller.net; Bill Powers; Richard Miller; Rob Hutsel; geoffrey Smith; Jack Paxton; Jerry Fisher; Janice Mckalson; Ellen Shively; Emil Kotik; Congresswoman Susan Davis; pattyreedy@Rocketmail.com; skip skip; Mike Bullock; Dave Grubb; w Huckell
Subject: Sill Hill Alternative proposed SDG&E Master Permit

The following is a video of my hike up to the SDG&E Master Permit alternative in the vicinity of the Marston and McCoy Ranch areas. I got to a promontory overlooking Boulder Creek Gorge across from Cuyamaca and Middle Peak. The 800 foot cascading waterfall (we call the Big Twelve) is between. Sill Hill waterfall -the famous one in Jerry Shad's A Foot and A Field in San Diego county lies above. It's 31 min. long but the pivotal portions are in the last 5 minutes if you wish to skip ahead. Scenes from the upper woodland back country on the way up.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CI6MleHB8Ss>

When the Master Permit DEIS comes out sometime in the coming weeks/months I hope you will refer back to this if there is in fact an alternative in this area.

From talking to a tribal member of the Inaja Reservation yesterday and seeing the stakes in the ground behind their small church I have to believe there will be an alternative presented in this vicinity as suggested in their scoping document last fall.

San Diego county is bigger than three states. Surely we can do better. They have chased this project across our county and back again, quite literally, and pushed it to the most remote corner, right up under our Signature Mountain, Cuyamaca. Cuyamaca and Middle Peak (at one point I mistakenly say North Peak, its not, its Middle Peak) are in the geographical center of town. The other side of them is the home of Rancho Cuyamaca State Park and Lake Cuyamaca. They are visible from nearly all of the county, especially from down town.

Imagine being at Paso Picacho or hiking on Middle Peak and seeing this massive line across the first ridgeline where use to be only wild open spaces.

I've sent out a myriad of emails and photos to defend the position that the other alternatives, the existing route in Cedar Gorge, any route crossing Cedar Creek at McGee Flat, or closer to the Eagle peak Three Sisters Trailhead would be almost as bad, though this may pretty much take the cake on bad ideas.

This proposal is labeled for a 69 kv. However with the addition of new 270 degree heat-amperage optimizing wire .9 inch thick, the capacity of the wire with 5.5 fold increase in amperage, is just that, 5.5 times the wattage of the current 69 kv and about 50% taller. Effectively it is the capacity of a 330kv or 100kv bigger than the 2 230 lines going into Alpine off of the Sunrise Powerlink on Bell Bluff across from Viejas.

My suggestion is that this should either be put under Boulder Creek Road, also providing power to that area

Devin Brookhart

From: Orsaba, Lisa <lisa.orsaba@cpuc.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 31, 2013 6:41 AM
To: rhhawkins@fs.fed.us; Rica Nitka; John Porteous
Subject: FW: SDG&E, SDG&E, OHHHHH SDG&E.....
Attachments: Boulder CRook Valleyesm.jpg; Boulder CRook Valleyesm.jpg; DSCN9965.jpg; DSCN9993.jpg; Looking BackAtEaglePeakFrom MarstonRidgeandMcCoyHillAsEveningFalls.jpg; MiddlePeakErosion.jpg; PineTreeFrom a SeaOfCeanothus.jpg; waterfalls.jpg; WaterfallsLabeled.jpg; DSCN0128.jpg; DSCN0127.jpg; NotSureIT HelpsButDefinitelyArtistic.jpg; DSCN0138.jpg; DSCN0144.jpg; DSCN0137.jpg; DSCN0126.jpg; DSCN0119.jpg; DSCN0117.jpg; DSCN0096.jpg; DSCN0116.jpg

From: Cindy Buxton [iokuok2@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 30, 2013 12:35 PM
To: Swanson, Brian D.; MDana@semprautilities.com; Bjorn Fredrickson; Joan Friedlander; Will Metz; Orsaba, Lisa; jaheys@fs.fed.us
Cc: kelly@kellyfuller.net; Bill Powers; donna tisdale; kay taff; Richard Halsey; Nathan Weflen; Molly Bigger; Congresswoman Susan Davis
Subject: SDG&E, SDG&E, OHHHHH SDG&E.....

In the last two days I've viewed a point across Cuyamaca and Middle Peak taking a sweeping signature view of San Diego's most premier Mountain and the 800 foot cascade that drops between these two peaks into Boulder Creek. To one side of me was the McCoy Hill to the other the former Marston Ranch. Apparently this is a potential general re-route for a near five fold increase in capacity of the Master Permit with the US Forest Service.

Peering down on this with the visual in front of me, I could not be more horrified that you would be thinking of stringing the massive upscaled powerline across the edge of this rare and unspoiled canyon. It severely impacts the proposed Sill Hill Wilderness Proposal and current Sill Hill Inventoried Roadless areas.

Subsequently I talked with a tribal member of the Inaja Reservation who pointed out several stakes in the ground placed there by SDG&E for a potential Routing that runs all over their property, with little regard for the culture and resources of the tribe, that I could see. It came within a few yards of a church, about a 100 yards of a burial ground used to this day by several tribes and then very near the historic water tower. It is as though they are trying to make the worst of the worst impact possible. The trajectory also confirms some of my worst fears for what they are suggesting could happen to the most remote and signature views in the county in upper Boulder Gorge and the three mountains everyone in San Diego sees on their skyline.

Is the real purpose of this proposal to bring power to the fire station at Pine Hills and the wealthy communities on North Peak? If so this must be disclosed.

If that was not enough the final clincher came a while later when I walked for probably the 30 or 40'th time in the last year into Cedar Gorge. Yet again, only 6 months after the last full dozing of this access they are bull dozing the road right into the stream bed. YOU GO and TAKE a LOOK and then you tell me where all of that loose soil is supposed to go the minute it rains?-January is historically our wettest month. Having to follow up on this to the tune of walking to Cedar Creek and walking out at night because no one paid to do this is apparently any where around or clued in to the task, well demonstrated at this point that if I don't it won't

happen, is beyond aggravating at this point. This is the many dozen'th time even after the re-permit would suggest rather strongly that the forest is not supportive of this practice. I'm trying to talk myself into providing the candid reaction on video last night, already too dark to see; but the audio was working just fine! I think I may be successful. If I get it loaded to Youtube you can enjoy the drama.

In the mean time the points are:

Your contractors after many years of this do not have any idea what the problem is.

On a Federal Contract a contractor has full responsibility for ensuring their sub-contractors are within contracting laws and a contractor can not insulate themselves from this liability by hiring contractors.

I doubt that you have any idea what the problem is.

The point in sending them down there should include keeping the road on the road and not allowing it to wash into the stream. That was the issue in the first place. Now it has escalated to the point of moving the line to the most signature promontory in the county while one more time the former route gets graded and washed into the stream?

Your road is way, way past any legal grade exceeding 25 % to over 40% in many places. That is true of the Boulder Creek portion as well.

Your trucks were in Boulder Creek last week and for the dozenth or so time are leaking oil along the way.

Your water truck was leaking as well-water I presume.

The water truck was not able to do the last 1/2 mile. The promontory where I saw it parked last night should be the absolute last place down into the gorge that you should allow grading. EVERYTHING else will wash into the stream.

You are not checking and clarifying with the people who make these complaints (in my perception , especially if they are female) before determining the exact issue or cause or solution, you continue to throw urban solutions at something you have not adequately reviewed to the tune of considerable money as well as hardship to our back country lands. Its not that you are not there , we are sick of seeing you there, you are there so much, It is that you don't understand the problem and make up rationalizing excuses instead, while throwing hasty solutions at the problem that are not working.

I'm very suspicious that some dozer operators have a racket going where by they fluff up the dirt it washes away and they fluff up the dirt and it washes away, lather, rinse , repeat. Ibid Boulder Creek Road maintenance as well. From Google maps one can view horrific silting from this process. This did not used to occur and partly because the road was allowed some vegetation to hold the soil. To date in the last 5 years or so I would say they have done everything possible to extend their reasons to continue grading the road ongoing which is having a detrimental impact to the stream.

There is a section of oaks right before Kelly Creek that appear to be dying. I smelled oil there a number of times last summer and the summer before. These should be reviewed.

Please have the large equipment operators park the main huge truck on the other side of the access road and away from the legacy tree at the Dance Hall. It is recovering from any number of stresses and should not have heavy equipment parked on its roots.

My having to do this is inappropriate. YOU should be doing this. I'm essentially having to do your -several of you -job for you. Not taking the public seriously is also inappropriate and yes I've grown very angry that it falls on me to do so yet again, spur of the moment, at night no less. If you do not have the resources you need to be saying so to the public, stakeholders like us the Sierra Club, and to Congress. The details of resource allocations to the Cleveland vs other Forests would be VERY helpful in supporting such an effort especially in requesting assistance or grants from Congress for emergency resources or 'catchup" from oversight to a lesser recognized Forest down here in the corner of the country-for some odd reason. Nevertheless demoralizing the public for taking an interest and reporting what is seen is way beyond inappropriate.

This does not support appropriate monitoring and is a primary if not fundamental issue and root cause.

Rumor has it the Forest has chosen a path of natural consequences for not actively looking up Forest Regulations as opposed to actually posting them on site. Can you confirm? (I would strongly disagree as I've witnessed very good reason to believe this is both ineffective and dangerous.)

The monitoring of this road was in the 2013 monitoring report. There was no mention of the many dozen trips "ah" volunteer or any human made, the reports to State Waterboards, Fish and Wildlife, the thousands of photos of eroding soil or the fact that it was "ah" volunteer that initiated that effort-a civilian just taking an interest in the land. However if I tell you something you do not want to hear I'm demoralized and discredited without the first phone call to check in to clarify what the problem is???? That is not monitoring. If you don't have resources the very first thing you need to consider is the efforts of lay people and not treating them like scum because they are telling you the truth!!!! How do you use their input in a monitoring doc but then turn around and discredit them only to use the issue to move the line ??? Seriously?? but you do not have time to make the first phone call to understand an issue before some, I perceive at this point from what was observed this weekend, passive aggressive retaliatory measure? -Retaliation for reporting a concern to the Federal Government is illegal and likely more serious than the issue reported. I do not need a NEPA project to complain about these issues but nevertheless unless you are willing to talk about them off line and sooner, you will likely hear about them again in the public forum!!!

I requested from the State during the re-permitting a statement describing how stakeholders are official stakeholders and why this status is not made public or the consequences thereof. To date I have not received this information.

I do not think the state stakeholder policy is congruent with the Federal contracting or Procurement laws without considerable mitigation and disclosure. I believe you need to have a Dept of Justice attorney review the legality of trying to fit Federal Contracts into a California contract such as what they are attempting to do with the PEIR/PEIS. I believe the current format is illegal by Federal Fair contracting standards as it does not provide equitable disclosure, separation, or input to the parties involved including the US Forest Service.

Sincerely,
Cindy Buxton
Chair of the Forest Committee, San Diego Sierra Club

From: BSwanson@semprautilities.com
To: iokuok2@hotmail.com

CC: tcardoza@fs.fed.us

Date: Tue, 15 Mar 2011 06:53:02 -0700

Subject: SDG&E access road and tight line in CNF

Cindy,

We met on Boulder Creek Road a couple of years ago when I was walking the road north of the Weflen parcels.

Molly Dana forwarded me your email with photos of the road and pole/lines, since these photos may be within my area of responsibility. I was formerly in charge of the area including the Weflen parcels, but changed to the adjacent territory starting near the McCoy Ranch. My area now runs between Ramona and Rainbow, San Marcos and Anza Borrego.

Do you have a way of indicating where the road photos and pole photos were taken? Maybe on the Thomas Brothers map? SDG&E put a lot of effort and money into erosion control in the vicinity of Boulder Creek Road last year. We'd really like to know where this area is so we can take a look at it. I'm not an engineer, but will forward the information about the lines/poles, however again I need a better description of where these poles are located. FYI each pole has a unique number on it, usually about 6 ft from the ground, which we can use to bring up on GIS very quickly.

Thanks for your help Cindy!

Brian

Brian D. Swanson
Land Management Representative
San Diego Gas & Electric Company
(858) 654-1249





























**Possible erosion on
Middle Peak dumping
into Boulder Creek from
their scraping the forest
restoration up there.**













Devin Brookhart

From: nweflen@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 5:56 PM
To: CNFMSUP
Subject: =?utf-8?B?
TWFzdGVyIHBlcm1pdCBjb21tZW50cy4gR2F0ZSBzdGlsbCB1bmxvY2tZCBvbiBUTDYyNi9
ENzkgYWNjZXNzIHJvYWQuIFNERyZFIEJNUCByb2FkiG1haW50ZW5hbmNIIIGNyZXdzIHV
zZWQgdGhpcyBnYXRlIGxhc3Qgd2VlayBhbmQgbGVmdCBpdCB1bmxvY2tZCBhcyBpdC
BoYXMgYmVlbiBmb3IgbWFueSB3ZWVrcyBub3...
Attachments: IMAG1488.jpg

Sent from my Verizon Wireless Phone



Devin Brookhart

From: nweflen@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:02 PM
To: CNFMSUP; Nate W
Subject: Master Permit CNF comments. Nice image of oil leaking along TL626/D79 in CNF
Attachments: IMAG1424.jpg

Image shows oil leaked and or spilled by SDG&E crew and or Biologist working 12-10-13 on TL626/D79 on access road in CNF on 47% grade section.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless Phone



Devin Brookhart

From: nweflen@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:05 PM
To: CNFMSUP; Nate W
Subject: Master Permit comments. Oil leak up close. CNF land, TL626/D79 SDG&E crew on 12-10-13.
Attachments: IMAG1430.jpg

Sent from my Verizon Wireless Phone



Devin Brookhart

From: nweflen@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:07 PM
To: CNFMSUP; Nate W
Subject: Master permit comments. Oil leak by SDG&E crew and biologist vehicles on CNF land.
TL625/D79
Attachments: IMAG1428.jpg

Sent from my Verizon Wireless Phone



Devin Brookhart

From: Nathan Weflen <nweflen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:24 PM
To: CNFMSUP
Cc: nweflen@yahoo.com
Subject: master permit comments

The gate into cedar gorge (TL626 access road) at approximate mile 13 on Boulder Creek road has been wide open for at least two days. I believe SDG&E crews left it open during the last Santa Anna event. This gate protects miles of recommended wilderness. SDG&E crews obviously don't care about protecting CNF recommended wilderness. Please deny SDG&E permit requests for TL626 until changes are made to actually protect the land they are leasing. I will document how long this gate stays unlocked and open on TL626. The CNF was notified via email 6:15 pm on 12-18-2013 regarding this gate as it is a public safety issue. Please close and lock the gate. Pictures of the open gate will be taken in the daylight.

Devin Brookhart

From: nweflen@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 5:47 PM
To: CNFMSUP; Nate W
Subject: SDG&E master permit comments
Attachments: IMAG1592.jpg

Another gate left open by SDG&E road crews performing "best management practice" along TL626/D79 on Boulder Creek Road mile 8. Access road into CNF was in this condition all weekend allowing anyone to offroad on CNF/SDG&E access roads. SDG&E crews have left multiple gates open in the past weeks and months and it has been documented in this comments. Please include this image and comment with others submitted relating to SDG&E complete lack on interest in protecting CNF lands. As of Monday, Gate is now closed and secured with pink plastic tape.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless Phone



Devin Brookhart

From: nweflen@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 5:37 PM
To: CNFMSUP; Nate W
Subject: Sdge master permit comments
Attachments: IMAG1570.jpg

TL626/D79 CNF gate still unlocked for months. SDG&E making no effort to follow current permit. Do not renew permit until strict limits are placed on behavior like this from SDG&E. Picture is a series submitted as comments.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless Phone



2013/12/30

Devin Brookhart

From: nweflen <nweflen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 6:12 PM
To: CNFMSUP
Cc: Nate W
Subject: Sdg&e master permit comments
Attachments: IMAG1631.jpg

TL626/D79 access gate in CNF along Boulder Creek Road. Gate was left open by Sdg&e road maintenance last week. Gate was closed and secured with pink plastic tape by none Sdg&e CNF visitors. Lock is visible and not in use. Sdg&e crews drove by this gate in daylight one week after leaving it open and did nothing. CNF staff were notified this gate is open and unlocked last week. This is the third gate on TL626/D79 to be left open since October. One gate has been documented on the website nearly every week since October 2013 and is still inlocked. This is an example of Sdg&e "best management practices" on CNF lands. Do not approve the master permit application until strict monitoring and compliance are enacted. Sdg&e management of powerlines on CNF lands is not taken serious as shown by these and past comments. Please include these pictures with all others I have submitted. Gates were left unlocked for 1-14-14 santa anna wind event with red flag status and wind speed gusting to 88mph.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone



Devin Brookhart

From: nweflen <nweflen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 6:14 PM
To: CNFMSUP
Cc: Nate W
Subject: Sdg&e master permit comments
Attachments: IMAG1628.jpg

TL626/D79 CNF gate secure with pink tape. Powerline and access road visible in background.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone



Devin Brookhart

From: nweflen <nweflen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2014 6:23 PM
To: CNFMSUP
Cc: Nate W
Subject: Master permit comments
Attachments: sil_ndfd (1).gif

Maximum wind speed 88mph on TL626/D79 1-14-14. Wind speed is over proposed fire hardening upgrades by Sdg&e. Do not approve powerlines rated below winds experienced on CNF lands. TL626/D79 started a fire several hundred yards from this spot in 2004 under similar conditions. See additional comment pictures showing photos of post 2004 fire repair slices of TL626. Above ground powerlines in this area of the CNF cannot handle wind speeds experienced even with proposed actions in current master plan. Under ground powerlines are the only option for TL626/D79.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

Gust/Humidity Plot - Sill Hill (79, 626)

— Observed Gust Speed — Gust Speed — Rel. Humidity

