



Please choose Alternative 5

1 message

Grazyna Krajewska <grazynak@hotmail.com>

Wed, Sep 30, 2015 at 4:33 PM

To: "sycamorepenasquitos@panoramaenv.com" <sycamorepenasquitos@panoramaenv.com>

Thank you for such a thorough work, looking at 41 alternatives to start with and analysing 5 of them. I support your choice of **alternative 5** as the best alternative. It transverses through a commercial area and most of it would be under-grounded.

I am glad that you also looked at the **distributed solar** alternative. You came to the conclusion that it is not viable based on the project objectives that required power line connections. To make it viable you would have to start with a question: what would be the best solution to provide homes and businesses with electric power?

If that was your goal you would direct SDG&E to accept that solar distributed power generation is here to stay and they need to adapt by spending money on energy storage, smart redistribution of what they get from rooftop solar, not on additional power lines to transmit electric power over long distance.

The other issue that should be revisited by a new CPUC commissioners is EMF radiation. The amount of expected **EMF** should be estimated and submitted in the application, not kept a secret. The CPUC Decision 93-11-013 and 2006 CPUC Decision 06-01-042 should be looked at again and updated.

Regards

Grazyna Krajewska
(Torrey Hills)