



RECEIVED
U.S. E.P.A.

2010 NOV 15 AM 10: 33

ENVIR. APPEALS BOARD

Request for appeal and review of:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
San Diego Gas & Electric Company's Sunrise Powerlink Project
(Applications A.05-12-014 and A.06-08-010)

SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
SPECIAL USE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE
SUNRISE POWERLINK TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT
U.S. FOREST SERVICE
CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST
SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Request made to:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Clerk of the Board, Environmental Appeals Board (MC 1103B)
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460-0001

US EPA
OECA (Office mail code)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave
Washington, DC. 20460

Additional copies sent :

Civil Enforcement
Director: Adam Kushner
Deputy Director: Pam Mazakas
Phone: (202) 564-2220
Fax: (202) 564-0027
Mail code: 2248A

Compliance
Director: Susan Bromm
Deputy Director: Kimberley DePaul
Phone:(202) 564-5400
Mail code: 2251A
Office of Environmental Justice

Director: Charles Lee
Deputy Director: Heather Case
Phone:(202) 564-2515
Toll Free: (800) 962-6215
Mail code: 2201A

Office of Federal Activities
Director: Susan Bromm
Deputy Director: Kimberley DePaul
Phone:(202) 564-5400
Mail code: 2251A

Tom Tidwell, Chief U.S. Forest Service
email: ttidwell@fs.fed.us

Secretary Tom Vilsack U.S. Department of Agriculture
email: agsec@usda.gov

Possible additions:
California State Attorney General's office
Edmund G. Brown

Former President William Jefferson Clinton
Author of the
Executive Order 13186 of January 10, 2001
Responsibilities of Federal Agencies To Protect Migratory
Birds

Request made by
Cindy Buxton
On behalf of herself.

Co-Chair of the Forest sub-committee for the San Diego Chapter of the Sierra Club
Adoptive Parent to the Proposed Eagle Peak Wilderness: California Wild Heritage Act by
Senator Barbara Boxer.

Appellant to the Decision to permit by Will Metz and
Reviewed by Regional Forester Randy Moore
On behalf of herself and the San Diego Sierra Club

541 Spruce Street
Imperial Beach, Ca. 91932
(619) 934-0323 home
(619) 817-3804 work
(619) 823-3620 cell

November 5, 2010

**Dear EPA Board members and reviewers, Forest Supervisor Tidwell,
Agriculture Secretary Vilsak:**

A. Purpose

I'm writing to appeal to you to review the Proposed Sunrise Powerlink, a project in San Diego requested by SDG&E, yet again, before allowing further action on this project.

Why should you look closer after so much for so long has already taken place in siting this project?

- This project is the poster child for far more to come.
- It has far reaching ramifications for much of our country's environmental integrity.
- In my opinion, there is much that needs review and some political "firewalls" constructed to ensure the shift into a national green movement to protect us from Global warming doesn't also meet with exploitation and corruption.

B. Introduction

Who wouldn't claim to be a liberal minded Sierra Clubber and not be in favor of a good plan to stop global warming? All things being equal of course I would be supportive. When the world's most respected researchers are telling us global warming is real and requires prompt attention theirs is an opinion I respect. Much of what is needed in that effort we've known for a long time that we should be doing anyway.

Nevertheless, basically we need to ensure the remake of the national transmission grid and the creation of big green projects are what they claim to be and are still making an exemplary effort to adhere to good environmental practices before siting and compromising our public lands unnecessarily.

If power corrupts, money is the catalyst that leads the way.

We are not saying don't solve the problem, nor even condemning or approving the merits of the general design herein, but we are saying, take

time to be wise. The focus on comprehensive goals and design is still insufficient on this enormous and growing-in-scope project, and all too easily exploited in a new chapter of green energy generation.

I believe there are issues, -issues that even the EPA identified and included in all three of their comment letters on the Sunrise Powerlink DEIS, SEIS, and FEIS for this project that continue to be increasingly disconcerting. It has been a step by step learning process for a lay person. I only found the three comment letters two days ago. They were a logical and rational breath of fresh air, so to speak.

Sincerely, I request that the EPA with support from the Forest Service and Dept of Agriculture to come take a look before allowing this to be final, committing such a large percentage of our community's unspoiled lands and natural resources for a life time.

I am not an attorney and not a regular among the local NEPA movers and shakers though this project has given me some reason to get acquainted with the basics. I admit the complexity of Nepa and the Federal process is more than I fully grasp as a lay person. I was asked with two weeks to spare, to write an appeal to the proposed Sunrise Powerlink by the Sierra Club though I would have written one anyway on my own. I had commented on every step of the process.

I attended a disposition with Cleveland National Forest Supervisor Will Metz and the project manager for the Forest Service, Rich Hawkins. Subsequently I received the appeals rejection letter from the regional Forester, Randy Moore and his appointed reviewer, Eli Iiano. At the end of the regional rejection letter it states that this is the final step of the appeals process. I was not sure if it is implied only for the Forest Service or anywhere.

I've spent days, amateur that I am, combing through government process rules online. I'm writing this letter in hopes that someone can still review this project from a thoroughly unbiased position. I think the Forest Service officials that have managed this so far were very much influenced, albeit pressured, and "had their hands tied". I do not fault them at this time for the difficult position they were in. They could have been severely hard shipped by doing anything other than what they did. That is not going to help the public receive a fully impartial decision by a body not associated with this project, on **a project that affects in one way or another, a large percentage of their public land resources and communities. So far, this level of impartiality has not been placed on the decision making process.**

I also took part years ago in the Cleveland National Forest Fifteen Year Land Management plan (LMP) and helped to photograph and document for Senator Barbara Boxer's California Wild Heritage Act. Many of the things I suggested then have taken place including a return to manning some fire towers.

I've known several members of the Forest Service over the years. We agree on most things, disagree on others. I cannot say that outside of any land issues that there are any members there I don't like, and even like a lot, though it would be honest to say I've kicked some dust on occasions when I was the only female or nearly so, weighing in against a perceived tide of testosterone. Most of them are well seasoned and professional to public criticism without letting it get to them, separating the principals from the personalities, so to speak; --at least I sincerely hope so. I do not consider this a personal issue by any means.

I'm writing on behalf of myself, though I'm the co-chair of the Forest Committee of the local chapter of the Sierra Club. At times I will refer to this relationship as "we" because at times in reference to the matter described I was in that capacity or supported by our forest committee and the other co-chair.

I started this "adventure" as a Chapter outings Leader for the Sierra Club, not on the political part of the 'general ledger' at all, as someone who takes people hiking and tries to get as far from these issues as possible. Consequently in the end I knew the land well and could integrate the issues better than average which landed me in the last hours right in the thick of them.

References to other documentation

I reference my appeal letter,
my many comment letters to the Forest Service,
Aspen Environmental acting as environmental reviewer for the California Public Utilities Commission, and the BLM.

My photo attachments if they are available and otherwise and any other supporting visuals provided on www.youtube.com at the channel : iokuok2 and my photos also on www.facebook.com under "cindy buxton"

I also reference the many comment letters and appeals by Donna Tisdale, the POC (Protect our Communities) and Backcountry Against the Dumps, submitted by Attorney Steve Volper.

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Opinion, FWS-2008B0423-2009F0097

C. The project may have lent itself to corruption and severe conflicts of interest.

The politics of being the first at the new energy table should not surprise any of you.

WE have seen a frightening level of manipulation and strong arming. The local chapter of the Sierra Club, initially, in the first three years, was the local leaders opposing this project "not to be sited anywhere." By contrast, most recently the National Sierra Club has issued a proverbial gag order to the local chapters not to oppose any energy projects. They voted 4-0 to support approval of the Solar II project and THEN asked the regional members that had spent months and months collecting and compiling data,

given one weekend notice, to supply input. It becomes increasingly suspicious that not only have we "battled" the specifics from SDG&E's original intentions; but also from a second level of political parasitism that has added to the battle of wills, confusion, and heart break of what this may do to our community.

Unlike SDG&E whose goals were at least generally known, in the case of the latter, many of these came from within and were some of the same individuals we had trusted and counted upon, who had solicited our time and money guaranteeing their position of opposition only to learn that this was probably not the case when the original desert routing had been removed from consideration. Those of us who genuinely go there because we love these places were surrounded and cut off, so to speak.

This is sorely unfair as not only was money moved from the Desert Protection Council to the Sierra Club tipping the balance, but also these leaders I'm confident knew the land under the route now chosen, very little if at all. I've inquired along the way and they had largely not been to the route at all. Nevertheless, they would not allow input to their task force from those of us who have and know it well.

By the time the Forest Service was asked to weigh in on their own land jurisdiction, the project had already encapsulated and obligated them. Not by any stretch do I think it wise to destroy Anza Borrego State Park; but essentially supporters, movers and shakers, in the desert, in a state park, largely run by the state of California, decided the predominating influence, not just to "not" go to the desert, but to put the large transmission lines in the National Forests, -- in places they did not know well, nor had at the very least inspected the spectacular visual qualities, much less more tedious criteria. We were told over and over again that "they did not want this anywhere", but as the wind mill and solar farm site-ings began along the current route, it was clear that that status for some of them had dramatically changed. I asked early on to contribute to that task force. I was not allowed. Likewise was the case for desert activist, Eddie Harmon, a multiple decade's veteran of Sierra Club activism, and expert on BLM and NEPA process, who happens to live in Ocotillo near the current route. Her exclusion finally caught the attention of our conservation committee. I do not live there. I go to nearly all parts of the Cleveland Forest under the proposed route frequently because of its pristine qualities to get away and explore nature "off of the proverbial matrix".

As the concerns progressed some Sierra Club members with significant expert status were asked to change their input, though they refused. Recently I've even heard some Native American "para"- Archeologists were told "not to find anything" or they would not be called to work again.

Since I had standing in the face of the gag order I was still available, at the request of our chapter Conservation Committee, Executive Committee and president to be the dubious author of our appeal over the chapter attorneys. I can't explain it. Subsequently, at our disposition with Will Metz our local Cleveland Forest Supervisor and the Forest Manager of this project, Rich Hawkins, one of my invited attendees, who

happens to also be a trained volunteer in a fire tower, was later chastised multiple times threatening his volunteer position by the local volunteer fire tower coordinator for coming to the meeting. There is a narrow connection how the volunteer coordinator could know of his attendance at the disposition. This surprised even me. Supervisor Will Metz said he knew nothing of the incident, and in all sincerity, I believe him. Nevertheless the entitlement to "ensure" a course prevails somewhere very close by and was being broadly applied by someone.

I've sent photos of our back country to both Congressman Duncan D Hunter and to actor environmentalist, Robert Redford. When arch conservative and patriot, Duncan D. Hunter writes letters far more strongly supporting environmental conservation for the goals of this project in contrast to Robert Redford and his beloved NRDC, (National Resources Defense Council), its all I can do to keep from pinching my self to see if I'm alive and awake. Hence how can I beg you more? Please, it's time for the National leaders to take a look. Something is odd, very odd. Perhaps there are very reasonable explanations for this. Nevertheless, we've seen more than enough to catch our attention and I believe soundly warrants expert review. I will say on more than one occasion when the words "insider trading" are mentioned, "the room" gets quiet quickly, and the subject changes as fast. How many times in history has democracy self destructed when instead of relying on the most sacred of its principles, especially under duress, someone at the core assumes that "a core" must dictate and control the solution? We need some boundaries on this process before our values are undermined with fear or entitlement.

I reference several other concerns in my appeal letter.

D. The contract term of 50 years is unreasonably long and obligating unfair adherence to old technology that disallows the best environmental practices.

At the very least, a 50 year lease is excessive. This obligates the Forest Service and environmental policy far beyond what any technology within view would indicate. I do not see why the Forest Service could not review their permit every 20 years which would be far more reasonable and adaptable.

What did your TV look like in 1960, your stereo? Your computer was a slide rule, your microwave was a pressure cooker, your contact lens were horn-rim bifocals, sunglasses were never Polaroid, cataracts were removed and corrected with very thick lens, your refrigerator used twice the electricity for half the space, your electric panel had fuses, your camera was expensive and used film, you probably didn't even process the pictures right away, your phone was stationary one phone with a dial, and long distance was expensive for most people.

However your car may have been a beauty, - if it was a Thunderbird. It drank gas but it had a 400 cc engine and did what a combination Cameo and

SUV could today, it cornered, handled, accelerated, and the seat belts were optional.

By contrast though, what if it the car was an Edsel, long forgotten and left in the dust, but you were making your last payment **this month**? That would be the analogy for this line: Surely that is not the loan on environmental integrity and public lands that the latest defenders from global warming would contract and speak for all of us?

Is it the best thing environmentally to not be able to promptly leverage a cleaner solution as soon as one is available? If the "magic black box" comes along in 20 years we will not have the politics or funds available to leverage it. Who would benefit from this old system? I could speculate on two general categories, the people who have centralized power over the power today and want to keep it, and the people who can control large quantities of land with this model perhaps for real estate once the Forest is too chopped up to manage, as opposed to putting decentralized, distributed power on rooftops today. Did these groups seduce the usual environmental activists with a solution to global warming, albeit a lucrative one, -at the expense of all of us?

E. The DEIS and FEIS were not easily reviewable by the public and Nepa requires that they are. The scope of the project is not attainable within the documentation provided.

The EPA's comments indicate, as we have, that the permitting of the Sunrise Powerlink and its connected actions, have been a moving target. They went into excellent detail of the ambiguities of the EIS for addressing the original mandate by our state independent operator to ensure power reliability on the grid. In the five years of reviewing the plan it has grown from that state "energy insurance policy", to the national savior and role model for global warming solutions. Is it the new state of the art model for green energy or a rationalization to keep the old strategy for centralizing the power over the power?

The latest we now learn from the California AB-2514 is not only is this project to be interfaced to the new Wind and Solar farms but also to the backup "batteries" in the form of converting many of our reservoirs and other lands into pump storage facilities to smooth out the supply and demand irregularities from green type windmills and solar farms on the grid. Hence the request or quest to determine disclosure of the full scope has not seen the end. Furthermore the original need was to be 500kv but SDG&E's marketing consistently refers to at least 1000kv.

The environmental impact statement was so large and cumbersome that no lay person could grasp it all in a normal committed amount of time for the normal member of the public. (see attached photo) Nevertheless the area it covered was about 350,000 acres of land impacts and close to a million acres of visual ones. As a result the 7000 pages in the DEIS in all actuality allowed only one page per forty five acres. That is one page to review water, species and habitat, visual, noise, air, fire, cultural, justice, cumulative and connected actions, ecology, watersheds, and others. How can a plan that is as permanent as this one be trusted to being this "diluted"? It is an elegant

slight of hand to say, as several reviewers have claimed, apparently from a surmising the size of the volume alone, that this had all been done "so thoroughly".

Without question, the Forest Service did far more in the months following the BLM ROD than had been done before. I perceived, given the intense political climate, Will Metz had little choice but he did much with what he had. They requested a significant number of mitigations and alterations to the proposal. They ultimately produced documents outlining in detail the impacts, but the most detailed documents were not published until the record of decision was out. Will and his team had more depth and sensitivity to the issues than anyone else but there are still significant holes that I do not think were comprehended, especially in terms of evaluating the ecology and watersheds as whole systems about to be severely fragmented, as well as incorporating some of the same criteria in the visual integrity analysis. At least there was some willingness that was lacking prior to the Forest Service involvement.

I refer to my appeal as well. We found populations such as Golden Eagles and riparian habitat that clearly are right under this route. The areas impacted in my opinion are off by more than a power of 10. If I've gleamed the references to future actions correctly this will double or triple in ways that are so adverse to the remaining watersheds it's difficult to imagine how it could be considered.

F. Invalid credentials for the Reviewing Officer:

According to the CFR for the Forest Service, "The Appeal Reviewing Officer shall be:

- (1) Designated by the Chief or designee, and shall be a line officer at least at the level of the **agency official who made the initial decision on the project or activity that is under appeal**, who has not participated in the initial decision and will not be responsible for implementation of the initial decision after the appeal is decided; (emphasis mine)

The appeals officer Eli Iiano, with all due respect, has some impressive credentials. However he is not "at the level of the agency official" in this case, Will Metz. Eli is a Deputy Forest Supervisor and Will is a Forest Supervisor. The position descriptions indicate distinctly different roles and titles as follows:

Job description of Forest Supervisor:

<http://federalgovernmentjobs.us/jobs/Forest-Supervisor-1989324.html>

Job description of Deputy Forest Supervisor:

<http://federalgovernmentjobs.us/jobs/Deputy-Forest-Supervisor-2059018.html>

G. Reviewer misunderstood the timeline of the project; and hence, the fundamental nature of some of our biggest core concerns over the

foreseeable future actions are not accurately addressed. He arbitrarily, capriciously restated existing points from the record of decision lacking more thorough review of the concern.

One of the shortcomings of this review that was particularly disconcerting is the review of future foreseeable actions. Both made reference to section "G" of the DEIS concerning connected actions. I do not see how this is fully accurate. Section G is in the DEIS. The future expansion in question, which entails more than a parallel line, is given a whisper at the end of the fourth volume, on a map in the FEIS. So how can section G be a reference to this? It had not happened at the time "G" was written. It was not apparent in the DEIS even though that is where the majority of the public was engaged in the commenting process. I asked at least a 100 people on Boulder Creek Road if they realized that it could still be in a route and not one of them knew. These were the folks that frequent these lands and would be most attuned to conditions affecting them.

I do not agree that the connected actions are handled according to NEPA. NEPA would require that this was known at the time of the DEIS comment period. The intention to expand was not disclosed until SDG&E was placed under oath before the California Public Utilities Commission in the Summer of 2007 where they indicated that the 500kv strands would be widened to two strands. At that time they insisted that the South Route was not feasible. So the South Route has one 500kv line but not capable of going north and will split into two and be further reduced to 460 kv.

The public at large, as any reasonable person would, has the impression that the expansion is parallel in close proximity to the current route. The map would indicate an entire new route where the names have been altered additionally to hide the full impact. This means that the real and true cumulative impacts of this project are double the ones in the FEIS.

We can speculate with some confidence that all other aspects, **not the least of which is cost** are also double.

NEPA says very specifically that you can not cut a project in half to reduce the presumed impact and this has been tried in several landmark cases. For all of the concerns thus far expressed, the true impact could be more than double and well concealed under the proverbial radar.

H. Erroneous Appeal Response.

There were erroneous references in the collective response connecting a response to the appellant who raised the concern. What was more disconcerting was the omission of a response to some items at all. I made reference to some land management areas that first mysteriously appeared in the Forest LMP in 2005 right on the heels of the

Energy Act. No one has ever explained why they are there. However there was an odd movement of a local proposed trail on an EIS map that also could not be explained. It turns out that the 2008 switch back on the ASPEN environmental map fits conveniently into the 2005 Forest Service LPM map. The switchback however is at a scale indicative of the 30 minute Forest Service visitor map and the other features are at scale with a USGS 7.5 minute topo map. The same area was conveniently altered in late summer 2005 without any compelling explanation as to why. I asked Tom White at an Eagle Peak Rock Climbing public open house two years later and he said "oh, some of the guys just thought we should leave that open". Does this sound like Nepa to you? Other mapping features including very small but significant ones have appeared on subsequent travel management maps that look like a power line tower was being slipped in right on top of a Golden Eagle nest and a seep with a "rural" designation just big enough for the tower pad. It comprises some of the most unspoiled deep canyon, "wild and scenic" stream, and critically endangered native trout habitat in our county yet it would appear that someone was considering this location and manipulating the LMP's under the radar to make them viable. I raised this issue in my appeal as well as numerous other times but the reviewer did not address it. The core concern is that it could indicate that in 2005 someone connected with the LMP knew that the route would be going south in the National Forest even though if the public was even beginning to become aware of the project at all it was widely discussed as a state project in Anza Borrego Desert. In so doing the public pressure to keep it out of the Forest was sidestepped while the initial commenting was going on.

This could have some very serious implications for motivations outside of the three stated intentions and in violation of FTC fair trade practices on a federally funded project or permitted project.

SDG&E's public notices of 2005 and early 2006 state that the Sunrise Powerlink would not be going through the Forest but the Land Management Plan suit brought by the Sierra Club and the Center for Biological Diversity state that one of their core concerns in April of 2006 was that they had learned of a project that might go across Inventoried Roadless Areas.

(United States District Court Northern District of California , California Resources Agency No. C08-1185 MHP, Plaintiffs, vs. United States Department of Agriculture, Defendants, and Center For biological Diversity , Plaintiffs, vs. United States Department of Agriculture , Defendants. Memorandum & Order, Re: Cross-Motions for Summary Judgement, page 6)

I. Forest personal pressured.

Neither the district rangers nor the forest supervisor had held their positions for very long when this enormous project was placed in their laps. Will had not been a Forest Supervisor when he came here and yet he had to preside over the largest and one of the most controversial EIS's in California history, in a state known for embracing controversy like desert. This would be like giving someone their driving learners permit

and having them jump on a Harley Davidson and ride a thousand miles with the Hell's Angels. He did.

There are referral procedures in the EPA and CEQ but it was obvious that those options were not likely realistically available. At one point there was an apparently logical option of using the current Southwest route. As it quickly vaporized it became obvious that agency authority was not fully leveraged and there was much to this approval that obscured from the public. Rumors of both politicians and environmental leaders with compromised interests have clouded the best faith in the integrity and intentions behind a global warming resolution.

There has not been a review step that was truly uninfluenced by pressure from the people who seem to want this project with blinders to the data. As the target has moved the project has not. If we need a comprehensive new energy deal, than that goal should be kept in mind from the beginning. This has not.

J. Conflicts with broad CEQ principles and plans and impacts to appellants.

"(The Great Outdoors Initiative) "The Memorandum calls on the Secretaries of the Interior and of Agriculture, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) to lead the Initiative, in coordination with the Departments of Defense, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Labor, Transportation, Education, and the Office of Management and Budget. The Initiative focuses on developing a 21st century conservation agenda that builds on successes in communities across the country, and starts a national dialogue about enjoying America's great outdoors.

To inform their work, senior-level officials are conducting listening sessions around the country to engage interested groups, including tribal leaders, farmers and ranchers, sportsmen, community park groups, foresters, youth groups, businesspeople, educators, state and local governments, and recreation and conservation groups. In addition, the President has made it clear that one of his priorities is to engage young people, especially those who live in our Nation's cities, and to find ways to get them to go outdoors to experience this Nation's unique natural heritage."

It is hard to read this initiative, more precisely too painful. For so long I have wanted and felt passionately for this type of initiative. To read more than a few sentence given the past couple of years is too painful. I can not think of more than once or twice in a life time when this had been so much the case. I know the areas near the route well. Why? Because if 10 years ago when they asked us to comment on the Forest Fifteen Year Plan much of what I commented on could have connected the dots that comprise this route.

The legal challenge brought against Sunrise Powerlink, by attorney Volper, was countered by the District Court judge, with a directive to provide evidence that this

project would have an effect on the litigants. It may be less easy to articulate but there is nothing in life here that is more significant in my opinion, than what has been threatened at times totally arbitrarily and callously. To provide an analogy, say for example, as an adult your sibling is killed. Do you "need" them? Maybe they are in another city and you don't even see them often. Does this mean the loss is felt any less? So the more difficult question is whether you can have a deeply connected relationship to the land. We might as well call the abnormal psychologists to the stand now. I say you can. I'm not alone. Even the Forest Service mentions this in their fifteen year plan in reference to Native Americans. I clearly remember countering this statement in my comments to the fifteen year plan, --that it applies to all of us.

K. Conclusions

There are no other obvious appeal steps that I am aware of for a lay person such as myself. I do not have the sort of money to bring legal challenge and the Sierra Club has done an about face on this project. . One needs to be brought.

In 2001 or so Bill Corcoran, the regional Sierra Club liaison at the time, assisted in bringing about the Senator Boxer Wild Heritage Act. Even in January of 2009 Bill was last seen at a table with other Sierra Clubbers in the "Smart Energy Task Force" discussing the very sort of suit that should have been. Some where some how between then and October of 2009, Bill Corcoran was pals with the Green Energy "guy", Carl Zichella who adamantly supported big green. It didn't seem to matter that Bill thoroughly knew the shaky history of Sunrise, deeply felt objections, having been the liaison to help oppose it, now the new powers were saying we could not. Volunteers were silenced; their work, their money, their passions, their time renounced, un-thanked. Without question, most of the Forest Service had more sensitivity than this. It is odd to the point that I've play little mental games to imagine the disposition or intentions of someone who would have this mind set. What micro- culture could produce the callus, fickle, indifference? What horror do they understand all of a sudden that we are not privy to but they will manage for us?

I met a man recently who was conducting some medical tests. He asked me to guess where he was from. Somehow I knew, due to a fateful coincidence, he was from Kazakhstan. (A childhood friend had a colt named Kazak, why I remembered this I don't know.) We spent the next 45 minutes talking about the conditions of Russia, the corruption, the poverty, and the natural gas...

I suspect that this is one of the reasons, one of the legitimate ones for this energy model. If our country has made some decisions to assist the growing nations out of communism, we may have made a good choice. That may explain the natural gas across Mexico but not everything. It would have been much faster, much less expensive had the cards all gone down on the table at once. They are not all there now. It is clear that something happened and it was not disclosed. Several volunteers were taken for granted and lost much.

L. Mitigations requested

One of the mitigations I requested in my appeal, odd though it may be, from the ground I feel very strongly that still it is one of the most important that can be done "between us kids" for no money to speak of and with enormous benefit. That was to encourage the forest rangers to come with us to the remote areas of the forest that we know well. It would play to our strengths, build a stronger team, and reduce both conflict and confusion.

Tomorrow I have to go back to being normal. It won't be easy. Five years of a mental epic journey, was a comfort only in the excuse to be in extraordinary times now, little by little to get replaced back to the comfort of not having any more alternatives.

Most people wrote a half a page of comments and they were done. For some of us it has been life changing, along with heart breaking. We made it to the end, like a trip up Whitney long enough to tap the top of a kiosk, sign a register and gage the 5000 foot descent before nightfall. We are tired and in a couple of weeks we begin the LMP SEIS for the last LMP resolution settlement all over again. Consistently, I was not allowed to participate. They asked for my comments on the Four Forests LMP settlement, and ushered me out. Likewise the same oddly close to Bill Corcoran did not allow participation in the Smart Energy Task force or the Rock Climbers and Eagles collaborative. I know the land. I go there as often as I can, they do not, and they blocked my input nearly every time in five years. Why?

Please find out why the sudden turn around of this bunch. This isn't NEPA. They aren't Congress. Secretary Salzar has already decided in their favor on some of the largest solar projects in history. It isn't the intention of going green that is at issue by any means. It is the blatant deviation from environmental process and polity as well as democracy.

But more than anything whether we ever know their intentions, we keep the real truth with us. Peer pressure can be a deadly thing. The annotate is as easy as going and seeing. Please ensure the Forest Service comes out to the land where there is no question, no faltering doubt, no crowd to please, no expectation to measure up to, just the land you already serve, waiting. I know first hand the strength that comes from being crystal clear what is there.

I fear I'll wake up one day to find metaphorically, that "the Mormon golden tablets sent back to the heavens", the land with be inundated, no one will believe me about the treasure that use to be.

Thank you for reading my concerns.

Sincerely,
Cindy Buxton
Co-Chair of the Forest Committee of the San Diego Sierra Club
Adoptive Parent of the Proposed Eagle Peak Wilderness

541 Spruce Street
Imperial Beach, California 91932

(619) 934-0323 home
(619) 823-3620 cell