

## Comment Set C.116: Kenneth and Donna Thompson

----- Forwarded by Marian Kadota/R5/USDAFS on 09/25/2006 09:11 AM -----

Donna Thompson <leonavalleydonna@yahoo.com>

09/21/2006 10:17AM

To  
jnoiron@fs.fed.us

cc

Subject  
PowerLines in Leona Valley

Dear Supervisor Noiron:

We are writing this letter in protest of the Southern California Edison power line proposed pathways through Leona Valley and West Palmdale, specifically the route known as "Alternative 5". This route would significantly impact our property, as it would be located less than ¼ mile to the east of our home. This proposed route is unacceptable, and would directly reduce both our property's value and the rural setting of our home.

C.116-1

We have noted that there are existing power lines to the east of our valley and through an as yet undeveloped area (known as "Ritter Ranch") and National Forest land. These lines could be expanded, without an enormous burden to our already populated, yet rural community of Leona Valley. Other options, such as underground power lines adjacent to the 14 or 5 freeways should be considered, to reduce the impact of power lines on rural communities.

C.116-2

The rural community is under attack in California, and particularly in Los Angeles County. There are very few islands of this unique type of community left anywhere. We purchased our home and land, specifically because of the rustic setting. The noise (crackling and snapping) generated from these power lines, as well as the visual unattractiveness would detract considerably from the significant appeal and value of our property. We are also very concerned about the health risks due to the proximity of power lines.

C.116-3

Please consider the value of our communities and our investment in our type of lifestyle, and find other solutions to this problem.

Thank you,

Kenneth and Donna Thompson

## Response to Comment Set C.116: Kenneth and Donna Thompson

- C.116-1 Thank you for your opinion on Alternative 5. Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC. Please also see General Response GR-1 regarding the potential effect of the Project on property values.
- C.116-2 A number of alternative routes were identified during the Scoping process to avoid the impacts of SCE's proposed Project. See General Response GR-4 regarding the alternatives identification process for the Project.
- C.116-3 A discussion of the noise impacts associated with Alternative 5 can be found in Section C.11.10 of the EIR/EIS. Please see General Response GR-1 regarding the effect of the Project on property values. Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.