

Comment Set C.123: Terri Valentine-Duarte and Family

Sent VIA email and regular mail

September 20, 2006

Honorable Julie Halligan  
Administrative Law Judge  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 5101  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
[jmh@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:jmh@cpuc.ca.gov)

RECEIVED  
SEP 26 2006

BY:.....

Re: Antelope Pardee 500kV Transmission Project, Alternative 5

Dear Judge Halligan:

My name is Terri Valentine-Duarte. Our family of six moved to Leona Valley on August 1, 2006 from New York State. Our address in Leona Valley is 7667 Elizabeth Lake Road. We currently have two children in Leona Valley Elementary, Joey and Lauren, and my youngest son, Tony, will begin attendance in two years. We are opposed to the Alternative 5, AntelopePardee 500 kV Transmission Project for the reasons that will be set out later in this letter. Further, we were not provided reasonable notice of the impending project or the Alternatives nor were we made aware of it to any extent that would have enabled us to seek out these facts during our relocation research. We believe it would have been a significant factor in our decision making process toward relocating 3000 miles from our home in New York specifically to Leona Valley, especially considering all the attendant costs of relocation.

C.123-1

Upon review of the document within the CPUC website regarding said Alternative 5, I noted the CPUC is quite aware of very significant problems with Alternative 5. I read within its own document, statements such as, "**Air Quality** – This alternative has the *second highest annual total emissions...* **Geology, Soils, Paleontology** – *Greatest potential ... that could damage project structures than all other alternatives...* **Land Use and Public Recreation** - ... it would traverse 103 privately owned properties and possibly remove one or more homes... **Noise** – *Has the greatest potential to expose the greatest number of residences to noise...* **Public Services** – *Would place the greatest demand on public services...* **Socioeconomic** – *Could result in the removal of existing housing...* **Traffic and Transportation** – *Would result in more road crossings... increased duration and severity of traffic impacts...* **Utilities and Service Systems** – *Would generate approximately 4,605 tons of waste, more than the proposed Project or any of the other alternatives except Alternative 1.*" (Emphasis added) Thus, these are obviously very significant and serious concerns that are already known and documented. Please forgive us for being "slow" but these known concerns seem to fly in the face of the same document's stated goal to "...minimize disruptions to existing land uses ... to the extent feasible." It is apparent to

C.123-2

us, who actually live here, that disruptions to “existing land use”, a.k.a. people who live in the area and use the land, are maximized, not minimized.

First of all, although the plan states it would (directly) traverse 103 privately owned properties and possibly remove one or more homes, it fails to address the effect this would have on the people who live their lives on these 103 properties and the entire community involved. The document’s tone and blatant attempt to clinicalize and minimize the significance of what such actions mean in reality is unacceptable. Even so, assuming *arguendo* that these 103 homes are not a significant number, certainly many more homes than the 103 properties identified and people in the community would be negatively impacted. Some of these homes are also historic or potentially historic landmarks. People live in homes and these are not simply properties but, rather, homes.

C.123-3

Further, there is a school affected and many children will be adversely impacted. There are many businesses, orchards, ranches and farms within the community that would be adversely impacted. Obviously, property values for the entire community would decrease significantly. There are many reasons for this, including, but not limited to, the loss of the beautiful viewscape and detrimental health risks associated with EMFs. Severe noise pollution will take place. There is also a viable threat to water sources, a severe increase in fire hazard risks as well as the attendant increased difficulty in controlling fires once initiated, and increased flooding problems caused by soil erosion from construction in an area already faced with well documented major flooding issues. All of these things are extremely expensive both long and short term, both directly and indirectly. Many, many people will be affected. There is also significant wildlife that will be impacted and/or obliterated.

C.123-4

Our family chose to move to Leona Valley because of the community, its people, the land, the water, the air, the quiet, the views, the wildlife, the property values, the school, the proximity to work and services, and the relative safety of our health and welfare. We were aware of the risks associated with living on the Fault Line and, in spite of those risks, the Leona Valley community was our choice. We had many other areas to choose from and we did not select Leona Valley by default. We thoroughly enjoy the way of life here and specifically planned on reaping the benefits of raising our children in this community. Another factor for us included that in this community we can ride our horses on the trails directly from our property. We have no doubt that Alternative 5 will destroy the socioeconomic system in this community and most other favorable aspects of the community. We are extremely disturbed to have to face the thought of more relocation and also concerned about the financial losses that we will be forced to endure if Alternative 5 is accepted. We will face these losses whether or not we relocate if Alternative 5 is accepted.

What are the benefits of Alternative 5 to those outside the Leona Valley community, i.e., the Forest Service? Do these benefits outweigh the extreme and permanent impact on this community? It certainly does not appear so. I am new to the community but I can appreciate the reasons an alternative to using the Forest Land was sought. However, it appears that the information provided regarding the impact of Alternative 5 to the community of Leona Valley, whether this information was properly prepared or not, whether the information was properly promulgated or not, or whether the information could be considered misleading or not, still

C.123-5

clearly indicates on its own merits that Alternative 5 is not a reasonable choice as an alternative to using the Forest Land. Our family is opposed to the health, safety, and environmental risks presented by Alternative 5, the irreplaceable loss of our new community and the significant loss of monetary value. Our family respectfully requests that Alternative 5 be denied.

C.123-6

Sincerely,  
  
Andrea Valentine

Terri Valentine-Duarte  
Manuel D. Duarte  
Andrea N. Valentine  
Lauren Valentine  
Joseph J. Duarte  
Anthony M. Duarte  
7667 Elizabeth Lake Road  
Leona Valley, CA 93551  
(661) 270-9367  
[mtjduarte@aol.com](mailto:mtjduarte@aol.com)

cc:

Jody Noiron, Supervisor Angeles National Forest [jnoiron@fs.fed.us](mailto:jnoiron@fs.fed.us)  
John Boccio, CPUC, EIR Project Manager  
Marian Kadota, USDA Forest Service, NEPA Project Manager, c/o Aspen E.G.  
Aspen Environmental Group  
30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215  
Agoura Hills, CA 91301  
[jbx@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:jbx@cpuc.ca.gov)  
[mkadota@fs.fed.us](mailto:mkadota@fs.fed.us)  
[antelope-pardee@aspeneq.com](mailto:antelope-pardee@aspeneq.com)  
Marian Kadota  
Adaptive Management Services Enterprise Team  
Forest Service  
6755 Hollister Avenue, Ste 150  
Goleta, CA 93117  
Terry Kenney, Alternative 5 Committee Chair, Leona Valley Town Council  
The Honorable Mayor Michael Antonovich, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
The Honorable Howard (Buck) McKeon, U.S. Representative 25<sup>th</sup> District  
The Honorable George Runner, State Senator  
The Honorable Sharon Runner, State Assembly District 36  
The Honorable Audra Strickland, State Assembly District 37  
The Honorable Dr. Keith Richman, State Assembly District 38  
The Honorable Mayor Laurene Weste, City of Santa Clarita  
The Honorable Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

## Response to Comment Set C.123: Terri Valentine-Duarte and Family

- C.123-1 Thank you for your opinion regarding Alternative 5. As discussed in section ES.1.4 (Summary of Public Involvement Activities) on June 24, 2005 the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR/Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS for the Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Line Project. The NOI was published in the Federal Register on June 28, 2005. Copies of the NOP and NOI were available at 10 local repositories. The NOP was mailed on June 24, 2005, to 77 federal, State, regional, and local agencies and elected officials. Notice of the two scoping meetings appeared on the CPUC project website. One newspaper advertisement appeared in five regional and local newspapers on Sunday June 26, 2005, and Saturday July 9, 2005. On June 29 and July 14, 2005, the CPUC and USDA Forest Service held two public scoping meetings to collect input for the scope and content of the EIR/EIS, as well as to provide an opportunity for the public to provide input on alternatives to the project and potential mitigation measures.
- C.123-2 In accordance with both CEQA and NEPA requirements, this EIR/EIS identifies alternatives to the proposed Project that could avoid or minimize significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project, including the No Project/Action Alternative. This EIR/EIS does not make a recommendation regarding the approval or denial of the proposed Project; it is purely informational in content and will be used by the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service in considering whether or not to approve the proposed Project or an alternative.
- C.123-3 The EIR/EIS does not attempt to minimize the significance with regard to private property. Specifically in the Land Use section C.9.10.2 (Impacts and Mitigation Measures) it is stated that “the preclusion of existing and planned land uses and the possible removal or acquisition of existing residences or properties would create significant and unavoidable impacts (Class I)”.
- C.123-4 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding effects on property values and General Response GR-3 regarding EMF. Impacts from noise are discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.10, where significant and unavoidable (Class I) noise impacts have been identified. Impacts to hydrology and water quality are discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.8. All impacts from the Project on hydrology and water quality have been reduced to a less-than-significant level with application of applicant proposed measures (APMs) and mitigation measures. Impacts to wildlife are discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.3. All impacts from the Project on biological resources have been reduced to a less-than-significant level with application of mitigation measures. The impacts of increased potential for wildfire on residences and the ability of aircraft to fight fires in the vicinity of Alternative 5 are addressed under Criterion FIRE3 for Impacts F-4 and F-6 in Section C.7.10.2 of the Forest Management Activities section.
- C.123-5 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. The proposed Project and each of the alternative routes would result in impacts to a number of issue areas which are discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS.
- C.123-6 Thank you for your opinion regarding Alternative 5. Your comment will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.