Comment Set C.153: John Whitaker

Lotus Star Ranch
40212 107th St West
Leona Valley, CA. 93551
661-270-1079

To whom it may concern:

I attended a recent community meeting at which an NFS staff member courteously and personally presented information on the various alternatives for the Antelope Pardee routing of utility lines and the mechanism to comment on the various alternatives.

I am writing to particularly voice my protest to Alternative 5, the route that would travel along 107th Street through Leona Valley. and essentially circumvent all Forest Service Land, thus dramatically impacting private property owners and the value of their homes and their quality of life. C.153-1

No on Alternative 5

1) This newly proposed transmission line is twice as long as the already established power corridor through the National Forest; **more than doubling the cost of expanding existing corridor.** In my view this is a misallocation of resources that will be passed on to consumers. C.153-2
2) This transmission line **impacts private property** in a rural community that prides itself in its rural and unspoiled atmosphere, open unobstructed vistas and rolling hills.
   a. Travels within a short distance of many homes and in at least one instance a home will have to be destroyed; other property will be bisected. **Quality of life will be adversely affected.** Our view is one of the most valued features of our home C.153-3
   b. **Property values will be adversely affected**, which for many, impacts older people in their retirement years as C.153-4

their real property may be a key plan for financing long term care. This is certainly true for my wife and me.

c. **Potential for adverse health effects** (both human and animal) when so many homes and farm animals are in the proposed corridor. C.153-5

3) **Community (people and animals) are already habituated to and accommodating of existing corridor.** The expansion of the existing corridor is the solution that enables us all to move forward with an already know quantity without having to mitigate the myriad unforeseen consequences of a reroute. C.153-6

I urge you strongly to take the above-mentioned factors into consideration to determine that **the proposed Alternative 5 should NOT be implemented.**

Sincerely,

John Whitaker, Ph.D., M.F.T.
Children's Bureau Director of Community Services

Response to Comment Set C.153: John Whitaker

C.153-1 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 potential effects on property values.

C.153-2 Although project cost is not discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS, we agree that due to the increased length of Alternative 5, it would cost substantially more than the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.

C.153-3 As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, the majority of land uses that would be restricted as a result of Alternative 5 would be the erection of new structures within the alternative ROW. However, given that SCE has not conducted construction or final alignment and design studies for Alternative 5, the EIR/EIS has assumed that the removal of one or more homes may occur. As such, Section C.9.10.2 (Impact L-3) concluded that potential impacts to residential land uses as a result of Alternative 5 would be significant and unavoidable. Also, see General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition.

C.153-4 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 potential effects on property values.

C.153-5 The proposed Project and each of the alternative routes would result in impacts to a number of issue areas including Public Health and Safety (Section C.6) which are discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS.

C.153-6 Thank you for your opinion regarding the proposed Project and the alternatives.