Comment Set C.191: Amanda Benatar

From: amanda benatar [mailto:amanda@cityappraisalservices.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2006 11:31 PM
To: Antelope-Pardee Project
Subject: propsed 500 kilovolt transmission line in agua dulce

Dear Mr. Boccio:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the California Public Utilities Commission and United States Forest Service proposed Alternate 5 route to the Southern Califronia Edison proposed Antelope Pardee Transmission Project, Segment 1.

C.191-1

It is my understanding that this alternate route is being considered due to the Forest Service's possible refusal to allow the transmission lines if there is an alternate route available outside the National Forest. Surely the prerequesites of that requirment are that it be a physcially feasable and financially viable route.

Let's review the logic of the 2 routes being considered:

The initial proposed route going through the angeles National Forest is: within their existing utility corridor; the initial proposed route displaces no residents; the initial proposed route is shorter; the initial proposed route will be less expensive to construct and more direct; the initial proposed route will cause no decrease in property values; the initial proposed route will cause no negative physical impact (as the effect on the physical body from close proximity to these power lines is still being study and very much up for debate); and the initial proposed routed will cause no substantial additional negative impact to wildlife (as the corridor already exists).

The Proposed Alternate Route 5 being considered will: require designation of a new utility corridor (costly in itself due to requried environmental impact studies, etc); require costly eminent domain proceedings, purchases of expensive properties, demolition of purchased properties, relocation of current homeowners; be more costly to construct due to its substantially longer pathway and extended construction time; displace approximatley 100+ families; negatviely impact the proeprty values of all homes and land within sitelines of the transmission lines; bring visual blight to the Vasquez Rocks Natural Area; increase flight hazards to the already difficulat to navigate Agua Dulce Airport; bring potential negative health issues to the residents of the area; and overall negativley impact the visual and physical quality of life to the remaining residents.

The original proposed route seems to be a win/win all the way around - cheaper, faster, minimal negative impact.

The Propsed Alternate Route 5 seems to be a lose/lose all the way around - vastly more expensive, longer construction time (and thus longer time before actual power can be transmitted to alleviate the "power problem"), considrable visible blight, substantial emotional trauma to all the residents.

It seems incredible to me that our small community has to actually dig into their pockets - yet again - to counter something that seems incredibly irrational.

Response to Comment Set C.191: Amanda Benatar

C.191-1 Thank you for your opinion regarding the proposed Project and Alternative 5. Your concerns will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the proposed Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.