Comment Set C.150: Dan and Emilie Fouts

----- Forwarded by Marian Kadota/R5/USDAFS on 10/02/2006 07:44 AM -----

Dan <drfouts@hughes.net>

To
jnoiron@fs.fed.us

09/29/2006 12:21PM

cc

Subject
Proposed Leona Valley transmission lines

40655 Shallow Springs Rd.
Leona Valley, CA 93551

Ms. Judy Noiron
Supervisor
Angeles National Forest

September 27, 2006

Dear Ms. Noiron:

Our family lives in Leona Valley. We are adamantly opposed to any transmission lines being placed within Leona Valley and specifically oppose Alternative 5. We came to this valley to enjoy a way and quality of life these lines would largely destroy. Most people in Leona Valley, like us, came here to be away from the city and industry and to live in a place of peace, natural beauty and quiet. The power lines would devastate our country lifestyle, and turn this beautiful valley into one big eye soar. This, of course, would not only defeat the whole purpose for us living in this valley but would greatly devalue all property in Leona Valley, including our own.

These transmission lines would also pose various risks, especially fire safety, to all homeowners in Leona Valley, even if their homes were located some distance from the lines. The following objections are hereby made by my wife and I to the proposed Antelope Pardee 500-KV Transmission project:

C.150-1

1. F-9: Project operation would adversely affect community safety. F-7 adversely affects fire prevention activities.
2. H-2: Degradation of surface water or ground water quality would occur from the accidental release of potentially harmful materials during construction activities and "operational activities."
3. H-3: P-H-5 Project would cause radio or television interference.
4. H-4: Disturbance of existing groundwater resources through project-related excavation activities.
5. H-6: Runoff introduced as a result of permanent Project features would cause the overloading of local storm water drainage system.

6. L-3: Operation of the Project would cause long term disruption of existing residential land uses.
7. L-6: The right-of-way expansion and larger 500kv towers would permanently preclude use of farmland.
8. S-3: Construction activities could cause a decrease in revenues for agricultural landowners.
9. U-4: Construction and operational water supply demands would require new or expanded water entitlements or resources.
10. P-2: Operational activities could increase demands on fire and police protection.

Also, it is our understanding that there are other proposals available to be utilized that would not have the detrimental impact that the two proposals going through Leona Valley would have. It would seem to us that the P.U.C. would utilize one of the proposals that would not damage and effectively destroy the community of Leona Valley. Again, our family and property would be directly or indirectly affected and we hereby give notice of our legal objections to the P.U.C. As long time California residents and taxpayers it seems to us outrageous to destroy a wonderful community like Leona Valley simply because of a preference for one proposal over another proposal, especially when there is so much uninhabited land immediately west of Leona Valley. It is our understanding that eminent domain is only to be used where there is no other recourse available. If eminent domain is used when it does not need to be utilized, it is our intention to take any and all appropriate legal action to recover damages. Whether or not our property is itself subject to eminent domain proceedings, it will nonetheless suffer loss in value. C.150-2

There will be other losses we expect to incur, also for which we will take legal action to recover damages. Our family may be subject to health and safety risks and other long-term damages. C.150-3

While the transmission project is being constructed in the Leona Valley area, long and short-term health risks may come from the noise and dust of construction. There will be long-term risks from the transmission of large amounts of electricity to the nearby residents and probably all of the residents of Leona Valley. C.150-4

Many property owners in Leona Valley keep and raise livestock. Some of us, as do we, partially or entirely depend on these animals for our livelihood. The impact on the health of these animals, who cannot escapes to the indoors, could be considerably greater. The noise of the construction alone could cause our animals to stop producing altogether. We may also lose our horse boarders. C.150-5

Additionally, the roads in Leona Valley will be closed on occasion during construction causing delays and waiting periods for access and egress to the Leona Valley residents. This same problem poses fire, security and health risks that cannot be protected against. C.150-6

Finally, we will be seeking monetary damages for all of the above losses that we will likely sustain if any one of the proposals is utilized in Leona Valley. We will be seeking damages for any and all temporary, as well as permanent, loss of use of our property, loss of value to our property, and damages for any and all impact these proposals have on us

as residents, homeowners and on our land, pets and livestock.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Respectfully,

Dan and Emilie Fouts

Response to Comment Set C.150: Dan and Emilie Fouts

C.150-1 We recognize that Alternative 5 would constrain the ability to aggressively fight a wildland fire in the vicinity of the route, and would create additional fire risks to inhabited areas such as Leona Valley and Agua Dulce (see discussion in Section D.5). Your concerns will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.

C.150-2 Please see General Response GR-4 regarding the identification, screening, and analysis of proposed Project Alternatives.

C.150-3 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.2.10.2, construction of the proposed Project would result in short-term construction related air quality impacts that are considered a significant and unavoidable impact of Alternative.5. Your concerns will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.

C.150-4 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential EMF impacts.

C.150-5 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.13.10.2, temporary closure of roads along the proposed Alternative 5 route would be less than significant with proposed mitigation measures.

C.150-6 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.2.10.2, construction of the proposed Project would result in short-term construction-related air quality impacts that are considered a significant and unavoidable impact of Alternative.5. Your concerns will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.