Comment Set C.152: Michael Danis

From: Winston Smith [mailto:mustapha-mond666@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 30, 2006 4:23 PM
To: jmh@cpuc.com
Cc: Boccio, John; Angeles@fs.fed.us
Subject: Antelope-Pardee 550k Transmission Project Comment

Ms. Julie M. Halligan

9/30/06

EIR Project Manager/Administrative Law Judge California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102

re: Proposed power lines in Leona Valley
Antelope-Pardee 550kV Transmission Project

Dear Honorable Ms. Halligan:

As a 20 year resident of Leona Valley, and as a retired principal in a prominent Los Angeles law firm, over the years I have seen many changes affect people in many ways in both my field of practice and in the community I call home, the lovely, serene Leona Valley.
Fighting for the legal rights of those who had been wronged gave me a feel for how large organizations can disregard the rights and safety of the 'little guys', especially when money and expediencies are involved. But in my experience, California has held a place of special significance when it comes to protecting those who are not powerful when they have been put in harm's way, or their rights and lawful concerns ignored. Our recently enacted law regarding greenhouse gas emissions shows how California can and will act to preserve the health and future of all our citizens, extending that concern across state lines and even reflecting a global awareness in our laws and policies.

Thus it was with the greatest dismay I discovered that the PUC is actually considering allowing Southern California Edison (hereinafter, "SCE") to run some of the most powerful electrical lines in the US within 1000 feet of my own home, where my wife and eleven year old step son live, sleep and play. I was utterly shocked that I not only received no direct notification of said proposal, but that the originally proposed route (hereinafter referred to as, "Original Route") which would have impacted our community far less, now appears to no longer be the route of choice for SCE. The PUC is now being asked by SCE to consider allowing SCE to put MORE people in harms way (from both EMF and ELF-EMF fields of enormous magnitude, as well as from the perspective of economic and quality of life issues) when a less populated, less environmentally damaging route, the "Original Route", was originally being considered. I ask you to reconsider this dangerous, unsightly and utterly unnecessary re- routing from the "Original Route" to the now likely "Alternative 5".

C.152-1

Anyone who has ever seen Leona Valley knows it is one of the most beautiful places left in all of Los Angeles county. Additionally, our agricultural produce is renowned, with visitors coming from all over to buy our rightfully world famous cherries. The proposed "Alternative 5"

would uglify this gorgeous, charming countryside in a way that is truly astonishing and disheartening. I spent a great deal of money, time and effort in selecting this place to live, in improving my property, and in contributing to the community. Most people in Leona Valley view this place as very special and unique.

From the wide open pasturelands with lazily grazing cows, to the spectacular sunsets that grace our lives on a daily basis, living here is a dream for anyone seeking a peaceful, healthy environment to raise their kids and live life to the fullest. Many LACFD firemen, LAC sheriffs and LAPD officers call this place home. It is one of the safest places to live in southerrn California. And all with no smog, no eyesores, nothing to detract from living in what my step-son has called, on more than one occasion, "paradise". And now SCE, for its own varied reasons, wants to end all of that, despoiling this pristine community with enormous, dangerous and spectacularly unsightly electrical towers running through the heart of one of California's last breathtaking rural communities that is only a short drive from one of the major metropolitan areas of the world.

C.152-2

As you are well aware, the risks associated with incredibly strong magnetic fields has been the subject of much scientific research in recent years, and a consensus that such electromagnetic emanations have deleterious effects on human beings, especially the young, has been reached by our own Department of Health and Human Services scientists who have studied the matter in depth. Choosing to expose the residents of Leona Valley to said effects, especially in the context of some of the MOST POWERFUL ELECTRICAL LINES in the US, just doesn't make sense, unless we utterly disregard the human element in making this decision. Credible scientific evidence supports the contention that the placement of any such lines must ALWAYS be in the position of least exposure to people, and most importantly, our children. And yet, by choosing to re-route these power lines directly over Leona Valley, the SCE has decided not to consider the safety of our kids and the voters of this pristine, beautiful community as being paramount. This is very disturbing.

C.152-3

I exhort you in the strongest possible terms to require SCE to return to their "Original Route" and to abandon the plans to use route "Alternative 5". With far more new land being consumed by the now proposed route "Alternative 5", (in fact, over THREE TIMES the land compared to the other route: 227 new acres vs. 698 new acres), and with far more people being exposed to the potential risk of extremely high levels of EMF and ELF-EMF, one simply cannot justify this change. This is especially so where it is alleged that this new routing may actually cause more inefficiencies and line loss, approximately 5%, it has been estimated. When SCE's originally proposed route along an existing power corridor is supplanted by this "Alternative 5" that exposes more people, including my own child and wife, to high levels of EMF unnecessarily, one must wonder why such an extraordinarily and unjustifiably risky endeavor is being seriously contemplated, when other, more efficient and effective, and most importantly SAFER, alternatives were already on the drawing boards.

C.152-4

When a truly safer (in terms of public health) alternative is already available, there is absolutely no reason to choose the alternative route that goes directly over the heads of people who paid very dearly for a safe, rural and beautiful place to live. Don't property rights and reasonable expectations of quiet enjoyment matter to SCE?

Apparently not. Putting people, especially families with small children, unnecessarily at risk of significant EMF exposures is NEVER good public policy, never a governmental 'rational basis', most especially when an alternative exists that does not entail such risks. Californians do not want a "cost/benefit analysis" done with the health of our children, spouses or our communities, where safer, more reasonable alternatives are already prepared and ready. Californians expect our government, especially the PUC, to put people ahead of corporate pocketbooks and/or economic expediency. It is the "Public" Utilities Commission. And as a member of the public most directly affected by this new proposed route "Alternative 5", I want my voice and concerns heard, and given at least as much consideration as that of a large corporation like SCE. Besides, we, SCE's customer base, will be the ones ultimately paying for this, so please don't force us to pay for the priviledge of seeing our beautiful community made ugly and unhealthful. Our property values have taken enough of a hit with the recent real estate downturn, and the future presence of huge electrical towers nearly TWO HUNDRED FEET TALL splitting our little valley straight down the middle will undoubtedly crush what value we retained as a result of the incredibly scenic nature of our community. Once this is lost, it is lost for us, our children and all those who follow us. This community provides a continuing legacy of beauty and rural charm that needs protection, not corporate disfigurement.

C.152-5

Californians want our governmental agencies to act with the highest level of awareness of the public's needs, and with a policy of protection of the public's health and safety. The proposed "Alternative 5" route fails in all these regards. The "Original Route", however, does not.

I most respectfully ask you to oppose this unwarranted exposure of numerous families to the risks outlined above, especially where safer alternatives are already available. The originally proposed route is far more reasonable, healthful, and does not destroy one of the last remaining scenic inspirations in this ever-growing greater Los Angeles area.

C.152-6

Thank you for your consideration of my views expressed herein. Please apprise me of the PUC's decision when one is made. I will very anxiously await your ultimate determination that so hugely affects the future of everyone in this, my beloved Leona Valley.

Most Sincerely,

Michael Thomas Danis
8746 Calva St.
Leona Valley, California 93551-7214

cc: The Honorable George Runner, State Senator; The Honorable Sharon Runner, State Assembly District 36; The Honorable Michael Antonovich, L.A. County Board of Supervisors; Mr. John Boccio, EIR Project Manager, California Public Utilities Commission; USDA Forest Service, attn Ms. Marion Kadota, NEPA Project Manager c/o Aspen Environmental Group; USDA Forest Service, attn Ms. Judy Noiron; and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, State Capitol Building.

Response to Comment Set C.152: Michael Danis

C.152-1 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding the Project's noticing procedures and review period. On September 13, the CPUC and the Forest Service formally extended the public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS to October 3, 2006.

C.152-2 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.15.10.2, the change to existing views as a result of infrastructure construction 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.152-3 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential EMF impacts.

C.152-4 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential EMF impacts.

C.152-5 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential EMF impacts.

C.152-6 Your concerns will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.