

## Comment Set C.162: Tim Orteg

**From:** Tim Orteg [mailto:Tim.Orteg@lacity.org]  
**Sent:** Mon 10/2/2006 9:00 AM  
**To:** Antelope-Pardee Project  
**Subject:** Antelope Pardee 500 kv Project

October 2, 2006

John Boccio, CPUC, EIR Project Manager  
Marian Kadota, USFS, EIS Project Manger  
Aspen Environmental Group

RE: Antelope Pardee 500 kV Transmission Project Proposed By SCE  
Application No. A.04-12-007

Dear Mr. Boccio and Ms. Dadota:

Our community is strongly opposed to the California Public Utilities Commission and United States Forest Service proposed Alternate 5 route to the SCE proposed Antelope Pardee Transmission Project, Segment 1.

The Alternate 5 route abandons a designated utility corridor on public National Forest Service land to be replaced by a new 18.8 mile utility corridor on private land. Relocation of this utility corridor will displace people, homes, and businesses. Eminent domain is a governmental power that should be used only as a last resort. There is no justification for removal of personal property or homes when adequate right-of ways are already present. Additionally, operational activities of the transmission project will substantially decrease property values along the Alternative 5 route alignment. The Draft EIR/EIS indicates there are 103 parcels that will be traversed by Alternative 5, yet the actual route is unknown. The detailed alignment studies will not be initiated unless this alternate is approved, therefore, the number of impacted property owners could be far greater than indicated. National Forest Service policy and providing adequate fire protection to our National Forests while important, should not outweigh the safety and fire protection of a community. Agua Dulce is in a very high fire danger zone with limited water supply and limited improved road infrastructure.

C.162-1

C.162-2

C.162-3

It is clear that SCE's original proposed route is far superior to Alternative 5. However, given the short amount of time we have been given to analyze the DEIR, it is possible that one or more of the alternatives could be a better choice than the proposed route. We realize that our good neighbors, Santa Clarita and Leona Valley could be negatively impacted by the original proposed route and we support them in their recommendation for any of the Alternatives except 5, which may lessen the negative impact in their communities.

**If Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project is allowed to follow Alternate 5 it would impact 2 parcels of land I own in Agua Dulce, one of which I live with my family. Alternate 5 would destroy the value of my home and property. Please it only makes sense that the corridor that is already established be used for this project. It's time that human quality of live take top priority in this situation. I'm sure you wouldn't want this project in your**

**backyard.**

Sincerely yours, Tim Orteg  
9804 Escondido Cyn. Rd.  
Agua Dulce Ca. 91390 Home 661-268-7698 Work 818-756-7845

## Response to Comment Set C.162: Tim Orteg

- C.162-1 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. Alternative 5 would not result in the displacement of a significant portion of the families in the Leona Valley or Agua Dulce communities.
- C.162-2 Please also see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.162-3 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.