

Comment Set C.164: Warwick and Karen Bryan

From: Karen Bryan [mailto:karen@precisionautobody.com]

Sent: Tue 10/3/2006 6:30 AM

To: commissionerpeevey@cpuc.ca.gov; Antelope-Pardee Project; jbx@cpuc.ca.gov; jnoiron@fs.fed.us; senator.runner@sen.ca.gov; assemblymember.runner@assembly.ca.gov; mantonovich@lacbos.org; mkadota@fs.fed.us; commissionerpeevey@cpuc.ca.gov; commissionergrueneich@cpuc.ca.gov; commissionerbohn@cpuc.ca.gov; commissionerchong@cpuc.ca.gov

Subject: Comments DEIR 04-12-007

See Attached.

Sent via email and regular mail

October 2, 2006

Honorable Julie Halligan
Administrative Law Judge
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room5101
San Francisco, CA 94102
jmh@cpuc.ca.gov

Re: Southern California Edison's Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Line Project, Segment 1, Alternative 5

Dear Judge Halligan,

Where does one start when it comes to the impacts the Alternate 5 option will have on us personally and how we live as residents of the small community known as Leona Valley, other than to say;

We are opposed to the Alternative 5 option in its entirety!

This project is so massive in scope. After weeks of trying to absorb it, we feel we have barely broken the surface in our understanding of the project, the DEIR/DEIS, and all that is involved in the future steps going towards protecting our property and our rights to an unobstructed lifestyle.

Because this project is beyond our comprehension, from a legal perspective, we have joined with others to retain the law firm of Jackson, DeMarco, Tidus and Peckenpaugh to represent us.

However, we do have a few individual comments to make and some questions to ask.

It appears to us that the only purpose for the Alternate 5 option would be to allow the ANF (Angeles National Forest) to keep it off their (public) land. The building of and then the ongoing and perpetual maintenance of the extended Alternate 5 transmission line route would certainly exceed the value, cost or environmental, of the only benefit claimed -- the avoidance of ANF land.

SCE (Southern California Edison) has its required easements already established along most of the "Proposed" route through ANF land. With a Federal mandate by the DOE (Department of Energy) and FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) that transmission corridors are to

C.164-1

stay on public lands wherever possible, please explain to us how the CPUC (in unity with the ANF) allowed the Alternate 5 route to be placed into the DEIR/DEIS as a consideration for an alternate route in the first place. It seems to us that the mandates by the DOE and FERC surely outweigh the *wants* of the CPUC and the ANF for placing alternate routes *outside* the already established corridor.

C.164-1
Cont'd

Comments from an SCE representative regarding the added costs of building an extended route said that, "it doesn't matter what it costs because if the CPUC tells us to build it then we will" outrages us. We are outraged because as ratepayers this means SCE will simply raise their rates to cover their costs. They will have to because surely the shareholders won't bear the increased costs. Has anyone at the CPUC or SCE done the math on what the additional costs for implementing the Alternate 5 route would be? You should. So now, not only will our health possibly be at risk and our beautiful views ruined, but we will also be expected to pay for it! Outrageous!

C.164-2

Further, we don't understand the "build it and they will come" mentality. Please correct us if we are wrong, but it is our understanding that SCE doesn't even have contracts in place from the wind farms in Tehachapi to power these transmission lines that they plan to build. It is also our understanding that BP (British Petroleum) is entering the renewable market in California to the tune of 8 billion dollars. BP has already spent some of this money in the Tehachapi area with strong indications that much more is to come. How many contracts are SCE likely to get (or lose) if a bidding/political war develops between SCE and BP? We realize you could fill a book with the issues and what-ifs on this topic but isn't that exactly what the CPUC is supposed to do? – try and anticipate the future needs and direction for the energy market. It definitely looks to us like SCE is putting the cart before the horse on this by building the lines and *then* trying to get their source to power them. We can't find any information on why building the transmission line prior to obtaining the (renewable) source is a viable business practice – can you please explain to us why you would allow it to be done this way.

C.164-3

Our land is sacred to us. The intrusion of these transmission lines will ruin our quality of life!

They will also have a severe impact on us financially. My neighbor had to reduce the price of his "in-escrow" house because of the possibility of transmission lines. Gossip and fear are already having a negative impact on our property values! How do we get compensated for that?

As planned on the Alternate 5 map, the transmission lines would be approximately 250 feet from our front door on the west side and then angle off on our north side. Affecting two sides of our property. The planned Right-of-Way is actually on our neighbors property, not ours - but on the boundary line. We have twenty-two acres and even though these lines and towers won't be on our property they destroy the intended way we use *all* of our property. How will we be compensated? Our house is on a raised knoll, parallel to where the lines swoop down, so it will actually put us closer to the lines than I'm sure anyone has considered – how do you "mitigate" that? We bought this property specifically for the views – they will be ruined! We also bought this property for the peace and quiet, and aside from the odd owl hooting or the odd coyote howling... you hear nothing.

C.164-4

How are we going to be protected from fires? Who is going to restore the land after rains cause severe soil erosion due to grading for the tower pads and access roads? What happens to us when earthquakes get these lines swinging making it dangerous to go out our front door for fear of them snapping, or of the towers crashing down on us? Who protects our water sources from being contaminated? Who is going to protect the wild animals that randomly roam *our*

C.164-5

properties? There are so many questions inadequately answered. Each property is unique and "blanket" answers just aren't fair. Who will answer our questions?

Shame on the CPUC and ANF for putting us, and all the residents of Leona Valley, Bouquet Canyon and Agua Dulce through this ordeal of having to defend our way of life.

We are not environmental zealots, but we will protect the pristine environment that we currently enjoy.

In closing I will reiterate our request to PLEASE have the Alternate 5 option removed from the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service Antelope-Pardee, Segment 1, Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Warwick and Karen Bryan
10715 Leona Ave.
Leona Valley, CA 93551
(661) 270-0261
Karen@hdeci.com

CC:

Aspen Environmental Group

John Boccio, CPUC, EIR Project Manager

Jody Noiron, Angeles National Forest Supervisor

The Honorable George Runner, State Senator

The Honorable Sharon Runner, State Assembly District 36

The Honorable Michael Antonovich, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

Ms. Marian Kadota, USDA Forest Service, NEPA Project Manager

Governor's Office, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

CPUC President Michael R. Peevey

CPUC Commissioner Geoffrey F. Brown

CPUC Commissioner Dian Grueneich

CPUC Commissioner John Bohn

CPUC Commissioner Rachelle Chong

Response to Comment Set C.164: Warwick and Karen Bryan

C.164-1 Please note that the characterization of the Saugus-Del Sur Utility Corridor as existing easement within the ANF is incorrect. The existing 66-kV line was a previously permitted use by the USDA Forest Service; however, the permit has expired and has not been reissued. As such, there is no existing SCE easement and there is no existing authorization for the existing 66-kV line.

Please see General Response GR-4 regarding the identification, screening, and analysis of proposed Project Alternatives, which includes a discussion regarding USDA Forest Service Policy for denying special uses if it “can be reasonably accommodated on non-NFS lands”.

C.164-2 Construction cost is unavailable at this time and is not a consideration in either the CEQA or NEPA environmental review process.

C.164-3 The purpose of the proposed Project and Alternatives is discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section B.

C.164-4 Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC. Please also see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.

C.164-5 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.

As discussed in Section C.5.10.2, damage related to earthquake induced phenomena would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.8.10, the construction and operation of Alternative 5 would result in less than significant impacts to water quality and available groundwater.

As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.3.10.2, the construction and operation of Alternative 5 would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated to both wildlife habitat and species along the Alternative 5 route.