

Comment Set C.94: Bob Turek and Carnetta Turek

From: rturek23@aol.com [mailto:rturek23@aol.com]
Sent: Sun 9/17/2006 7:45 PM
To: jbx@cpuc.ca.gov; jnoiron@cpuc.ca.gov; mkadota@fs.fed.us; Antelope-Pardee Project; comissionergreuneich@cpuc.ca.gov
Subject: Proposed 500 Kilovolt Transmission Line through Agua Dulce California

Dear interested parties- the Alternative 5 for the proposed 500 Kilovolt transmission line through Agua Dulce, California would result in disastrous consequences to current property owners in Agua Dulce. Alternatives using current utility corridors exist and should be used ahead of Alternative 5 for the following reasons:

C.94-1

1. Alternative 5 is 45% longer and encompasses 19 miles outside of current utility corridors
2. Alternative 5 will take 23% longer to construct
3. 103 parcels will be affected
4. The proposed alternative 5 will be within 1 mile of Vasquez Rocks
5. Alternative 5 results in the most noise to residences
6. Alternative 5 will result in the greatest fire risk to homes
7. Alternative 5 increases road crossings including 2 freeway crossings.
8. Alternative 5 will be within 1 mile of Agua Dulce airport thereby causing potential dangers to flights.
9. Alternative 5 will result in a brand new 18.8 mile utility corridor

C.94-2

Apart from property values being affected, the views and quiet of the area will be destroyed. Agua Dulce is a one of a kind area in California- the forest area within which the current utility corridor exists, is actually desert with very little use. To put forest use in a desolate area ahead of a beautiful one-of-a-kind country area is poor planning and use.

C.94-3

I'm completely amazed by the decision to consider alternative 5 and am very surprised that we only heard about this through our town council and the local paper.

C.94-4

Thank you for the opportunity to give you input on this important topic.

Bob Turek and Carnetta Turek
8128 Clayvale Road
Agua Dulce, CA 91390
661-268-8808

Response to Comment Set C.94: Bob Turek and Carnetta Turek

- C.94-1 Thank you for submitting your opinion regarding Alternative 5. Your comments are consistent with the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS regarding the increased length of Alternative 5, as well as the requirement of Alternative 5 to establish new utility right-of-way (ROW) areas. However, it should be noted that the proposed Project and each of the other four Project alternatives would also require land acquisition for ROW purposes, either for new transmission corridors or for widening of existing transmission corridors. Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.94-2 These same issues were identified and addressed in an earlier comment. Please see the response to Comment C.69-4.
- C.94-3 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.94-4 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding noticing procedures and the review period for the Draft EIR/EIS. On September 13, the CPUC, as the CEQA Lead Agency, and the USDA Forest Service, as the NEPA Lead Agency, extended the public review period for the Project from 45 days to 60 days, now ending on October 3, 2006.