Comment Set D.48: Richard Ricci

Sep 14 06 08:34p p.1

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Public Meeting Comments

Proposed Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project

Date: Sept 14, 2006

Name*: Richard Ricci

Affiliation (if any):* Property Owner in Agua Dulca Area

Address:* 21020 Chatsworth St, ~~Chatsworth, Calif~~

City, State, Zip Code:* Chatsworth, Calif 91311

Telephone Number:* 818-882-1371

Email:*

— See Attached Letter —

Yours Truly,

Richard Ricci

**Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.*

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be postmarked by September 18, 2006. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (661) 215-5152 or emailed to antelope-pardee@aspeneg.com.

Sep 14 06 08:34p p.2

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the Alternative 5 option of this proposed new power line and in favor of the forest line proposed route.

I own a lot located at 9156 Old Stage Road in Agua Dulce and am currently building a house on the property. I specifically selected this lot for development because of the view it provides of the Vasquez Rocks area. Now, two years later you are proposing to put a power line across the valley right in fornt of that view and, for all practical purposes, too close to my house and lot.

I could possibly see using this alternative 5 route if it offered a "better way" of doing business or was more efficient, but based on the data I've seen to date, this route is actually one of the worst (if not the worst) of all the choices presented. Below I will list the "Cons" of picking this route over the initially proposed forest line route (through the national forest land).

Comparing Alternative 5 to the forest line proposed route (Cons):

1) More expensive (ten miles longer, must buy/acquire a lot of private land, etc.)

2) 30+ percent longer - much more intrusive footprint on the environment and local community.

3) Must acquire extensive right of way from existing private land (vs. existing already acquired right of way in forest).

4) Ruins views of existing private land already developed or being developed.

5) Disrupts development projects currently underway or soon to be underway.

6) Creates more pollution for the environment - both during construction and under future annual maintenance/operaton.

7) There is a possible electromagnetic effect to the people who will be living close to this line (vs. virtually no one close to the line in the forest land).

D.48-1

The only "Pro" reason I have been able to discover (for using Alternative 5 vs. the forest line route) is that this will prevent a second power line across forest land (even though it will be on or close to the existing line power line now in the forest land).

In conclusion then, It appears the Alternate 5 will be more environmentally damaging than the forest line route; will cause more pollution, both during construction and afterwards; will cost more to construct; will be more disruptive to the surrounding community; will certainly be more litigious; will be longer and therefore more intrusive overall; and will take longer to implement.

DO NOT USE ALTERNATIVE 5!

Yours truly,
Richard Ricci

Response to Comment Set D.48: Richard Ricci

D.48-1 Your comment and concerns 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-3 regarding EMF concerns.