

Comment Set D.57: Roger and June Reitano



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Scoping Comments

Proposed Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project

Date: September 14, 2006

Name*: ROGER & JUNE REITANO R-RANCH

Affiliation (if any)*: REITANO FAMILY TRUST

Address*: 12150 ELIZABETH LAKE ROAD / P.O. BOX 771

City, State, Zip Code*: LEONA VALLEY, CALIF. 93551

Telephone Number*: 661-270-0904

Email*: NONE

RECEIVED
SEP 18 2006

BY:.....

attached copy, 7 page letter

*June & Roger Reitano
Reitano Family Trust
Sept 14 2006*

*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@aspenerg.com.

John Boccio/Marian Kadota
CPUC/USDA Forest Service
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215
Agoura Hills, Ca 91301

September 14, 2006

To: John Boccio/ Marian Kadota,

With regard to the transmission line in Leona Valley:

Our Family has owned 600 acres fronting on Elizabeth Lake Road and backing up to the Angeles National Forest in Leona Valley since the mid 1930's. We have farmed and raised Hereford beef for over 60 years.

The Edison power lines (9 – 10 towers) have gone through the middle of our property since late 1929. We have put up with the inconvenience for 70 years and now we are fighting back.

Note that 4 of the 5 proposed routes still go through our property. We are route 1. Route 5 is the one that finally gives us a break by missing our property. Note also that at every local meeting the cry is "leave it where it is", "Let the guy who now has it keep it" or, "I don't want it near my house so that my property is de-valued"; etc, etc, etc. We've been here many more years than the others and they want us to take the hit while they feel good about saving their land.

1

Forestry has made provisions to protect their land (#2,3,4,5) with no consideration for us; (except #5). Forestry has now admitted to providing a 1,000 ft. utility easement corridor should it be necessary in the future. This of course, means our family farm will suffer even more financial damage. Our property is not going to be beat to death for Edison, Forestry, Leona Valley, or the folks who need more electric power.

At the last town meeting in Leona Valley, (September 11, 2006) suggestions from Forestry were given as to what **NOT** to include in community letters in an effort to better support the cry “keep it away from our house”. No mention of any support or suggestion on our behalf.

Although some routes require burying the line through forestry lands, Edison has made proposals by objection on the basis of cost. It could be done but they don't want to pay. It's clear Forestry does not have the strength to stick with their proposal of, “No passage through the middle of our forest”.

Their reasons for #5 are sound but no one wants to listen:

1. No bulldozing access and maintenance roads through pristine wilderness.
2. The very **REAL** possibility of a fire caused by construction.
3. Contamination from an oil or gas spill.

D.57-1

4. Contamination from human presence.
5. Guaranteed danger to air fire suppression crews (aircraft) while trying to dodge 180 ft towers let alone 500K lines.
6. Loosing even one aircraft and crew would not be worth having the lines on Forestry land.
7. The erosion from construction cannot be justified nor repaired completely.
8. Forestry cannot replace 100 year old scrub oaks or manzanita no matter what anyone says.

A. All of the above conditions exists on our land.

9. Due to extreme rugged terrain on both our land as well as Forestry, construction may require large areas to be bulldozed and possibly destroying natural flow of spring water.

A. This is also the case on our land in view of the fact our house and cattle are fed from springs. No water, no ranch!

10. Wildlife will be impacted.

The effect of proposal 1,2,3,4, on our cattle ranch/farm is basically one step from going out of business.

D.57-1,
cont.

1. I cannot (will not) spend what years I have left farming under 500 K electric lines.
2. The likely possibility of adverse physical affects on both me and my wife.
3. We have the largest herd of registered Polled Hereford beef in the A.V. and we will not risk their health, milk flow, calving, or soundness due to EMF NO MATTER WHAT EDISION SAYS.
4. Should a line come down on our property a fire would wipe us out since we have about 400 ac. of natural growth just like the forest.
5. The natural wildlife on our land will be impacted with human intervention. At least 8 or 10 families of coyotes, hundreds of deer, thousands of quail & doves, dozens of bobcats, one mountain lion, one black bear, one pair of nesting red tail hawks, countless wild birds including those migrating as well as local mallard ducks, egrets, two golden eagles, (from the Peterson property) which hunt on our property. Two gray herons feed in our ponds, and the condors at the Frazier Park reserve stop here once a year on

D.57-2

D.57-3

their migratory flight to drink water. Also, barn owls, hoot owls, and great horned owls. We have all of this.

Note: We do not hunt nor do we allow any hunting of animals on our ranch.

6. Entering and leaving a cattle ranch through multiple gates is always a problem (if a gate is ever left open) for both Edison and construction crews. No one would ever admit to leaving a gate open! Right!

7. We have been selling All Natural Beef for 30 - 40 years and we have many buyers who cannot ingest, for physical reasons, anything but ALL NATURAL BEEF. I will not be able to guarantee that there is no harm from EMF.

Consequently, my income and business may be forced to shut down.

8. We will not allow Edison to swallow our land for 50 more years with the possibility of future expansion taking even more land costing us more financial lost.

9. If this happens (all the above) and our land is put at risk financially and health wise, we are then put out of business.

D.57-3,
cont.

10. You could not pull this off over in Beverly Hills, or Malibu Beach, so why here??

11. Again plans 1-2-3-4 all go through our property. But not #5.

We support #5 in total.

12. Why not By Pass Leona Valley completely? **We support proposal #5 for the following reasons:**

1. It does not impose it's ugly head on the forest.
2. Fire danger is at a minimum.
3. Once you carve up the forest it is there for all to see forever.
4. It does not impact the last working farm/cattle ranch in Leona Valley.
5. #5 goes through flatter country and fire fighting would be easier.
6. The smaller parcels of land could have the homes moved if wanted.
7. Once this corridor was established maintenance would be considerably cheaper and easier plus safer than through the forest.

D.57-3,
cont.

8. We have been paying the taxes on land that we can not, and have not, been able to use or develop for 70 years.
9. We've never received a dime from Edison for use of our land.
10. People who are forced to sell out to Edison will at least end up with money.
11. Move the line off our property (move it **EAST** or **WEST** of us) and let some non farmer/rancher enjoy the benefits of paying taxes on land they can't use.

D.57-3,
cont.

Sincerely,



Roger Reitano

Reitano Family Trust

Response to Comment Set D.57: Roger and June Reitano

- D.57-1 Thank you for submitting your opinions on Alternative 5. For further information on the impacts associated with biological resources, erosion, environmental contamination, fire suppression, and hydrology as a result of the proposed Project and each of the alternatives, please see the Draft EIR/EIS Sections C.3.5 through C.3.10, C.5.5 through C.5.10, C.6.5 through C.6.10, C.7.5 through C.7.10, and C.8.5 through C.8.10.
- D.57-2 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.
- D.57-3 Thank you for expressing your concerns. 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.

Regarding further information on property acquisition, please see General Response GR-2. The Draft EIR/EIS acknowledges that impacts to existing land uses would occur under the proposed Project and Alternatives 1 through 4. Please see Sections C.9.5 through C.9.9 for a discussion of these impacts. Please also see the Draft EIR/EIS Section D.5 for a discussion of fire hazards associated with Alternative 5.