

Comment Set C.199: Lyle and Ann Rancier

Lyle and Ann Rancier
40305 N. 107th St. West
Leona Valley, CA 93551
E-mail: SHawk48816@aol.com
September 27, 2006

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

Attention Public Comments Department:

RESIDENT OPPOSING Antelope-Pardee 500kV ALTERNATE 5 POWER LINE PROJECT THROUGH LEONA VALLEY

We have lived in the same home on 107thSt, in Leona Valley for over 21 years. We are opposed to the construction of the Alternative Route 5 Power Lines through our community.

Fire hazards and inhibiting the ability of firefighters to protect our homes here in Leona Valley with aerial support is a huge issue. Fighting fires on the ground, as well as under and around these lines could be equally as dangerous. It is irresponsible for you to propose such a potential tragedy to our community, as well as to our highly respected Firefighters who come to help our community when we need them. (ES-25 Alt. 5 ...with more than 10 additional miles of transmission line. Consequently, this alternative would have the greatest demands on Public Services.) (ES-28 Alt. 5...would constrain the ability to aggressively fight a wildland fire...Alt. 5 also traverses several inhabited rural and semi-rural areas...including portions of Leona Valley and Agua Dulce, where protection of homes and property would likely become a priority in the event of a wildland fire in that area... Therefore, fire fighting is problematic...) I would like to point out that the danger is not just to those homes on the border of the power lines. **Fire is a danger to the whole community and we will not let you take this issue lightly.** In 1986 a fire started two homes over from my house. Homes were damaged and burned here on 107thSt. It quickly turned into a wildfire swept by the winds, and ended up burning down a home on the other side of Leona Valley along Lake Elizabeth Road. It couldn't be stopped and continued on to Northside Drive also damaging homes there. In 1998 yet another fire started on 107thSt., also damaging homes, destroying personal property, as well as outbuildings. For both of these fires air drops of retardant were spread across the back of my property as well as my neighbors homes, and ground crews walked through my property. Then there was the Leona Valley fire which started along Bouquet Canyon in 2004. **This fire came towards my house from the slopes above Lost Valley Rd. in Leona Valley, also along the route where Alt. 5 is proposed to be built.** Walking south down my road to see how close the fire was to 107thSt., we witnessed flames along the sides of the slopes and planes flying over with retardant to hinder the fire from burning towards 107th St. Fires here spread quickly, we have many homes on 107thSt. as well as Lost Valley Rd. and the terrain can make it difficult to control fires. Natural wind patterns in the area add to the problem. In the past

C.199-1

aerial firefighting support has been very effective in saving our homes and I would expect it play a major role in protecting us during future fires. I experienced the blinding, smoky conditions during these fires, when all you can see is the sun as an orange blur in the sky, and I know that firefighters would be in great danger flying near these power lines to try to save our homes. In all three of these instances aerial support as well as ground crews played a vital role in protecting my home, my personal property, as well as my animals and livestock from perishing in a fire. Will our homeowners insurance bills skyrocket? Will homeowners here even be able to get fire insurance at all if Alternate 5 is built through Leona Valley?

Leona Valley is located on top of the fault line. In your Environmental Setting report Section 4.2.5.2 you state, "The Leona Valley, created by the San Andreas Fault, is bounded to the south by the mountainous Angeles National Forest." **Once again it is irresponsible to propose a power line corridor through a populated area known to be "created by the San Andreas Fault."** (ES-22 Alternative 5 would be subject to a higher potential for strong ground shaking to damage project structures than the proposed Project or other alternatives.) **Imagine us dealing with an earthquake disaster AND a wildfire?** Power lines so close to our homes adds to the potential for a fire should an earthquake damage our community. You must understand how serious of an issue this is for us. It is not hard to grasp the big picture. As residents we are the ones who would have to deal with the fire consequences should the towers become damaged during an earthquake. **This is a very serious safety issue which should carry a lot of weight for human safety.** It is often said that it is not if a major earthquake will occur but when it occurs. What if we become trapped in our homes, or are unable to leave our properties due to buckled roads? It makes sense that if we couldn't get out, help would have a hard time getting in to assist us. Who knows how long it would take for help to arrive after an earthquake. It could be days or even longer in an area like Leona Valley. Alt. 5 being built through a community which **you describe in your own documents as being, "created by the San Andreas Fault"** would definitely increase the potential for a life threatening fire during an earthquake emergency. What are you thinking? Are our lives valuable? Wow, I just can't believe I am having to go into such detail to explain what appears to be the obvious. It is good to write these things out, as it is making it so very clear to me how incredibly little consideration was given for the welfare of Leona Valley residents when Alt.5 was drawn up. We are really going to have to stand up to protect ourselves because those who made the Alt. 5 proposal surely don't care about us. Many of us do have livestock that would need to be moved in the event of a fire. If the fire started directly next to our homes we would have no warning and possibly no time to load our animals into trucks and trailers to transport them to safety. If the roads were blocked no outside helpers with trailers would be able to offer us assistance. We may just be fleeing for our own lives leaving our animals behind.

C.199-2

Erosion is another great concern here on 107thSt. (ES-28 ...Alt. 5, new unpaved roads would need to be constructed across soils with a "severe" hazard rating for erosion. In addition, portions of existing unpaved roads would need to be improved. These roads would accelerate natural erosion processes, especially in steep hillside areas, because the soil surface would remain exposed as long as these roads are maintained and used.) I say NO, NO, NO, to any paving of our road, or your machinery coming in and moving around our dirt. If I had wanted a paved road I certainly would not have moved to 107thSt. This is a private dirt road maintained by those who live here. We the residents know the water patterns and how it should be maintained. You coming in and trying to rearrange our water patterns would not be helpful. We also enjoy the fact that joggers, bicyclists, families out for walks and

horseback riders frequent our dirt road to ride, enjoy the scenery and walk up in the hills. Bumpy dirt roads are great for keeping people's speed down. A paved road would encourage people to speed, creating a whole other set of hazards with children, hikers, joggers, cyclists and horses. We like our dirt road, we have lived with it for 21 years, and we take care of it when needed.

The storms of December 2005 literally wiped out 107thSt. The road turned into a river as water rushed 2-2½ feet deep on average, and deeper where the water cut immense trenches. We opened up the fences on our property so people could walk on high ground to their homes. It was days before even 4-wheel drive trucks attempted to drive down the road. There was no mail delivery and no trash pick up. Our road was closed down. If a heavy storm can do this what would happen if you added the following elements; (1) erosion of our present roads with your machinery as well as the process of bulldozing new roads and the upkeep of new service roads, (2) destruction and removal of natural vegetation and land configurations which slow down water runoff leaving bare surface dirt and (3) cutting flat areas into our hillsides for tower placement, all of which would accelerate or change the course of water rushing down the roads and hillsides so very close to our homes? Whose property will flood for the first time or loose excessive amounts of dirt because you moved and removed dirt, changing the natural course of water runoff? Are you prepared to be held responsible for damage to our homes and/or loss of property? Has anyone bothered to study the runoff pattern from the hills here on 107thSt? You cannot just judge by the steepness of the terrain because 107thSt. has numerous natural springs that surface after it rains or when the snows melt.

C.199-3

Along part of 107thSt. residents rely on wells for their only water supply. Will your machinery and installation of towers damage or interfere with their sources of underground water flow? Has there been a study made of natural underground water and where our families have their wells located? Will their water supplies become contaminated from radon being trapped in Electro Magnetic Fields? How about properties where future wells will be needed? There is a public water tank here on 107thSt as well as the private tanks of individuals. If there was an earthquake, what would happen if fallen power lines mixed with water and/or metal water tanks in a populated area? Doesn't sound like anything I would want to be near. There are numerous natural springs located throughout 107thSt., flowing at different rates throughout the year. Are you aware of where these springs are and where they flow? Will you change the natural water flow and make our wells obsolete? All good questions from our point of view, considering water is so vital to our lives.

C.199-4

I might add at this point that on 107thSt. we have abundant wildlife right here on our private properties and on the undisturbed, virgin lands behind us. If you build Alt. 5 on these areas you will destroy habitat and breeding areas for our local wildlife and native plants that live here. The beautiful creatures that live among us (frogs, toads, lizards, snakes, bats, butterflies, rabbits, squirrels, quail, owls, hawks, woodpeckers, raccoons, possums, coyotes, deer, a huge variety of birds that come to my feeders, bobcats, deer, even an occasional bear) also need to be considered a treasure to be protected. Basically these are pretty much the same animals that live in the Angeles Forest. Why is it ok to disturb our local wildlife when you already have an existing power line corridor with existing service roads where the wildlife that live there are already adapted to its presence? We are actually guardians of our local wildlife by trying to protect them from destructive proposals such as Alt. 5. Why would you come here, intrude on our privately owned properties and destroy animal habitat that we nurture and protect? I have personally gone to great lengths

C.199-5

to plant trees, shrubs, provide water and cover for the wild creatures that pass through and live on my property. Wildlife is always welcome here. Private property owners like us, are probably the best form of protection for wildlife and plants, because they enhance our properties and our enjoyment of nature in our own backyards. The animals themselves are a great advertisement for wildlife appreciation and preservation. When people actually see these animals and experience how amazing they are, people will have respect for them and leave them unharmed when they see them elsewhere.

At the meeting held by our Town Council here in Leona Valley a question was addressed about how weeds were controlled around the towers and along the maintenance roads. We never got a straight answer to that question. We will not allow you to use herbicides or any other chemicals on or around our properties. It becomes a health issue for well water pollution as well as our families coming in contact with the chemicals from the wind blowing, or by skin contact. If these roads and towers are cleared of weeds and brush by hand, who is it that does it? We certainly do not want prison labor to come on our private properties to clear and maintain roads. It is even questionable for hired or contracted crews who are not from the prisons to come on our private properties. How would these workers be screened for the jobs they perform? We have a right to protect our personal property located on our own land, by knowing who these people are. Many of us have children and grandchildren, and we would want to know who was around our children. There will need to be a lot of questions answered, and potential problems you will need to address, with strangers coming onto our private properties during construction also. How will these issues be dealt with?

C.199-6

Many people including myself are concerned about living next to the Electro Magnetic Fields and radon trapped by power lines. One example from the internet www.powerlinefacts.com "News Brief - The Calif. Health Dept. final report on power frequency EMF was published in Oct. 13, 2002. This 7 year, \$9 million study concludes EMFs can cause some degree of increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage. The Evaluation further concludes that magnetic fields may cause suicide and adult leukemia." Of course you will argue with the word "cause" in these studies and make it controversial. Statistically there is evidence that EMFs PROMOTE health problems. "Promoting" and "causing" health problems is a technicality of terminology. Whether EMFs cause cancer, (leukemia, Lou Gehrig's, miscarriage etc.) or promotes it, the end result is the same. It does affect ones health negatively. The argument EMFs do not "cause" harm to our bodies and that it is safe to live next to them is deceitful. Why are schools not built next to power lines? Answer: Because the parents and community would be up in arms to protect the children. The controversy goes on and residents of Leona Valley including myself do not care to become a statistic in a study to see what living next to Electro Magnetic Fields does to human beings. You wouldn't build under these type of lines for many reasons so why would you build these lines over our existing homes and through our communities?

C.199-7

Electro Magnetic Fields have a bad reputation with the general public and in this case just the perception of them being dangerous to our health would severely devalue our properties. I know that is not your problem, but it is a problem for me and every resident living here. Think about the dollar amount of the devaluation loss, and how many individual homeowners and their families would be affected. Alt. 5 would have a huge financial impact on a lot of angry citizens. I would not choose to live next to power lines if I were a home buyer. It cannot be denied that our property values would severely decline and that the pool of potential

C.199-8

you displace them. Costs invested in mortgages, home repairs and improvements, moving expenses, higher property tax on another home and refinance fees will never be reimbursed by a government agency buying out a homeowner. Families forced out of their homes are always going to come out on the short end of the dollar when it comes to re-establishing themselves. If the people are younger with a family the children would be yanked from their childhood neighborhood, possibly relocated to another school and have to make new friends and adjustments. If these people are older it would certainly impact their retirement reserves. If they were on a fixed income they may not have any suitable alternatives whatsoever. Face it being forced to look for another house would not be a pleasant experience for anyone. **Who are the unlucky people you will tell, that they have to leave their homes and how will the forced move impact their lives? How much time will they be given to plan a whole new life strategy and to get off of their properties? Being forced from ones home would be devastating, not to mention the residents adjacent to the properties that have been taken by force. Those residents would have to live next door to perhaps a power line tower out their window. They would certainly take a severe financial hit if they try to sell their property and nobody will compensate them for their loss. Does anyone care that Alternate 5 will do harm to more private citizens than any of the other alternatives? These lines would actually cross over 103 private properties but how many more properties do they directly affect even though they do not cross directly over ones land? The lines will not directly cross over my property (unless I just haven't been notified) but they will certainly affect me. Recreational use along the original Proposed line, in the Angeles Forest corridor should not hold precedence over a beautiful community like Leona Valley. **People who use that part of the Angeles Forest for recreation do not necessarily live there. Most likely they merely visit there periodically for a few hours of recreation. Residents in Leona Valley live here every day and night of the year because this is where our homes are already built, and where we raise our families.** I hardly think the scenery and recreation of the Angeles Forest area merits harming this many citizens on their own properties. After all, there are already numerous power lines and service roads already in the Angeles Forest. Visitors expect to see the lines there and the people going there for recreation are happy to use the service roads for their activities. I seriously question how many people go to that part of the Angeles Forest to actually gaze at the scenery. I mostly see dirt bike riders who are preoccupied with speeding around on their vehicles and seeing how much Angeles Forest dirt they can stir up. I want to make it clear that I understand that is how they have fun and it is fine that ride in unpopulated areas where it is legal. I am not against their sport. It truly looks like great fun. But really how many recreation people are going to even notice if the existing lines were removed to "beautify" the area? Weigh this against the potential harm to landowners, and others who will be affected when you put up 18.8 miles of new transmission lines where none currently exist. People along this new 18.8 mile stretch are surely going to notice. It is certainly not going to beautify our community. (ES-28 Alt.5 would introduce a new transmission line into an 18.8 mile-long corridor where no transmission lines currently exist.) I see Alt. 5 also crosses over the 14 freeway not just once but twice. What a nightmare for commuters. Sounds like a lot of backed up traffic to me. Can you make their lives any more miserable? If Alt. 5 is built we will be sure to publicly let all those drivers know why they are sitting in traffic and who was responsible for the decision.**

Will our radio reception become just static if these lines are built behind my home? I would guess yes. Presently I listen to the radio daily to keep myself informed about local and world issues. Radio gives one a whole other perspective than the other media. Not being able to listen to radio would cut me off from being informed. You may argue that I can be informed other ways but this is a time issue.

C.199-8
cont'd

Listening to the radio is less time consuming than TV, newspapers, internet etc, and I can perform multiple tasks while listening to the radio. Time is valuable and being informed is important.

We can use the Alternate 5 Proposal as an example of the importance of being informed. We knew nothing about the SCE Alternate 5 Power Line until a few days before the Quartz Hill information meeting presented the Aspen Group, on August 28th. Apparently these Alternatives were being worked on for years without our knowledge. That in itself is infuriating. Leona Valley does have a working Town Council and the Leona Valley Improvement Association. Neither of these organizations were made aware that you were planning power lines through our community. Why not? I personally never received any notices in the mail. We were not even informed that there would be a public meeting regarding Alternate 5. We received the information that there would be a public meeting by a phone call from a neighbor. Shouldn't it have been someone responsible for working on the project and not my neighbor that informed me about Alt. 5? How would people in Leona Valley know about a meeting in Quartz Hill if we were not notified by those who were hosting the meeting? Is this how you deal with people when you propose issues that will so greatly impact our lives? Seems like you wanted us to be silent and uninformed.

In your Environmental Setting report section 4.2.5.2 Leona Valley (Mile 3.5-5.7) It is stated that, "The primary land use in the Leona Valley is agriculture; residential development is minimal." You are correct that we have many U-Pick Orchards here, a winery and a vegetable grower, that are run on a seasonal basis. These are not necessarily a full time income for these individuals. They live, work and play here but most importantly these orchards, the winery and the property where they grow produce are also these peoples homes. As far as "residential development", being "minimal" I don't know what your definition or minimal is. It is a very loosely used term here, seeming to imply that not many people live here. We have quite a few businesses here that are supported by this "minimum residential development". Ranchers Market stocks a little bit of just about everything we need including gas and a newly remodeled Post Office. We have a well stocked hardware store, two restaurants, a Farmers Insurance office, three Real Estate offices, a feed store, a carpet cleaning service, auto repair shop, beauty salon, wood splitting business and a tractor sales lot. People do live here and our activities reach way beyond our love of agriculture. Yes our properties range from approximately a half acre or a little less, to 40 acres but that doesn't mean no one lives here. The fact is that everywhere you look there are houses. The pictures presented to us at the Aspen Group meeting in Quartz Hill seemed to purposely aim the cameras away from our homes giving the impression that Alternate 5 would only "minimally" impact a few scattered people. I don't know if this was your intention or not but your photos and your description of minimal residential development are a total misrepresentation of our community and I take serious issue with you on this point. This is not just agricultural land you are dealing with. People live here in our family homes, and there are lots of us. You saw how many people showed up for your meeting and you didn't even publicly let us know you were having a meeting. How many people were not even made aware that there was a meeting or perhaps found out too late to be able to make plans to be there? Some Leona Valley parents and families were at the A.V. Fairgrounds with their 4-H children because on the night of the Quartz Hill meeting some of the livestock was being shown. These kids spent a lot of time, love and money on their animals and show time is the highlight of the year for them. A perfect example of our communities commitment and dedication to our families. How many more people would have showed up if you

C.199-9

buyers would be greatly cut back. My husband is a commuter and in 21 years it has cost us a lot of money, time and sacrifice just to be able to live in Leona Valley. At the moment Leona Valley is a very desirable area to live and your proposed lines have the potential to trash our property values and all that we have worked to improve on our homes and paying off our mortgages. We have a lot to loose and we will fight for our property value and for our neighbors who would have their land and privacy rights taken away from them.

(ES-29 Alt. 5 has more adjacent land uses that would be exposed to corona noise for the first time.) Noise from power lines would ware on ones nerves. Right now it is so very pleasant to go outside at night and hear nothing but an owl hoot, frogs croaking or a coyote's yelping. Crackling, humming electrical lines and even the wind blowing through the towers would disturb our solitude. (ES-24 Alt. 5 would have the potential to expose the greatest number of residences to noise associated with construction, operation and maintenance activities than any of the other alternatives...) Perhaps you do not understand the value of quiet and solitude but it must be taken into consideration because for some of us it is a rare quality of life worth preserving and fighting for. Living in an area like Leona Valley is not always easy and people that choose to move here, purposely do so to have peace and quiet, where we are not bothered by "outside intrusions." As home buyers 21 years ago that is why we moved here. Construction, maintenance, workers coming on to our properties, noise, potential health risks, and visually having the power lines so close to our homes, are all "outside intrusions".

Since this issue has come up I have heard many people say that if they build Alt. 5, they will move their families elsewhere. We would consider this ourselves. Alt.5 could cause some of our most valued residents to leave our community. When you hear comments like this it becomes a great concern that if we loose families our local school may be forced to close down due to low enrollment. This would be another direct hit on our property values as well as the family and community values now enjoyed by residents here. Our local school children would have to be transported out of our own community to schools elsewhere. A few years ago the parents and school were figuring out how to keep up enrollment so our children could learn and have friends locally here in our own community. We have wonderful parents who care enough to raise their children in a place like Leona Valley. If the fear of living by EMF's and the other issues of the power lines drives families away Alt. 5 could close down our school. Bus arrangements would have to be made to transport our children elsewhere. Besides the obvious fact that this would be detrimental to our local students it would be another direct hit on our property values. A local community school so close to our homes looks awfully good to a family looking to buy a house. You are going to have a lot of angry parents and residents to deal with.

C.199-10

(ES-11 Alt. 5, would be 45 percent longer than the Proposed Project.) I understand that Route 5 is the longest line, the most expensive and that due to its extra length an estimated 5% power would be lost. (ES-24 Alt. 5 would traverse 103 privately owned parcels and possibly remove one or more homes.) **(ES-29 Alt. 5 is also expected to result in the loss of at least one existing home and the consequent displacement of the residents of any homes that need to be acquired.)** You have certainly left this an open ended statement. Is it one home or is it more than one home? It sounds like it is likely to be more than one home so why don't you just say it? People here in California are getting really angry over these instances of our governing organizations taking family homes and intruding on our private properties. People that loose their homes cannot really be repaid when

C.199-11

would have publicized there was going to be a meeting regarding power lines being constructed through Leona Valley and been straight forward with us? You grossly underestimated our numbers and couldn't even provide us with vital written information and DEIR reports. The night of August 28th we were told by the Aspen Group that we had to have our public comments in by September 18th. Not a lot of time to study over such serious issues and comment, especially considering you didn't have the information available for us that night. At the request of our Town Council and our hired legal council we were granted a fifteen day extension to study the situation and submit our comments and I thank you for that. However fifteen days was the minimum requirement for extensions and that is all the time you allowed us. There were far more of us at the Quartz Hill Meeting than you expected. That should tell you something about how wrong you are about your quote of "residential development" being "minimal".

C.199-11
(Cont)

(ES-21 Alt. 5 has the second highest annual and total emissions and increases emissions in SCAB and DDAB.) (ES-26 Alt. 5 would require 8.60 acre feet of water and would generate 4.605 tons of waste, more than the proposed project or any of the other alternatives except Alt. 1.) The sell on electricity is that it is a cleaner form of energy than other sources. If part of the objective is to clean up California why go out of your way to build the longest project (causing a 5% loss of energy), with the most maintenance, the highest emissions, and the most expense, except for Alt. 1, the most waste and water use? These extra expenses will certainly result in higher electric bills for the general public. You want to disturb virgin untouched land both on privately owned properties and along the Angeles Forest. You plan to remove existing housing, place new lines on an 18.8 mile stretch where there currently are no lines, but you have other alternatives that have existing power line corridors already running through them. It makes one wonder what the real intent is here considering that the night of the Quartz Hill meeting on August 28th the Aspen Environmental Group knew that the "Pink Line" (another separate corridor proposed for the east end of Leona Valley also being handled by the Aspen Group) issue was going to surface in Leona Valley within the next week. Not a single word was mentioned about a second power line in the works. One cannot help but wonder what else is being hidden from our community. Surely you cannot expect us to fully trust what you present to us. The combination of Alt. 5 and the "Pink Line" should have been revealed to Leona Valley. The excuse that because the Forest Service was involved with Alt. 5 and not with the "Pink Line" is not acceptable. It was pertinent information because power line corridors on both ends of our community have a devastating double impact on us and it should not have been purposely withheld from residents of Leona Valley. Do you have any other proposed plans that you are holding back from the public that you will strategically wait until the time is right to spring it on us? You cannot blame us for asking this question and being wary of what we are told, or worse yet what we are not told. The Aspen Group obviously was told not to mention the second "Pink Line" corridor proposed through Leona Valley. Once you get a start with power lines through our community what else do you have to propose that will interfere with Leona Valley's welfare? Could it be even more lines or a substation, storage facilities, security lighting? Who is behind this push to run these power lines through Leona Valley and why are you going about it in such a dishonest, secretive fashion? You definitely have our community fighting mad.

C.199-12

C.199-13

The Rancier Family on 107th St in Leona Valley has joined with the community to take legal action to block the power line project Alternate #5 from being constructed here. We are determined to preserving our quality of life for ourselves, our families and our neighbors. These are all pretty motivating issues when it comes to a community like Leona Valley. Living in a rural community is not always easy

and the character of us who have chosen to live here is tough. Our community is determined that you choose another route and we will legally block you every way possible, because it is apparent to us that you don't care about what happens to Leona Valley. We live here and we passionately do care about our personal safety and preserving Leona Valley as the pristine community that it is now.

If Alternative 5 is chosen as the build route I am respectfully requesting a personal reply from you, addressing each and every one of my comments and questions that I have brought up in this letter. I have put much time and thought into my comments and I am being responsible by complying with your request for detailed, substantive objections. I would expect nothing less than for you to be detailed and equally as concerned for my communities safety as we are.

Lyle and Ann Rancier
Homeowners in Leona Valley

The image shows two handwritten signatures in black ink. The top signature is a stylized, cursive signature that appears to be 'Lyle Rancier'. Below it is another signature, also in cursive, which reads 'Ann E. Rancier'.

Response to Comment Set C.199: Lyle and Ann Rancier

- C.199-1 We recognize that Alternative 5 would constrain the ability to aggressively fight a wildland fire in the vicinity of the route, and could 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.
- C.199-2 Southern California is a seismically active area, as demonstrated by the list of significant active and potentially active faults in the Project area provided in Table C.5-3, in Section C.5 (Geology, Soils, and Paleontology) of the Draft EIR/EIS document. There is a risk that the location of towers along active faults, including the San Andreas Fault, could be damaged in the case of a surface fault rupture (Impact G-4). Implementation of the required Mitigation Measure G-4 (Minimize Project Structures within Active Fault Zones) would ensure that such potential impacts, including as related to fire risk, would be less than significant. Further discussion of the geologic and seismic characteristics of the Project area is provided in Section C.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Discussion of potential fire risks associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Project and alternatives is provided in Section C.7 (Forest Management Activities) of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- C.199-3 As discussed in Section C.5 (Geology, Soils, and Paleontology), minor changes in topography associated with the Project (Impact G-3), except for Alternative 1, are not expected to be significant. Implementation of the required Mitigation Measures G-2 (Minimization of Soil Erosion) and B-1a (Provide Restoration/Compensation for Impacts to Native Vegetation Communities) would additionally avoid potential impacts to surface water runoff resulting from topographic changes.
- There is a potential for construction of the proposed Project or an alternative to affect local runoff patterns through the introduction of new infrastructure and impervious areas. Any impacts to surface water runoff from the construction of new impervious areas (such as access roads and transmission towers) would be less than significant for the proposed Project and Alternatives 2 through 5. For Alternative 1, Mitigation Measure H-5 (Permeability of Ground Cover) would be implemented to ensure that any potential impacts to runoff would be less than significant.
- C.199-4 The supply and quality of water resources, including in the Leona Valley, would not be significantly affected by the proposed Project or an alternative. As discussed in Section C.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the EIR/EIS, implementation of the proposed Project or an alternative is not expected to significantly interfere with groundwater supply and recharge (Criterion HYD2), or with existing surface water drainage patterns (Criterion HYD3). If the proposed Project or an alternative is approved, the required implementation of mitigation measures during construction and operation would ensure protection of water resources.
- C.199-5 Your comment is consistent with the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS. The proposed Project and each of the alternative routes including Alternative 5 would result in impacts to a number of issue areas including biological resources (Section C.3), which are discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS.
- C.199-6 Impacts resulting from invasion of weedy exotic species are discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.3, Biological Resources, under Criterion BIO1, Impacts B-1 and B-4. Mitigation Measures B-1a (Provide Restoration/Compensation for Impacts to Native Vegetation Communities) and B-4

(Implement Weed Control Measures) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level (Class II).

- C.199-7 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.
- C.199-8 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values and General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition.
- C.199-9 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding noticing procedures for an EIR/EIS.
- C.199-10 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.
- C.199-11 As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, the alternative alignment would be constructed across 103 privately owned parcels. 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. As such, Section C.9.10.2 (Impact L-3) concluded that potential impacts to residential land uses as a result of Alternative 5 would be significant and unavoidable.
- C.199-12 Although project cost is not discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS, we agree that due to the increased length of Alternative 5, it would cost substantially more than the proposed Project. 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.199-13 SCE's proposed Project and several of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS include the use of existing transmission rights-of-way. However, the proposed Project and each of the alternatives would require the acquisition of land for right-of-way purposes, either for new transmission corridors or for widening of existing transmission corridors. Please see General Response GR-4 regarding the development of alternative routes outside of NFS lands.