

Comment Set C.101: Alice Wollman

-----Original Message-----

From: Boccio, John [<mailto:JBX@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2006 1:58 PM
To: JDavidson@aspenerg.com; Flynn, Thomas
Subject: FW: Angelope Pardee 500-KV Transmission Project, Alternate Plan 5

-----Original Message-----

From: Alice Wollman [<mailto:AliceWollman@Adelphia.net>]
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2006 10:16 PM
To: Halligan, Julie
Cc: Terry Kenney
Subject: Angelope Pardee 500-KV Transmission Project, Alternate Plan 5

Dear Honorable Julie Halligan:

We are residents of Leona Valley and we have tremendous concerns over the proposed transmission lines that are projected to traverse our valley via Alternate Plan 5. It is my understanding that various routes were considered early in the process, but Alternate Route 5 was an addition only recently. Most may not be aware of where or how a line may impact a residential farming community. Here are my concerns:

- 1.) Leona Valley is known for its fault-line location. It was featured in the book "California Fault" specifically because the San Andreas fault bisects this community. As such, the location of Leona Valley would seem inappropriate for an electrical line that supplies a large portion of Southern California. | C.101-1
- 2.) Much of our Valley relies on ground water/well water supply, and there may be a potential interruption or redirection of underground streams that service this area. | C.101-2
- 3.) I am concerned about EMF's. The neighboring town of Acton has already suffered a cluster cancer case adjacent to the power plant, that appears to be attributed to EMF's. | C.101-3
- 4.) Diminution in market value to properties in the community. | C.101-4
- 5.) Much of this town is family farming/equestrian uses. Horses will not traverse under or near electrical transmission towers, which will adversely impact this small town. | C.101-5
- 6.) Our Town is in a Class 4, High Fire Hazard Area and we rely almost solely on air support during fire storms. With the installation of Towers in this Valley, there will be an increase in fire hazard including access by our air-fire copters/planes as well as sparks during wind/storms. This is a high wind hazard area. | C.101-6
- 7.) Increased tax basis for those forced to relocate. | C.101-7
- 8.) Leona Valley is considered a "significant ecological area" and a nesting area for the red-tailed hawk, endangered owl species and the California Condor. | C.101-8
- 9.) Leona Valley is known for its picturesque setting and thousands of tourists come to this Valley for its vineyards and cherry orchards. The | C.101-9

construction of ETT's will bring a visual blight to the community that currently does not exist.

I respectfully request that alternate 5 not be chosen for the above referenced reasons.

Thank you for your consideration.

George Jay and Alice M. Benoit
10140 Leona Avenue
Leona Valley, Ca 93551-7310

Response to Comment Set C.101: Alice Wollman

- C.101-1 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 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.
- C.101-2 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.101-3 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.
- C.101-4 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.101-5 Thank you for your comment.
- C.101-6 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 regarding increased fire risk will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.101-7 Please see General Response GR-1.
- C.101-8 The proposed Project and each of the alternative routes would result in impacts biological resources (Section C.3). Potential impacts are discussed and mitigation measures as necessary are presented in the biological resource section of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- C.101-9 Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.