

Comment Set C.136: Cindy Corn

----- Forwarded by Marian Kadota/R5/USDAFS on 09/28/2006 12:44 PM -----

CindyPCorn@cs.com

09/28/2006 12:00PM

To

mantonovich@lacbos.org, Linda.lambourne@mail.house.gov,
senator.runner@sen.ca.gov, assemblymember.runner@assembly.ca.gov,
assemblymember.strickland@assembly.ca.gov,
Catherine.kennedy@asm.ca.gov, L.weste@santa-clarita.com,
jbx@cpuc.ca.gov, mkadota@fs.fed.us, jmh@cpuc.ca.gov, fnoiron@fs.fed.us

cc

Subject

Power Towers

Dear sirs:

I agree the power capacity and reliability needs to be upgraded in the Agua Ducle area. I do not agree, however, that the proposed Alternative Route 5 is an acceptable solution to this need.

1) It will be too expensive. This route is both longer and it will have to cross the 14 twice, increasing both construction and maintenance costs.

C.136-1

2) If the impacts on Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch and the Bouquet Canyon Stone Company are great enough to cause rerouting, surely the impacts on the filming at Vasquez rocks the the 103 homes in Agua Dulce are equally unacceptable.

C.136-2

3) While it would be nice to remove all power lines from the ANF, the function of government is to balance the needs of people with those of the environment. There is already an existing easment within the ANF, and I find it hard to believe that running a line of new, bigger towers down the same easement will cause more damage to the environment and wildlife than the existing towers do. You cannot tell me with the same breath that the electric lines will cause unacceptable harm to wildlife, but its ok to run them through my neighbor's back yard.

C.136-3

4) Some of the argument seems to be about "visual resources". If it is not acceptable to spoil the view in the ANF (more than it already is), why is it considered acceptable to spoil the view from 103 homes in Agua Dulce, and Vasquez Rocks?

I expect you to do better.

Cindy Corn
11705 Darling Rd.
Agua Dulce, CA 91390

Response to Comment Set C.136: Cindy Corn

- C.136-1 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.
- C.136-2 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.136-3 The purpose of the alternative analysis section is to present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public. As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, the Alternative 5 alignment would be constructed across 103 privately owned parcels. 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.

Please note that the characterization of the Saugus-Del Sur Utility Corridor as “existing easement within the ANF” is incorrect. The existing 66-kV line was a previously permitted use by the USDA Forest Service; however, the permit has expired and has not been reissued. As such, there is no existing SCE easement and there is no existing authorization for the existing 66-kV line.