

## Comment Set C.140: John and Irene Hammons

---

**From:** john hammons [mailto:linknspace@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 30, 2006 5:16 PM  
**To:** jmh@cpuc.ca.gov; jnoiron@fs.fed.us; fifthdistrict@bos.co.la.ca.us;  
george.runner@sen.ca.gov; sharon.runner@asm.ca.gov;  
assemblymember.strickland@assembly.ca.gov; keith.richman@asm.ca.gov; Antelope-Pardee  
Project  
**Subject:** Antelope-Pardee 500 kv Transmission Project - Alternate 5

September 29, 2006

Honorable Judge Julie Halligan  
Administrative Law Judge  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 5105  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Antelope-Pardee 500 kv Transmission Project – Alternate 5 Protest

Dear Honorable Judge Halligan:

The following represents issues we have with subject project and the negative social, economic and environmental effects it will have on our community, Leona Valley:

- |  |         |
|--|---------|
| Visual Effects – unsightly large metal structures/towers in a beautiful ranch/farm community comprised of orchards, vineyards, lilac farms in one of the last like communities in southern California. A community apart from the ordinary.  | C.140-1 |
| Health concerns associated with EMF’s – close proximity to all living elements.  | C.140-2 |
| Fire Prevention – 170- to 220-foot power transmission lines will be a great obstacle. Fire fighting, water/fire retardant dropping aircraft, helicopters, and bulldozers and other equipment will be extremely limited during fire fighting operations. Homes/property in jeopardy. Also, increased fire insurance premiums. | C.140-3 |
| Electrical humming, popping, sparking of lines and electromagnetic field effects that emanate from high- voltage electrical power lines will be of great continual disturbance to nearby residents.  | C.140-4 |
| Economics – subject project proposal is 30% more dollars/miles crossing a major freeway twice than the other proposed alternates.  | C.140-5 |
| Eminent Domain – Insurmountable impact/displacement, to many residents/families, livestock and pets with established homes/ranch properties who chose this special community for raising their children in a peaceful, rural environment.  | C.140-6 |

- San Andreas fault zone in Leona Valley proper – high potential for major power disruptions, property damage, personal injury, fires in the event of earthquake activity. | C.140-7
- Increased traffic - continual noise/air pollution/disturbance - transmission line construction, demolition operations also resulting in erosion, damage to water sources. | C.140-8
- Routine helicopter patrol and ground vehicle maintenance operations on transmission lines causing disturbance to residents and habitat. Also, potential future build-out requirements on easement/corridors. | C.140-9
- Potential School closure due to loss of families in Leona Valley. Quotas affected. School zone is in Leona Valley proper. | C.140-10
- Resident/family burden to relocate and expenses involved – increased property tax basis, property devaluation, financial hardship, unnecessary stress and anxiety placed on community and families. | C.140-11
- Wildlife habitat, livestock and pets will be adversely affected. | C.140-12

Leona Valley is a very special rural community cherished not only for its beauty but for its rich heritage and legacy. Leona Valley's history is truly a vibrant part of early California. A great community to live in and preserve in its beautiful, natural state for now and future generations.

Thank you for your evaluation and consideration of the foregoing issues/concerns as we see it as long-time residents (1973) of picturesque Leona Valley.

Sincerely,

John & Irene Hammons  
Leona Valley

Distribution:

The Honorable Michael Antonovich, Howard McKeon, George Runner, Sharon Runner,  
Audra Strickland, Dr. Keith Richman  
John Boccio  
Marian Kadota  
Terry Kenney

## Response to Comment Set C.140: John and Irene Hammons

- C.140-1 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.140-2 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential EMF impacts.
- C.140-3 We recognize that Alternative 5 would constrain the ability to aggressively fight a wildland fire in the vicinity of the route, due to the proposed single-circuit 500-kV towers which would be approximately 113 to 178 feet tall, and would 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.140-4 As discussed in Section C.10.10.2, corona noise would result in identical less-than-significant noise impacts for Alternative 5 as the proposed Project.
- C.140-5 Your concerns will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.140-6 As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, 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. Alternative 5 would not result in the displacement of a significant portion of the families in the Leona Valley or Agua Dulce communities.
- C.140-7 As discussed in Section C.5.10.2, damage related to earthquake induced phenomena would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
- C.140-8 As discussed in the Draft EIS/EIR, all of the impacts addressed in this comment are either found to be less than significant, or less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
- C.140-9 As discussed in Section C.10.10.2, periodic annual helicopter maintenance of the route would result in less than significant impacts to the overall noise environment of the area.
- C.140-10 As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, 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. Alternative 5 would not result in the displacement of a significant portion of the families in the Leona Valley or Agua Dulce communities, nor would it necessitate the closure of local schools.
- C.140-11 As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, 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. Alternative 5 would not result in the displacement of a significant portion of the families in the Leona Valley or Agua Dulce communities.

C.140-12 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.3.10.2, the construction and operation of Alternative 5 would result in less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporated to both wildlife habitat and species along the Alternative 5 route.