

Comment Set C.145: Daniel and Christina Rodriguez

From: Tina Rodriguez [mailto:kmooky@hughes.net]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2006 6:56 AM
To: jmh@cpuc.com; Angeles@fs.fed.us; Boccio, John
Subject: objection to Antelope-Pardee Alt. Rt. 5

As a member at large of the Leona Valley Town Council I submit the following letter and comments in addition to the letter drafted by the law firm Jackson, DeMarco, Tidus, Pedkenpaugh. I oppose the alt. rt. 5 proposal.

Daniel & Christina Rodriguez
10725 Leona Avenue
Leona Valley, CA 93551

October 2, 2006

VIA FACSIMILE (661) 215-5152

VIA EMAIL antelope-pardee@aspeneq.com

John Boccio

Marian Kadota

CPUC/USDA Forest Service

c/o Aspen Environmental Group

30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215

Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Re: Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project

Alternative 5 – Sierra-Pelona Re-Route

Dear Mr. Boccio and Ms. Kadota:

Following are my comments and specific requests regarding the above-referenced matter.

From what I can ascertain from the information available on the website, my property at 10725 Leona Ave in Leona Valley would be directly affected by the path of the transmission route.

My comments and requests are as follows:

1. The Antelope-Pardee 500 kV Transmission Project has been in the draft planning stages for over two years, yet Alternative 5 was proposed only in the spring of this year, 2006, per a request by certain unnamed environmental groups protesting the proposed routes through the Angeles National Forest and requiring that another route be found around the Angeles National Forest. **Thus, the property owners along the new Alternative 5 have not had the benefit of time and opportunity to comment on the proposal, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”). The draft EIR/EIS process must be restarted from the beginning in order that all property owners in and around the proposed route in Alternative 5 have the legally required access to comment.**

As a property owners directly affected by the proposed Alternative 5 route, I demand that the Draft EIS/EIR and its timeline for compliance with CEQA be restarted in order that I may have the legally required time and access to counsel that I need to fully evaluate Alternative 5.

State, with particularity, how the CPUC/USDA intends to bring into compliance, with CEQA, the proposed Alternative 5, and its requirements to notify on a specific timeline the property owners affected by Alternative 5.

C.145-1

2. The proposed Alternative 5 route would displace about 30 families in Leona Valley. The impact of rendering around 120 people homeless has not been thoroughly considered in the Draft EIS/EIR. Most of the properties affected are single family residences. Leona Valley is home to about 2,000 residents total. Potentially 10 percent of the total population of Leona Valley would be displaced. There are not enough homes available for sale to accommodate the relocation of this many people.

Please state with particularity where in the Draft EIS/EIR the displacement of 30 families had been studied and what mitigation would be proposed.

C.145-2

3. The Leona Valley Elementary School has been threatened with closure in the past due to a small enrollment. With the displacement of 30 families, surely the enrollment of the elementary school would drop further, potentially closing the school and causing more than 100 children to have to attend school 10 miles away in either Palmdale or Quartz Hill. I did not see in the Draft EIR/EIS any mention of the Leona Valley Elementary School.

Please state with particularity where in the Draft EIS/EIR the impact, and potential closure, of Leona Valley Elementary School had been studied, and what mitigation would be proposed for the displaced students.

C.145-3

4. The values of properties not directly in the path of the proposed Alternative 5 route would be devalued significantly. In today's market, the devaluation would amount in the hundreds of thousands. The average value of a home in Leona Valley is \$800,000 mine is over \$1.5 million, but with a transmission line running through Leona Valley, all properties would lose value.

Please state with particularity where in the Draft EIS/EIR the impact to property values, and their devaluation, had been studied, and what mitigation would be proposed for the devaluation of properties.

C.145-4

5. The viewscape of Leona Valley is of uncluttered views of the surrounding mountains from every direction. The closest transmission lines are on Angeles National Forest property. The additional of a transmission line through Leona Valley would ruin the value and quality of the viewscape of Leona Valley. I did not see in the Draft EIR/EIS any mention of the viewscape of Leona Valley.

Please state with particularity where in the Draft EIS/EIR the viewscape of Leona Valley had been studied, and what mitigation would be proposed for the maintaining the viewscape of Leona Valley.

C.145-5

6. Many studies prove that living near transmission lines causes higher incidences of cancer. There is no dispute that electromagnetic fields ("EMFs") generated by transmission lines, and surrounding them, trap the radioactive element radon, found in virtually every area of the United States. Epidemiology studies prove that people living with a certain distance of transmission lines will have a statistically higher rate of various cancers. I did not see in the Draft EIR/EIS any mention of the

increased rates of cancer expected in Leona Valley with the addition of a transmission line through Leona Valley, but certainly a higher incidence would result.

Please state with particularity where in the Draft EIS/EIR the impact of EMFs and trapped radioactive elements resulting from the transmission line on human populations had been studied, and what mitigation would be proposed for the higher incidences of cancers in the residents of Leona Valley.

C.145-6

7. I did not see in the Draft EIR/EIS any mention of how the compensation of affected property owners, for their properties' values or for tax increases, or any other increase in living expenses, would be carried out.

Please state with particularity where in the Draft EIS/EIR the compensation of property owners would be carried out, particularly in view of the loss of a favorable tax liability, and disruption of retirement plans, and what mitigation would be proposed for the affected property owners.

C.145-7

8. Since the required notification and timetable for comments was not followed for Alternative 5, it would be illegal to continue to consider Alternative 5 in the current Draft EIS/EIR.

Please state with particularity how and when the Draft EIS/EIR process with regard to Alternative 5 will be carried out in full compliance with the requirements of CEQA.

C.145-8

Because the CEQA requirements regarding notice and the legally mandated timeline have not been followed with regard to Alternative 5, I reserve the right to made additional comments and requests.

This letter was copied in part from Mrs. Marcy Watton as she addresses the facts, as I would have.

Thank you,

Daniel & Christina Rodriguez

- CC to the following people:
- CPUC*
- Julie M. Halligan
- jmh@cpuc.com
- EIR Project Manager
- California Public Utilities Commission
- 505 Van Ness Avenue
- San Francisco, CA 94102
-
- *Jody Noiron*
- 701 N. Santa Anita Ave,
- Arcadia, CA 91006,
- 626-574-1613,
- Fax: 626-574-5233
- Mailroom R5
- Angeles@fs.fed.us

- *Mr. John Boccio*
- jbx@cpuc.ca.gov
- CPUC, EIR Project Manager California Public Utilities Commission
- c/o Environmental Science Associates
- 225 Bush Street, Suite 1700
- San Francisco, CA 94104
- *Aspen Group*
- Aspen Environmental Group
- 30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215
- Agoura Hills, CA 91301
- *The Honorable George Runner, State Senator*
- 848 W. Lancaster Boulevard, Suite 101
- Lancaster, CA 93534
- *The Honorable Sharon Runner, State Assembly District 36*
- 747 W. Lancaster Blvd.
- Lancaster, CA 93534
-
- *The Honorable Michael Antonovich, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors*
- 1113 W. Ave M-4, Suite A
- Palmdale, CA 93551
- *Leona Valley Town Council*
- P.O. Box 795
- Leona Valley, CA 93551
- *USDA Forest Service*
- Ms. Marian Kadota
- NEPA Project Manager
- c/o Aspen Environmental Group
- 30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215
- Agoura Hills, CA 9130
- *Governor's Office*
- Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
- State Capitol Building
- Sacramento, CA 95814

Additionally, I am concerned with the projects (during construction and operation phases) adverse affects on my community safety (fire prevention and fire fighting activities)
Degradation of surface and ground water.
Radio and TV interference.
Disturbance of groundwater. Increased demand on existing groundwater.
Drainage and runoff from project structures and grading.

Disruption of existing and future residential or agricultural land use.
Decrease in land and home values.
Increased potential for demand on police and fire departments.
The repercussions if both alt rt 5 and the "pink route" are approved. Increased EMF because North, East, South and West sides of Leona Valley will be surrounded by transmission lines.
Wildlife on my property is just as valuable yet this is not addressed in EIR.
An existing easement/right of way is in place in the forest.

Respectfully
Daniel and Christina Rodriguez

Response to Comment Set C.145: Daniel and Christina Rodriguez

- C.145-1 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding the Project's noticing procedures and review period. On September 13, the CPUC and the Forest Service formally extended the public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS to October 3, 2006.
- C.145-2 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.145-3 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.145-4 Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC. Please also see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.145-5 As discussed in Section C.15.10.2, visual impacts to Leona Valley associated with Alternative 5 would be significant and unavoidable. 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.145-6 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential EMF impacts.
- C.145-7 Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC. Please also see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.145-8 Please see General Response GR-4 regarding the identification, screening, and analysis of proposed Project Alternatives.