

Comment Set C.182: Debbie Weilbacher

8727 Elizabeth Lake
Leona Valley, CA 93

RECEIVED
OCT - 3 2006

BY:.....

September 21, 2006

Honorable Julie Halligan
Administrative Law Judge
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 5101
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Antelope-Pardee Alternative 5

Dear Judge Halligan:

A safe, quiet, beautiful, rural parcel of land in Southern California—I know of no others—that is Leona Valley. The potential infringement of 500kv transmission lines routed through our valley would devastatingly change all that, and more.

Health and safety concerns are paramount, especially when it comes to our children. Childhood cancers are associated with living in close proximity to powerful electromagnetic fields—as are numerous other ills. Additionally, according to the Alternative 5 (Antelope-Pardee Sierra Pelona Re-route) key environmental issues report, other health concerns are at stake, take air quality for example. Alternative 5 has the “...second highest annual and total emissions” of all five route options. Should this route go through, we will all be exposed to unnecessary, harmful emissions.

C.182-1

The beauty of quiet will be no more for those residents who will be exposed to the noise or ‘buzz’ generated by the lines for as long as they exist. Additionally, the entire valley will be exposed to the noise of the installation since there is no other construction or traffic noise in this area. According to the key environmental issues report, Alternative 5 “has the potential to expose the greatest number of residences to noise associated with construction, operation, and maintenance...”

The picturesque landscape of our small valley is another reason so many of us live here. The daily view of nature will become corrupted with unsightly towers and lines, and devalue our homes that will sit near, or overlook these monstrosities. Even more shocking is the thought of losing one’s home, which 30-plus families will do if this proposal is ratified. Isn’t that a cost too high?

C.182-2

With so many alternatives to choose from which would have less of an impact on residents of California, but Alternative 5 having the lead, is this progress? Forest lands, convenience, and public utility authority are more important than people themselves—their children, their lives, their homes? I urge you, Judge Halligan, to view Alternative 5 as unacceptable, and choose another. Please choose in favor of people over all else!

Sincerely,

Debbie Weilbacher

Debbie Weilbacher

Cc: Governor Schwarzenegger
The Honorable Michael Antonovich, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Howard (Buck) McKeon, U.S. Representative 25th District
The Honorable George Runner, State Senator
The Honorable Sharon Runner, State Assembly District 36
The Honorable Audra Strickland, State Assembly District 37
The Honorable Dr. Keith Richman, State Assembly District 38
The Honorable Mayor Laurene Weste, City of Santa Clarita
John Bocio, CPUC, EIR Project Manager
Marina Kadota, USDA Forest Service, NEPA Project Manager
Terry Kinney, Alternative 5 Committee Chair, Leona Valley Town Council

Response to Comment Set C.182: Debbie Weilbacher

- C.182-1 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.
- C.182-2 Alternative 5 would not entail the removal of 30 to 40 homes. 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.