

Comment Set C.18: Assemblywoman Sharon Runner, California State Assembly, 36th District

AUG-31-2006 19:56

CPUC

P. 01/03

SACRAMENTO OFFICE
STATE CAPITOL
P.O. BOX 942849
SACRAMENTO, CA 94249-0036
(916) 319-2036
FAX (916) 319-2136
ANTELOPE VALLEY OFFICE
747 W. LANCASTER BLVD.
LANCASTER, CA 93534
(561) 723-3388
FAX (561) 723-6307
VICTOR VALLEY OFFICE
14343 CIVIC DRIVE, 1ST FLOOR
VICTORVILLE, CA 92392
(760) 843-8045
FAX (760) 843-8396

**Assembly
California Legislature**



SHARON RUNNER
VICE CHAIR, ASSEMBLY APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
ASSEMBLYWOMAN, THIRTY-SIXTH DISTRICT

COMMITTEES:
• VICE CHAIR, APPROPRIATIONS
• VETERANS AFFAIRS
• WATER, PARKS & WILDLIFE
SELECT COMMITTEES:
• LOS ANGELES HEALTHCARE CRISIS
JOINT COMMITTEES:
• JOINT LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

August 28, 2006

John Boccio, CPUC, EIR Project Manager
Marian Kadota, Forest Service, EIR Manager
Aspen Environment Group
30423 Canwood St., Suite 215
Agoura Hills, CA 91301-4316

Dear Mr. Boccio and Ms. Kadota,

I am in strong opposition to the California Public Utilities Commission proposed alternative 5 route to the Southern California Edison proposed Antelope Transmission Project of segment one.

In comparison to CPUC's proposed alternative, Southern California Edison's proposal is significantly shorter and properly utilizes existing right-of-ways. These differences will likely cause less harmful environmental impacts.

C.18-1

Eminent domain, especially when dealing with personal property and homes, is a last resort governmental power. There is no justification to remove 30 plus homes when adequate right-of-ways are already present.

C.18-2

I will continue to watch as more develops on this issue. I look forward to working with you in the completion of this project.

Please contact me with questions or comments regarding this topic or any concerns on another matter.

Sincerely,

Sharon Runner
Assemblywoman, 36th District

Cc: President Michael Peevey
Commissioner Dian Grueneich
Commissioner Geoffrey Brown
Commissioner John Bohm
Commissioner Rachelle Chong
Delaney Hunter, Director CPUC Governmental Affairs
Alis Clausen, Southern California Edison

Printed on Recycled Paper

Response to Comment Set C.18: Assemblywoman Sharon Runner, California State Assembly, 36th District

- C.18-1 Thank you for submitting your opinion on the Project.
- C.18-2 The removal of 30 homes would not be anticipated to occur under Alternative 5. 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.