

## Comment Set C.213: Assemblywoman Audra Strickland, California State Assembly, 37<sup>th</sup> District

STATE CAPITOL  
P.O. BOX 942849  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94249-0037  
(916) 319-2037  
FAX (916) 319-2137

DISTRICT OFFICE  
2659 TOWNSGATE RD., STE 236  
WESTLAKE VILLAGE, CA 91361  
(805) 230-9167  
FAX (805) 230-9183

September 27, 2006

John Boccio/ Marian Kadota  
CPUC/USDA Forest Service  
C/o Aspen Environmental Group  
30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215  
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

**RE: Alternative #5**

Dear Mr. Boccio and Ms. Kadota,

We were recently contacted by members of our community who are concerned about Alternative #5 for the proposed transmission line between Southern California Edison's existing Antelope and Pardee substations in North Los Angeles County.

I am writing to encourage the California Public Utilities Commission to find a reasonable solution to replacing the existing 66-kV line and cross the 13 miles of the National Forest System lands. I urge you to remove Alternative #5 as an option for the project. My specific concerns with Alternative #5 are listed below:

- It abandons a designated utility corridor on public national Forest Service land to be replaced by a new 18.8 mile utility corridor on private land; C.213-1
- It will displace people, homes and businesses; C.213-2
- It will decrease the value of property along the Alternative 5 route; C.213-3
- It will jeopardize the safety of residents due to the high fire danger zone with limited water supply and limited improved road infrastructure; C.213-4
- It will affect an area where filming for movies takes place, thereby hurting the local economy; C.213-5
- It has the greatest negative impact on geology, soils, noise, public services and traffic; and C.213-6
- It has the longest route out of all of the alternatives, therefore creating the most waste and the highest demand for Public Services to maintain. C.213-7

As you will see from the concerns of residents and other community members, there is much apprehension about Alternative #5 of the Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project to connect the Antelope Valley and Santa Clarita.

Thank you for your careful attention to this matter. Please feel free to contact my district office at (805)230-9167 should you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



AUDRA STRICKLAND  
Assemblywoman, 37<sup>th</sup> District

Assembly  
California Legislature

AUDRA STRICKLAND  
ASSEMBLYWOMAN, THIRTY-SEVENTH DISTRICT



RECEIVED  
OCT - 4 2006

BY:.....

## Response to Comment Set C.213: Assemblywoman Audra Strickland, California State Assembly, 37<sup>th</sup> District

- C.213-1 Thank you for submitting your comments on the Project. They will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.213-2 SCE's proposed Project and several of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS include the use of existing transmission rights-of-way. However, the proposed Project and each of the alternatives would require the acquisition of land for right-of-way purposes, either for new transmission corridors or for widening of existing transmission corridors. Please see General Response GR-4 regarding the development of alternative routes outside of NFS lands.
- C.213-3 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. Please see General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition.
- C.213-4 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.213-5 We recognize that Alternative 5 would constrain the ability to aggressively fight a wildland fire in the vicinity of the route, 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.213-6 As stated in Section C.12.10 of the Draft EIR/EIS, Alternative 5 would result in no impacts to the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch. Specific impacts to the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch were completed for the Draft EIR/EIS due to the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch providing comments and concerns of the proposed Project route early in the public scoping process. It is addressed that Agua Dulce is used as a filming location, as all public and private lands could potentially be used for filming activities. Similar to the analysis provided for the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.12.6, impacts to filming in Agua Dulce would be visual related. Urban areas within Agua Dulce would not be impacted visually by the proposed Alternative 5 infrastructure, as electrical infrastructure is considered part of the urban landscape, and would not eliminate these areas as filming locations. However, as discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.15.10.2, impacts to the visual quality of the Vasquez Rocks as a result of Alternative 5 would be significant and unavoidable. While these impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable, economic film industry related impacts to the Vasquez Rocks Natural Area Park are unlike the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch, which is a land use specifically designated for filming activities only. The Vasquez Rocks Natural Area Park is not a specific filming location, and has a primary purpose of being a public recreational use area. Furthermore, due to the proposed linear route of Alternative 5, and the size and topography of the Vasquez Rocks Natural Area Park, it is believed that locations would continue to be available within the Park that would provide similar background views for filming without views of the proposed Alternative 5 infrastructure.

C.213-7 Your comment is consistent with the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS. A discussion of the geology and soils (Sections C.5), noise (Sections C.10), public services (Sections C.11), and traffic impacts (Sections C.13) associated with Alternative 5 can be found in the EIR/EIS. Construction of Alternative 5 would generate the greatest amount of demand placed on public services as compared to the proposed Project and other project alternatives provided in the Draft EIR during construction, the maintenance of this line would be identical to the proposed Project and other Alternatives. Therefore, Alternative 5 would not have greater public service impacts related to line maintenance. Furthermore, while the Alternative 5 route is the longest, resulting in the greatest potential demand on public services during construction, as identified in Section C.11 (Public Services) on Draft EIR Page C.11-8, these potential impacts were determined to be less than significant.