

Comment Set C.27: Carol Roth

RECEIVED  
SEP 05 2006

BY:.....

Aug. 31, 2006

I am writing this as a resident of Leonas Valley to express my strong opposition and outrage at the proposed alternative five plan.

C.27-1

Our beautiful rural community would be devastated by this project and many of our families & their homes or ranches would be destroyed. The fire department would not be able to fight our frequent brush fires in our hills because of the lines & towers preventing helicopters & bombers from coming in. There would be a danger to residents from cancer causing EMF. Our property values will drop if this is built.

C.27-2

C.27-3

C.27-4

C.27-5

- 2 -

Our insurance rates will go up because of added fire danger. There would be an increase of large vehicles on our streets where children ride their horses.

C.27-6

C.27-7

This is just a small number of the problems & results of this project which the environmental study did not address.

C.27-8

We are requesting an extension of the Sept. 18 deadline for public comment since the residents did not receive adequate notification.

C.27-9

We are urging that one of the other four alternatives be chosen that do not bring devastation to this community.

C.27-10

Sincerely,  
Mrs. Carol Roth  
9520 Leona Ave -  
Leona Valley, Ca.  
93551

## Response to Comment Set C.27: Carol Roth

- C.27-1 Your comment will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.27-2 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.
- C.27-3 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.27-4 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential health hazards associated with EMF exposure.
- C.27-5 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on local property values.
- C.27-6 The EIR/EIS acknowledges that there are heightened fire risks along Alternative 5 (see Section C.11.10 and the response to Comment C.2-1). However, the calculation of fire insurance rates as a direct result of the Project is outside of the scope of this analysis and would be speculative at this time.
- C.27-7 Construction of Alternative 5 would result in construction-related traffic on area roads. However the Project includes several measures to reduce the effects of traffic on local streets. A Construction Transportation Plan will be prepared to limit traffic on local streets as much as possible. Traffic encroachment permits will also be obtained from the relevant jurisdictions for any work done in or near a local street. All construction related traffic would be required to adhere to enforced speed limits and traffic laws as well as the requirements of the Traffic Encroachment Permits obtained as described above. The Project would also include a Traffic Control Plan which would follow California state standards for traffic safety and would include such measures as flag persons, warning signs, and other measures to construction workers as well as vehicle, bike, pedestrian and horse traffic. Where construction will result in temporary closures of sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities, SCE will provide temporary pedestrian access through detours or safe areas along the construction zone. Furthermore, since there are only two locations within the Leona Valley area, construction activities (and hence construction-related traffic) would only be present in the area for a small portion of the entire 16-month construction period.
- C.27-8 Note that this EIR/EIS is over 2,000 pages in length and addresses several technical issue areas in detail. The proposed Project and alternatives are evaluated at an equivalent level of details as required by NEPA. The issue areas and level of detail of the analysis included in the EIS/EIR were developed over a long public scoping process and are considered by the CEQA and NEPA lead

agencies and the EIR/EIS preparers to be accurate and appropriate to address the potential environmental impacts of the Project per CEQA and NEPA requirements.

- C.27-9 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding the Project's noticing procedures and review period.
- C.27-10 Your comment will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.