

## Comment Set C.44: Laurie Ostrom

----- Forwarded by Marian Kadota/R5/USDAFS on 09/07/2006 05:28 PM -----

Laurie.Ostrom@uboc.com

09/07/2006 04:57PM

To

jmh@cpuc.ca.gov, jnoiron@fs.fed.us, jbx@cpuc.ca.gov, mkadota@fs.fed.us, [mantonovich@lacbos.org](mailto:mantonovich@lacbos.org), [linda.lambourne@mail.house.gov](mailto:linda.lambourne@mail.house.gov), senator.runner@sen.ca.gov, [assemblymember.runner@assembly.ca.gov](mailto:assemblymember.runner@assembly.ca.gov), [assemblymember.strickland@assembly.ca.gov](mailto:assemblymember.strickland@assembly.ca.gov), [catherine.kennedy@asm.ca.gov](mailto:catherine.kennedy@asm.ca.gov), [L.weste@santa-clarita.com](mailto:L.weste@santa-clarita.com), jbx@cpuc.ca.gov, mkadota@fs.fed.us, [aguadulce2006@aol.com](mailto:aguadulce2006@aol.com), [rgarwacki@prodigy.net](mailto:rgarwacki@prodigy.net), [herdem@aol.com](mailto:herdem@aol.com), [horsinground@aol.com](mailto:horsinground@aol.com), [alicewollman@adelphia.net](mailto:alicewollman@adelphia.net), [ccoussoulis@earthlink.net](mailto:ccoussoulis@earthlink.net), [countryjournal@bigplanet.com](mailto:countryjournal@bigplanet.com), [reedterito@aol.com](mailto:reedterito@aol.com), [jmh@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:jmh@cpuc.ca.gov), jnoiron@fs.fed.us, cmoore@coxcastle.com, [mike.mackness@sce.com](mailto:mike.mackness@sce.com), [meallen@sempra.com](mailto:meallen@sempra.com), lau@cpuc.ca.gov, rmd@cpuc.ca.gov, bxlcpge.com, [jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com](mailto:jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com), dtk5@pge.com, cte@eslawfirm.com, [james.caldwell@ppmenergy.com](mailto:james.caldwell@ppmenergy.com), porter@exeterassociates.com, [fyanney@fulbright.com](mailto:fyanney@fulbright.com), [cfaber@semprautilities.com](mailto:cfaber@semprautilities.com), case.admin@sce.com, [erin.moore@sce.com](mailto:erin.moore@sce.com), [liddell@energyattorney.com](mailto:liddell@energyattorney.com), ko'beirne@semprautilities.com, [hal@rwitz.net](mailto:hal@rwitz.net), califhorseman@yahoo.com, [cacaroll23@aol.com](mailto:cacaroll23@aol.com), [mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com](mailto:mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com), dianefellman@fpl.com, [jay2@pge.com](mailto:jay2@pge.com), [cem@newsdata.com](mailto:cem@newsdata.com), [mmattes@nossaman.com](mailto:mmattes@nossaman.com), ssmyers@att.net, [keithwhite@earthlink.net](mailto:keithwhite@earthlink.net), [nrader@calwea.org](mailto:nrader@calwea.org), e-recipient@caiso.com, [grosenblum@caiso.com](mailto:grosenblum@caiso.com), [terry@water.ca.gov](mailto:terry@water.ca.gov), ajo@cpuc.ca.gov, jbx@cpuc.ca.gov, jmh@cpuc.ca.gov, [omv@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:omv@cpuc.ca.gov), gig@cpuc.ca.gov, tcx@cpuc.ca.gov, [tbo@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:tbo@cpuc.ca.gov), [claufenb@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:claufenb@energy.state.ca.us), [trf@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:trf@cpuc.ca.gov), [hcronin@water.ca.gov](mailto:hcronin@water.ca.gov), clu@cpuc.ca.gov

cc

[aguadulce2006@aol.com](mailto:aguadulce2006@aol.com), mharnett@wcclaw.com

Subject

Regarding SCE's Antelope-Pardee 500kV Transmission Line Project

Good Afternoon,

My name is Laurie Ostrom, and I reside with my husband and two young sons at 35431 Anthony Road in Agua Dulce. I am writing this letter to strongly protest the proposed Alternative 5 (Antelope-Pardee Sierra Pelona Re-Route).

It was with much shock that I learned at 5:00pm on Wednesday August 30<sup>th</sup> 2006, of a public meeting scheduled to occur at 6:30pm on Wednesday August 30<sup>th</sup>. As I was still at my job in Downtown Los Angeles, my husband arranged for child-care and hurried to the Women's Club to hear what was going on. You can probably imagine our horror upon discovering that since December 9, 2004, SCE has been proposing a new transmission project through NFS lands, and that at some undisclosed date, several Alternatives had been proposed. One of those Alternatives, Alternative 5, as stated in the paperwork we received that evening, shows that 103 privately owned property and homes would be impacted, with the possible destruction of one or more homes. And imagine our horror when we were handed a piece of paper with an image of our home, and some power lines super-imposed along side.

After the initial shock and sickness passed, it was anger that settled in. Anger that we have not been given any information prior to August 30<sup>th</sup>. Anger

C.44-1

that the timeline given for us to understand this complex documentation and provide our intelligent commentary was extremely short (until September 18th). Anger that Alternative 5 would even be considered when you compare all of the Alternatives and the original proposal. For nine years my husband and I have worked hard to build a home for our family. With pride and much sweat, we have painstakingly improved our home and land so that our children would have a safe and happy place to grow up. As a matter of fact, just 2 days prior to that fateful August afternoon, we had finally completed construction on a new swimming pool. A swimming pool, that according to Alternative 5, would lie directly underneath 500kV of electricity.

C.44-1  
cont.

With emotion aside, I'd like to point out several facts that I have garnered from the paperwork I was given just one short week ago.

Alternative 5 has the greatest negative impact to Geology, Soils, Noise, Public Services and Traffic.

- The path of the lines would be located in unstable areas with the highest potential for ground disturbance | C.44-2
- The noise associated with construction would affect the greatest number of individuals for the greatest amount of time. (construction occurring Monday thru Saturday 6:30am until 5:00pm for 16 months) | C.44-3
- The lines would traverse 18 miles of area that do not currently have transmission lines, and would introduce corona noise | C.44-4
- Alternative 5 is the longest route of all proposed solutions, and would place the greatest demand on Public Services to maintain. | C.44-5
- Alternative 5 would have the greatest negative impact to traffic, which is already quite a problem. | C.44-6
- Alternative 5 has the second greatest impact to Air Quality, and Utilities and Service Systems | C.44-7
- Alternative 5 has the second highest annual and total emissions. | C.44-8
- Alternative 5 would generate approx. 4,600 additional tons of waste than the proposed solution and more waste than Alternative 2,3 and 4.

The only areas that Alternative 5 is considered the better option are rebutted below:

1. Forest Management Activities: This is strictly from the perspective of the Forest Management Agency and is completely subjective. The proposed solution and some of the Alternatives are proposed to follow along existing corridors through the National Forrest. I am not sure that I understand how replacing the existing towers with new towers would cause any Additional impact to the Activities in the Forest. | C.44-9

2. Land Use and Public Recreation: I quote "this alternative would avoid significant impacts to the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch and Bouquet Canyon Stone Company; however it would traverse 103 privately owned parcels and possibly remove one or more homes". I can hardly type that quote without becoming physically ill. Since when do the wants and needs of a few, trump the wants and needs of many? Two businesses would, or could have impact, but 103 hard working individuals may lose their homes? In addition, the fact that these two business owners were given an opportunity to share their concern and have it voiced in the Executive Summary while 103 home and land owners like myself were not, is entirely unfair and unjust. | C.44-10

3. Visual Resources: I quote "this would be the preferred alternative from a visual resources perspective, as it would have the most beneficial effect on the visual environment within the ANF by removing the existing transmission line, results in the least detrimental effects on NFS lands and would avoid the Veluzat Ranch". Again, I would beg to differ that this option has the most beneficial effect on the visual environment. As one of the homeowners likely to lose my home with this Alternative, I would find the visual impact to be devastating. Also, the visual impact to my neighbors homes, our quaint and well loved community and the beloved and historical Vasquez Rocks Recreation Area would be devastated. I can't even count the number of movies and TV shows that have used the beautiful and unique Vasquez Rocks as their backdrop. And, once again, the Veluzat Ranch owners were afforded the opportunity to share their view in this executive summary, while 103 individuals were not.

C.44-11

I would like to go on record as stating that I strongly disagree with the statement in section ES.1.4 Summary of Public Involvement Activities (page ES-4) I quote "To date, there have been extensive public participation efforts on the Antelope-Pardee Project. " The details show that 3,423 notices were mailed, however, in Agua Dulce, there was only one confirmed receipt of a mailed notice. My home was on the cover of the Alternative 5 handout and I did not receive a notice! The details state that 29 individuals attended the public scoping meetings. For a project of this magnitude, and with this much potential impact (including the possibility of 103 homes and privately owned lands being impacted) wouldn't it be expected that more than 29 individuals would attend such a meeting? It seems to prove the fact that proper notice was not given to those that would be so devastatingly impacted.

C.44-12

In closing, I demand that we be given equal consideration in this important, possibly life altering event, and we are granted an adequate amount of time to understand the full impact so that we can intelligently address our concerns with all affected parties. I would also like to state for the record, that I have consulted an attorney on behalf of my family, and will participate in any and all legal actions taken in order to receive fair and equal consideration in this matter. My house is roughly valued in the high 700's, and I stand to suffer great financial loss if Alternative 5 is implemented, however, there is no dollar amount I can place on the home that my family has so painstakingly built in Agua Dulce.

C.44-13

Respectfully,

Laurie Ostrom  
35431 Anthony Road  
Agua Dulce, Ca. 91390  
(661)268-7400

## Response to Comment Set C.44: Laurie Ostrom

- C.44-1 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding noticing procedures and the review period for the Draft EIR/EIS. Please also see General Response GR-4 regarding the identification of a non-NFS lands alternative. 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.44-2 A discussion of the geologic, seismic, and paleontologic impacts of Alternative 5 can be found in Section C.5.10.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Mitigation Measure G-4 (Minimize Project Structures within Active Fault Zone) has been identified to reduce impacts associated with overhead active fault crossings to less-than-significant levels.
- C.44-3 Your comment is consistent with the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS. A discussion of the noise impacts associated with Alternative 5 can be found in Section C.10.10 of the EIR/EIS.
- C.44-4 Your comment is consistent with the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS. A discussion of the noise impacts associated with Alternative 5 can be found in Section C.10.10 of the EIR/EIS.
- C.44-5 A discussion of the noise impacts associated with Alternative 5 can be found in Section C.11.10 of the EIR/EIS. While 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.
- C.44-6 Your comment is consistent with the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS. A discussion of the traffic impacts associated with Alternative 5 can be found in Section C.13.10 of the EIR/EIS.
- C.44-7 Your comment is consistent with the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS. A discussion of the air quality impacts associated with Alternative 5 can be found in Section C.2.10 of the EIR/EIS, and a discussion of impacts to utilities is presented in Section C.14.10.
- C.44-8 Your comment is consistent with the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS. A discussion of the estimated waste generated by Alternative 5 can be found in Section C.14.10 of the EIR/EIS.
- C.44-9 The proposed Project and each of the alternative routes would result in impacts to a number of issue areas that include biological resources (Section C.3), cultural resources (Section C.4), hydrology and water quality (Section C.8), recreation (Section C.9), and visual resources (C.15), which are discussed in the aforementioned sections of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- C.44-10 A number of alternative routes were identified during the Scoping process to avoid the impacts of SCE's proposed Project. See General Response GR-4 regarding the alternatives identification process for the Project, and General Response GR-5 regarding the noticing procedures for the Draft EIR/EIS.
- C.44-11 As described in Section C.15.1.1, the Forest Service adopted the Scenery Management System (SMS) in its 2005 Forest Management Plan. The objective of the Forest Service SMS is to manage

NFS lands to attain the highest possible quality of landscape aesthetics and scenery commensurate with other appropriate public uses, costs, and benefits. The Forest Service SMS uses Desired Landscape Character (DLC) and Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIOs) to evaluate, manage, and monitor landscape aesthetics and scenery. DLC expresses the highest quality goal for a given landscape. SIO represents the minimum level of visual quality to which any landscape should be subjected, in other words, the minimum acceptable visual quality that is achieved by the maximum level of acceptable change. The desired landscape character is natural-appearing landscapes and the scenic integrity objective is high for most of the ANF. There are no comparable visual resource management objectives for private lands outside the ANF. Although Alternative 5 would have 20 Class I (significant, unavoidable) visual impacts, it would also have the highest number of beneficial effects (eight Class IV, beneficial visual effects. For all the reasons stated in Section D.4.14, Alternative 5 is preferred from a visual resources perspective.

C.44-12 A Notice of Availability regarding the Draft EIR/EIS was sent to the following address:

Craig & Laurie Ostrom  
35431 Anthony Road  
Agua Dulce, CA 91390

Please also see General Response GR-5 regarding the noticing procedures for the Draft EIR/EIS.

C.44-13 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.