

Comment Set C.49: Gail A. MacDonald

----- Forwarded by Marian Kadota/R5/USDAFS on 09/08/2006 05:33 PM -----

"Gail A. MacDonald" <fuzzypower@sbcglobal.net>

09/08/2006 04:59PM

To

jbx@cpuc.ca.gov, mkadota@fs.fed.us

cc

Michael Antonovich mantovonovich@bos.co.la.ca.us,
Linda.lambourne@mail.house.gov, George Runner <senator.runner@sen.ca.gov>,
assemblymember.runner@assembly.ca.gov,
assemblymember.strickland@assembly.ca.gov, Catherine.kennedy@asm.ca.gov

Subject

Antelope-Pardee 500 - kV Transmission Line Project - Alternative 5

My husband and I are 23 yr. residents of Agua Dulce. We moved out here from the SFV in 1983 for the open space, solitude, beauty, peace and quiet this little community offers us. Once again I read we are threaten by yet another infringement of these wonderful qualities, namely the Antelope-Pardee Sierra Pelona 500-kV Transmission Project, Alternative 5. This will severely impact our own property value and cause the following problems:

destroy the aesthetic view from our own property

C.49-1

ruin property values in general

will run either through our property or exist very close by

cause ground water contamination

cause air and noise pollution

C.49-2

cause major health problems, such as cancer

cause environmental damage

cause economic havoc on our community

C.49-3

cause 40 facilities to lose their homes

create an eye sore from the pristine Vasquez County Park

C.49-4

add additional and unnecessary cost to tax payers for longer and more

complicated routing

C.49-5

residents of Acton and Agua Dulce will not benefit by getting better

quality service

We were not given adequate time to prepare for this bombshell.

C.49-6

WE WANT THIS ALTERNATIVE REMOVED FROM CONSIDERATION and WE WANT A 90-DAY EXTENSION TO THE SEPTEMBER 18, 2006 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD IN ORDER TO PREPARE A REBUTTAL TO THE ALTERNATE 5 PROPOSAL.

C.49-7

First it was the prison in 1983, then it was over development, then the airport expansion, then CEMEX, and now ugly transmission towers that will ruin the aesthetic value of our precious community.

We suggest that the original route be followed and where necessary go underground so as not to negatively impact the Bouquet Canyon route.

C.49-8

Gail and George MacDonald
33710 Shallow Creek Rd.
Agua Dulce, CA 91390
661 268-0267

Have a nice day.

Gail

Response to Comment Set C.49: Gail A. MacDonald

- C.49-1 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values. The visual impacts associated with Alternative 5 are discussed in Section C.15.10 of the EIR/EIS.
- C.49-2 The impacts to water quality, air quality, and noise as a result of Alternative 5 have been discussed in the EIR/EIS Sections C.8.10, C.2.10, and C.10.10, respectively. Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.
- C.49-3 Alternative 5 would not entail the removal of 40 homes. As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, the alternative alignment would be constructed across approximately 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 any engineering design or routing studies for Alternative 5, the EIR/EIS has assumed that the removal of one or more homes could 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.
- C.49.4 Vasquez Rocks Natural Area Park would be located approximately 0.8 miles west of the Alternative 5 route, and recreational use of the area would not be affected by the Alternative 5 alignment (see Section C.9.10.1). However, as discussed in Section C.15.10.2 (Impact V-25), impacts to the visual quality of landscape views from Vasquez Rocks as a result of Alternative 5 would be significant and unavoidable.
- C.49-5 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.49-6 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding noticing procedures on the Draft EIR/EIS.
- C.49-7 An alternative can only be removed from consideration in the EIR/EIS if it is infeasible or does not meet the stated Project objectives. 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.49-8 Thank you for submitting your opinion on the Project.