

Comment Set C.62: Charles Brink

From: David Baral [mailto:david@rcbaral.com]
Sent: Monday, September 11, 2006 12:51 PM
To: Boccio, John; mkadota@fs.fed.us; aguadulce2006@aol.com; mantonovish@lacbos.org; Halligan, Julie; ccoussoulis@earthlink.net; countryjournal@bigplanet.com; reedterito@aol.com; jnoiron@fs.fed.us; rgarwacki@prodigy.net
Subject: RE: Edison Transmission line

September 10, 2006

Edison Project

The Agua Dulce Town Council needs to file a motion with the Administrative Law Judge on this case demanding an extension of 90 days to provide an opportunity to retain counsel and make an appropriate objection to the newly disclosed "Option 5".

Apparently, the National Forest is a co-preparer of the project and was granted a 10-month extension in 2005 to respond to the project as it was originally proposed back in 2000.

The National Forest took a position that their new National Forest Plan prohibited power lines in the forest and instructed Aspen Engineering to develop "Option 5", which not only removes the new power lines from the forest, but also removes the existing 66KV power line as well.

Aspen Engineering, like an obedient puppy dog, now claims that "Option 5" is the visually preferred route because it removes a power line from the forest and totally ignores the impact of condemning 103 properties in Agua Dulce.

They placed "Option 5" on their website on 7-21-06 with a comment cut off of 9-18-06, giving less than 60 days. Even though Agua Dulce has 2 adjudicated newspapers, they provided no formal notification of this massive project.

There is no way that anyone in the community could have been aware of "Option 5" unless they constantly monitored the CPUC's site. As the proposed project had no effect on Agua Dulce until this stealth change was made under the Forest Service's direction, it would be unreasonable to expect anyone in the community to even be aware of the project.

The basis of the extension should be at least:

1. Failure to notify adjudicated newspapers within the community. | C.62-1
2. Inadequate time notice of this massive change in the project. |
3. The self-dealing between Aspen Engineering and the Forest Service which has destroyed any independence that Aspen Engineering must maintain under its contract. | C.62-2
4. The failed analysis of "Option 5", in what appears to be a predetermination that "Option 5" is the best option. | C.62-3

5. A detailed analysis of the taking of property is required under eminent domain, as well as the huge potential cost of destroying the view scape. Also, all of the additional lawsuits must be considered, with the taking of peoples' rights and the loss of the community's still pristine view scapes.
6. The effect of this huge additional cost on ratepayers with "Option 5" as opposed to simply expanding the existing circuit in the National Forest. The National Forest is neither pristine nor forest and has allowed massive mining in Acton and Agua Dulce, without any regard to the injury to the forest.

C.62-4

I will be happy to assist you in any way I can and will provide a sworn declaration of lack of notice to attach to your petition.

Charles Brink

David L. Baral
R.C. Baral & Company
Business Management
818 905-0151 phone
818 789-2194 fax

Response to Comment Set C.62: Charles Brink

- C.62-1 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding the noticing procedures for the Draft EIR/EIS and the public review period.
- C.62-2 Aspen Environmental Group has been contracted by the CPUC and the USDA Forest Service to prepare this joint EIR/EIS for the analysis of the Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project that was proposed by SCE. Please see Section A.1 for a description of the Project application process and the role of each agency in preparing and reviewing the EIR/EIS.
- C.62-3 The impacts associated with Alternative 5 are discussed for each of the 14 issue areas in Sections C.2.10 through C.15.10 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Please also see Section D for a comparison of the alternatives and a discussion of the CEQA Environmentally Superior Alternative.
- C.62-4 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values, and General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition.