

Comment Set C.96: Susan McCartney

----- Forwarded by Marian Kadota/R5/USDAFS on 09/18/2006 07:56 AM -----

Jody Noiron/R5/USDAFS

09/18/2006 07:38AM

To

David McCartney <dsmccart@sbcglobal.net>

cc

Marian Kadota/R5/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Sherry Rollman/R5/USDAFS@FSNOTES

Subject

Re: LEONA VALLEY TRANSMISSION LINES

(Document link: Marian Kadota)

Thank you for your note and comments. I will ensure your comments are provided to the Ca Public Utility Commission and Aspen Environmental to be included and considered as formal public comments to this project.

Regards, Jody

Jody Noiron

Forest Supervisor

Angeles NF, R5

Phone (626) 574 - 5216

Fax (626) 821 - 6777

Pager (626) 473 - 9080

E-MAIL jnoiron@fs.fed.us

David McCartney <dsmccart@sbcglobal.net>

09/16/2006 01:46PM

To

Jody Noiron <jnoiron@fs.fed.us>

Subject

LEONA VALLEY TRANSMISSION LINES

I HAVE ENCLOSED A LETTER TO CPUC. PLEASE EMAIL ME IF THIS LETTER IS UNREADABLE. YOU UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF TRANSMISSION LINES BEING PLACED IN AREA'S TO DECREASE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. AS WELL AS YOUR ABILITY TO FIGHT FIRES, WHEN THESE LINES EFFECT YOUR ACCESS BY HAND CREWS AND AIR SUPPORT WATER DROPS. PLEASE UNDERSTAND THAT THIS MAY NOT DIRECTLY EFFECT ANGELES FOREST, BUT IF A LEONA VALLEY FIRE CAN'T BE ACCESS BY LA COUNTY, IT WILL GO INTO YOUR FOREST. I LIVED THROUGH THAT SUCH FIRE. SINCE ANGELES FOREST IS ALSO MY FOREST, PLEASE PROTECT IT BY SPEAKING UP AGAINST NEW TRANSMISSION LINES.

SUSAN MCCARTNEY

8726 CALVA ST

LEONA VALLEY, CA

93551-7214

dsmccart@sbcglobal.net

Honorable Julie Halligan
Administrative Law Judge
California Public Utilities Commission
jmh@cpuc.ca.gov

Honorable Julie Halligan

It has come to our attention that our valley is under consideration for a new transmission line to be constructed for the Antelope-Pardee 500-kv transmission project submitted by Aspen environmental group. This project is not the existing Section 2-3, but the Alternate Route 5. This route would not be going over exiting transmission lines, but across our valley.

1) This would impact several news properties, not limited to viewscapes, but health risks with EMF's proximity.

C.96-1

2) Our Valley is a rural part of Los Angeles county. Our fire protection is limited in resources. Most Responses are not only hand crews, but Water drops by fire departments. These high transmission lines thru the alternate route would threaten our properties, due to increase risk to ground fire crews and water drops, decision would be made not to intervene. I have lived thru fire evacuations, but knew our properties were protected due to the fire departments ability to access our valley and perform their job.

C.96-2

3) This alternate route would require new "Right of Way"s, causing de-valuation of properties. Who wants 500kv towers on their property, when ranching and agricultures their source of revenue. Who wants to live with one on their property and the noise they transmit, just listen to my radio when I park next to one.

C.96-3

4) I already have difficulty with my cell phone transmission with the existing transmission lines. Our 911 call boxes are no longer functioning and a cute sign is covering them "Call this number on your cell phone for emergency assistance". People's lives have been impacted by accidents on our rural roads and inability to contact emergency services. While budget costs have effected maintenance of our boxes, if we can limit our electrical interferences by keeping our towers in existing areas. I ask ,“Who’s life we may save?”

Please understand my concerns and understand there are other ways to bring power to the Edison sub-stations than what Aspen Environment Group is proposing with this project.

C.96-4

Susan McCartney
APN 3205-014-021
8726 Calva St
Leona Valley, Ca
93551-7214
Email address dsmccart@sbcglobal.net

Response to Comment Set C.96: Susan McCartney

- C.96-1 Potential health risks associated with the Project are discussed in Section C.6 (Public Health and Safety) of the Draft EIR/EIS. Please see General Response GR-3 regarding electric and magnetic fields (EMF) and potential health effects.
- C.96-2 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.96-3 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.96-4 The SCE proposed Project and several of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS include the use of existing transmission rights-of-way. However, the 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.