

Comment Set C.9: Glenda Tumin

From: Glenda Tumin [mailto:pilargandalus@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2006 11:40 AM
To: antelope-pardee@aspeneg.com
Subject: Opposition to Alternative 5- Antelope Pardee Sierra Pelona Re-Route

Dear Mr. Boccio and Ms. Kadota,

I am extremely opposed to the proposed Alternative 5 Antelope -Pardee Sierra Pelona Re-Route based on the following:

1. The proposed 500kV transmission line project would compromise air quality in the surrounding area, affecting both humans and wildlife; | C.9-1
 2. It would also result in production of 4, 506 tons of waste that would have to be disposed of and is likely to result in contamination of the surrounding area by potential contaminants; | C.9-2
 3. It has the potential to damage or interfere with water sources in Leona Valley as construction and destruction associated with the project will likely alter the topography, affecting runoff | C.9-3
 4. It increases the potential for fire hazard in the surrounding area and will interfere with disaster and emergency prevention/preparedness as fires in this area are most effectively fought with water dropping helicopters, the flight patterns of which would be interrupted. | C.9-4
 5. It would result in the devaluation of my property in conjunction with the devaluation of surrounding properties due to loss of the viewscape. | C.9-5
 6. It would result in increased noise pollution. | C.9-6
 7. It would result in the displacement of a significant portion of the families in this area and has the potential to cause the closure of the local elementary school which my daughter attends. This would result in increased wear on my vehicles and greater fuel costs for my family. | C.9-7
 8. The increased fire risk would result in an increase in my fire insurance premiums | C.9-8
 9. The deterioration of my neighborhood would result in a loss of quality of life and perhaps cause me to move which would in turn... | C.9-9
 10. Result in an increase in my property taxes should housing values reflect the current market conditions |
 11. The location of the towers (along the San Andreas Fault) creates an increased risk of damage to the towers which would create a greater fire risk | C.9-10
 12. Concern for the health and safety of my family due to |
 - a. increased exposure to EMFs associated with childhood leukemia and increased incidence of spontaneous abortions | C.9-11
 - b. increased traffic/large construction and demolition | C.9-12
- vehicles traversing roads between my home and the local school.

In addition to the above, I take issue with the methods that were employed in scheduling and conducting the "scoping meetings" in my area. The meetings were held in Lancaster and Santa Clarita, areas that is are not affected to the same degree as Leona Valley and are distant. Notification of the citizens of Leona Valley was negligible; therefore, I | C.9-13

demand that the process be restarted so that the citizens most impacted by this proposal may participate in the process as as is mandated by the CEQA.

Sincerely,

Glenda P. Gonzalez

Thanks again,

Glenda Tumin

Response to Comment Set C.9: Glenda Tumin

C.9-1 The Project will have one-time construction emissions that would occur over the length of the Project route. The construction impacts to any one location would be limited due to the limited activity and duration of construction at any one location along the route. Regardless, the potential for significant temporary air quality impacts during construction was determined in the EIR/EIS analysis, and mitigation measures have been recommended to reduce construction equipment and fugitive dust emissions to the extent feasible. The EIR/EIS recommends the use of newer lower-emitting diesel and gasoline fueled construction equipment and the use of the most effective forms of dust control feasible for unpaved roads and disturbed surfaces.

The Project's operating emissions would be minor, clearly below applicable emissions significance criteria, typically consisting of emissions generated during annual inspections by helicopter and/or survey truck. Additionally, minute amounts of direct oxidant, ozone and nitrogen oxides (NO_x), emissions would be formed by transmission line corona discharge. Transmission lines are designed to minimize corona discharge because of the increase in line loss it causes. The minute corona discharge emissions are at their highest during rain and fog when ambient ozone concentrations are at their lowest, and are reduced during fair weather when ambient ozone concentrations would be at their highest, and these minute emissions would not cause or significantly contribute to exceedances of ozone or NO_x ambient air quality standards.

C.9-2 Waste materials generated by construction are estimated for the proposed Project and each alternative in Section C.14 of the EIR/EIS. The potential for contamination associated with construction and operation of the transmission line is discussed in Section C.6 of the EIR/EIS. While construction of Alternative 5 would generate the most amount of solid waste compared to the proposed Project and other project alternatives provided in the Draft EIR, this waste is within the daily permitted disposal rates and available capacities of landfills available to receive the waste. Solid waste generated by construction activities occurs with all development projects, and is planned for in landfill capacity and design. Construction debris is typically disposed of at Unclassified (inert waste) Landfills, which are permitted to accept inert waste and construction/demolition debris. These landfills generally have much higher capacity and daily limits compared to Class III Landfills, which accept typical daily waste. To further reduce solid waste, construction of Alternative 5, as well as the proposed Project or other identified alternatives, would be subject to Draft EIR Mitigation Measure U-2, as identified in Section C.14 (Utilities and Service Systems) on Draft EIR Page C.14-7, which would require the construction contractor to recycle a minimum of 50 percent of construction waste generated. Therefore, construction waste would be minimized to the greatest extent feasible, and would be a one-time generation of solid waste associated with construction activities that would be within daily permitted rates and existing capacities of landfills accepting this waste.

C.9-3 The supply and quality of water resources, including in the Leona Valley, would not be significantly affected by the proposed Project or an alternative. As discussed in Section C.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the EIR/EIS, implementation of the proposed Project or an alternative is not expected to significantly interfere with groundwater supply and recharge (Criterion HYD2), or with existing surface water drainage patterns (Criterion HYD3). If the proposed Project or an alternative is approved, the required implementation of mitigation measures during construction and operation would ensure protection of water resources.

As discussed in Section C.5 (Geology, Soils, and Paleontology), minor changes in topography associated with the project (Impact G-3) are not expected to be significant. Implementation of the required Mitigation Measures G-2 (Minimization of Soil Erosion) and B-1a (Provide Restoration/Compensation for Impacts to Native Vegetation Communities) would additionally avoid potential impacts to surface water runoff resulting from topographic changes.

There is a potential for construction of the proposed Project or an alternative to affect local runoff patterns through the introduction of new infrastructure and impervious areas. Any impacts to surface water runoff from the construction of new impervious areas (such as access roads and transmission towers) would be less than significant for the proposed Project and Alternatives 2 through 5. For Alternative 1, Mitigation Measure H-5 (Permeability of Ground Cover) would be implemented to ensure that any potential impacts to runoff would be less than significant.

- C.9-4 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.9-5 Please see General Comment GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.9-6 Alternative 5 would result in significant and unavoidable (Class I) noise impacts during construction and operation, specifically inspection and maintenance activities. Noise impacts associated with Alternative 5 are discussed in detail in Section C.10.10 of the EIR/EIS.
- C.9-7 As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, 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. Alternative 5 would not result in the displacement of a significant portion of the families in the Leona Valley or Agua Dulce communities, nor would it necessitate the closure of local schools.
- C.9-8 Your concerns regarding increased fire risk will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.9-9 See General Response GR-1.
- C.9-10 Southern California is a seismically active area, as demonstrated by the list of significant active and potentially active faults in the Project area provided in Table C.5-3, in Section C.5 (Geology, Soils, and Paleontology) of the Draft EIR/EIS document. There is a risk that the location of towers along active faults, including the San Andreas Fault, could be damaged in the case of a surface fault rupture (Impact G-4). Implementation of the required Mitigation Measure G-4 (Minimize Project Structures within Active Fault Zones) would ensure that such potential impacts, including as related to fire risk, would be less than significant. Further discussion of the geologic and seismic characteristics of the Project area is provided in Section C.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Discussion of potential fire risks associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Project and alternatives is provided in Section C.7 (Forest Management Activities) of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- C.9-11 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.

- C.9-12 Construction of Alternative 5 would result in construction-related traffic on area roads as discussed in Section C.13.10 of the EIR/EIS. 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 protect traffic, pedestrians and construction workers. 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.9-13 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding the noticing procedures for an EIR/EIS. On September 13, the CPUC and the Forest Service formally extended the public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS to October 3, 2006.