

Comment Set D.65: Joel Crannell



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Scoping Comments

Proposed Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission

RECEIVED
SEP 18 2006

Date: 9/14/06
Name*: JOEL CRANNELL
BY:.....
Affiliation (if any)*: Homeowner in Leona Valley
Address*: 10254 LEONA AVE
City, State, Zip Code*: LEONA VALLEY, CA 93551
Telephone Number*: 661-270-1494
Email*: JOEL@moultonlogistics.com

I strongly oppose Alternative 5 option.

I believe the National Forest option to be the best and least impact for all involved.

As a strong + very financial giving individual to the environment and wildlife projects, the route through the National Forest will be best option. Though it will have some initial impact during construction, the forest + habitat will remain area after all is installed.

I have been a faithful taxpayer whom continues to be, but moved to my family to this rural area to escape the city dwelling and activities.

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.


Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be postmarked by September 18, 2006. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (661) 215-5152 or emailed to antelope-pardee@aspeneg.com.

D.65-1

This area is truly one of the most protected and beautiful areas in So. California. It would be a crime to alter the scenic beauty and force American's from their homes due to eminent domain that came here because of the area, when a more sensible alternative is available.

D.65-2

I appreciate your thoughts to this letter and your consideration of the alternative option.

Sincerely,


Place
Postage
Here

CPUC/USDA Forest Service
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Response to Comment Set D.65: Joel Crannell

- D.65-1 Thank you for your opinion regarding Alternative 5.
- D.65-2 Please see General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition. As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, the alternative alignment would be constructed across 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 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. 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 and unavoidable. Also, note that the Draft EIR/EIS identifies numerous adverse visual effects from the proposed Project or the alternatives.