

## Comment Set C.158: Alexis Upton-Knittle

**From:** Alexis Upton-Knittle [mailto:[auk9@earthlink.net](mailto:auk9@earthlink.net)]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 02, 2006 3:05 PM  
**To:** antelope-pardee@aspeneg.com  
**Cc:** Senator George Runner; Supervisor Michael Antonovich; The Honorable Julie Halligan; Jody Noiron  
**Subject:** Antelope-Pardee 500 kV Transmission Project

October 2, 2006

TO: John Boccio, CPUC

RE: Comments to the Antelope-Pardee 500 kV Transmission Project DEIR

This is a follow up letter to a previous comment letter dated September 5, 2006. Due to other information which has surfaced in the intervening period, we felt compelled to write again about the lack of clarity and legality of Alternative 5.

1. At the public hearing in Quartz Hill on August 28, 2006 on Alternative 5, we asked if there were other projects in the works. The audience was told, "No." by representatives from Aspen. Yet, the next day, the DEIR for the Segments 2 and 3 of the Antelope Transmission Project was announced. This route also goes through Leona Valley also. Is this clear communication to the public or is it an attempt to deceive the public? More importantly, it is our understanding that segmenting projects is not legal; separating one large project into smaller ones to make it appear to minimize the impact is not legal. So we question the whole process of the Alt. 5 DEIR and the Segments 2 and 3 of the Antelope Transmission Project DEIR. Can having this one large project converging on the same town and representing it as two separate projects be construed as segmenting? If so, then the DEIR process is flawed from the beginning. C.158-1
2. It appears that Alt. 5 violates the intent of The Energy Policy Act of 2005. Part of the intent of this act is to maintain corridors for utilities on public land and not to intrude onto private property. It would appear that the USDA/ANF policy to keep utilities off the forest land is in direct conflict with the Energy Policy Act. Can you please comment on whether this was taken into consideration? C.158-2
3. While attending the Governor's Conference on Women last week, Vivienne Cox, CEO, British Petroleum, Gas, Power and Renewables Division spoke about \$8 billion that BP was committed to spending in its efforts to address alternative power needs in California. From several articles and the Energy Conference that Governor Schwarzenegger and British Prime Minister Tony Blair headed in July, 2006, it is clear that BP plans to be a large player in Southern CA in the renewable energy field. Was their impact considered by Aspen? Is it possible that since they own one of the largest conglomerate of wind farms (Greenlight Energy) that the Alternative of No action should have been considered? Is it possible that BP will be able to provide the necessary energy? What is the scope of their projects in the Southern CA area? C.158-3

Thank you for your attention to this comment letter. We look forward to your response. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Alexis Upton-Knittle  
Lloyd J. Cook  
40165, 40167 and 40203 107th Street West  
Leona Valley, CA 93551  
[auk9@earthlink.net](mailto:auk9@earthlink.net)  
661-270-0065

### **Comment Set C.158: Alexis Upton-Knittle**

- C.158-1 We apologize for any misunderstanding regarding the Antelope-Pardee Transmission Project and Segments 2 & 3 of the Antelope Transmission Project. The Draft EIR/EIS for the Antelope-Pardee Transmission Project was released for public review on July 24, 2006, and the Draft EIR for Segments 2 & 3 of the Antelope Transmission Project was released for public review on August 24, 2006. These are separate projects that have different purposes and independent utility (please see the response to Comment B.18-115).
- C.158-2 Please see General Response GR-4 regarding alternatives identification, screening, and analysis. The USDA Forest Service requirements and National Energy Policy (NEP) goals were considered in developing Alternative 5.
- C.158-3 The Project would provide transmission capacity for wind energy resources that are expected to develop in southern Kern County and northern Los Angeles County. As such, the No Project/Action Alternative considers that if the transmission line were not built that “other renewable energy resources would need to be identified and transmission studies would need to be conducted to connect these newly identified sources to the transmission grid.” Under this scenario, wind farms potentially developed by BP to “provide the necessary energy” would also need transmission capacity. The scope of BP’s plans within the southern California area is unknown to the EIR/EIS preparers.