

**Comment Set C.211: Robert R. Mallicoat**

DENNIS D. SMITH

LAW OFFICES  
ROBERT R. MALLICOAT  
321 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE  
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90212

RECEIVED  
OCT - 4 2006

BY:.....

October 2, 2006

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

Re: Proposed Antelope-Pardee 500-KV Transmission Project

Gentlemen:

First, let me establish that I am now, and have been for the past 31 years, a resident of Pitchfork Ranch in Leona Valley, California, an area which will be detrimentally impacted by a proposed routing of the above project being urged by our U.S. Forest Service. I believe that it is route choice No. 5.

I have been alerted to the fact that an extremely high voltage transmission line coming from the Tehachapi Wind Farm area to the north down through Leona Valley and to its ultimate power grid terminus is being proposed along a circuitous route which will cut through Leona Valley, require condemnation of homes of long time residents of our Valley, and the choice could well result in a senseless loss of the power being transmitted due to length of the route you are urging.

At the present time, there is existent and crossing Leona Valley in a north-south direction, a transmission line constructed and operated by Southern California Edison. I am advised that the Edison Company has very logically proposed that this new much higher powered transmission line follow the same route as their existing transmission line. I understand that the present line is a much more direct route but that it crosses the hallowed land supervised by our United States Forest Service. These high power lines have become one of the most unsightly structures anywhere on our landscape. If, in fact, we must tolerate the unwelcome sight of this newly proposed huge high powered transmission line, the most simple and sensible logic dictates that it should follow the existing SCE route. The fact that it crosses Forest Service land is as it should be. These are public lands already owned by the public, not the Forest Service; and, since this is a public sponsored taking of property, it should be retained upon land already owned by the citizenry and devoted to power transmission.

The thought that we would even consider the arrogant dictates of the Forest Service calling for the condemnation of people's homes when an existing route is available and in use is frightening. It would, indeed, be comforting to know that the Forest Service has some real concern for the people whose homes surround them instead of creating this unnecessary and most unwelcome conflict with homeowners.

C.211-1

CPUC/USDA Forest Service  
October 2, 2006  
Page Two of Two

I am also informed that the Forest Service proposed routing of this proposed monstrosity is much longer and that the extra distance will result in "leakage" of as much as 5% more of the power being transmitted.

The Forest Service proposal also exposes more people to potential health problems due to the "power leakage" in the area beneath and nearby this high capacity transmission line.

It is a deep concern of mine that the Forest Service can be so impervious to the basic values of people who neighbor the land entrusted to its supervision as to border upon the worst of bureaucratic arrogance.

If such a transmission line as is proposed must be, let's use some common sense and erect it on the existing power transmission line operated by Southern California Edison. Gentlemen, please be reminded that we in Leona Valley love our Valley and our good neighbors and friends who live in and also love the Valley. There is no need, nor is there any justification, for this budding Forest Service boondoggle.

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to be heard on this critical issue and thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,



ROBERT R. MALLICOAT  
Pitchfork Ranch  
Leona Valley, CA 93551  
661/270-0680

RRM/mry

## Response to Comment Set C.211: Robert R. Mallicoat

C.211-1 Thank you for your opinion regarding the proposed Project and Alternative 5. A number of alternative routes were identified during the Scoping process to avoid the impacts of SCE's proposed Project. See General Response GR-4 regarding the alternatives identification process for the Project. SCE's proposed Project and several of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS include the use of existing transmission rights-of-way. However, the proposed 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. Your concerns will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.