

**Comment Set C.217: Bryan Bobrosky**

**Bryan Bobrosky**

11660 Lonesome Valley Road  
Lions Valley, CA. 93551

(661) 270-9407 Fax (661) 270-0054

John Boccio / Marian Kadota  
CPUC / USDA Forest Service  
C/O Aspen Environmental Group  
30423 Canwood St. Suite 215  
Agoura Hills, CA. 91301

September 17, 2006

RECEIVED  
OCT - 5 2006

BY:.....

RE: Antelope-Pardee Transmission Project Draft EIS/R -Opposition to Alternative 5

Dear John and Marian,

The purpose of this letter is to offer substantive comment as to why I strongly oppose the proposed Alternative 5.

My residence is in an area which is approx. 3/4 mile to the west of where the proposed lines would cross 107th St. and Lonesome Valley Road. Fire is of the greatest concern to residents in this area. There is no water service in our area. This means no hydrants available for fire fighting. We depend only on private wells and water storage for fighting a fire.

This situation makes aerial firefighting our only real defense. Lines in our area would diminish our only real defense against fire fighting.


Representatives from the Forest Service have acknowledged the problem of access to fire control in our area. They pointed out additional fire our "fuel breaks" located in our area. These breaks are present because of high risk to residents of the area. As a resident who has experienced 3 major fires near my home in the last 16 years, these breaks did not stop the fires. Aerial suppression was the key to saving lives and homes.

Installation of the proposed lines will take this away from us!

Other issues I have are probably common to others in the area. They are the unsightly towers, depreciation of our property values and potential harmful health effects.

Lines have existed through the ANF since the 1930's. Corridors through the Forest are tried and proven. This appears to be a more viable alternative.

Sincerely,



Bryan Bobrosky

C.217-1

## **Response to Comment Set C.217: Bryan Bobrosky**

C.217-1 Thank you for your opinion regarding Alternative 5. 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.