

## Comment Set C.84: Jennifer Rohletter

---

**From:** Jennifer Rohletter [mailto:je\_rohletter@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thu 9/14/2006 10:30 PM  
**To:** jahale@hotmail.com; Antelope-Pardee Project  
**Subject:** opposed alternate 5 route

Date: 13 September 2006

Name: Jennifer Rohletter

Affiliation: Friend of Agua Dulce Landowner

Address: 12630 Ralston Ave., Sylmar, Ca 91342

Telephone Number: 818-364-0480

I am opposed to the California Public Utilities Commission's proposal of the alternative 5 route. This alternative would traverse over a hundred privately owned parcels and possibly remove one or more homes. It has the potential to expose the greatest number of residences to noise associated with construction, operation, and maintenance activities. This alternative has the second highest annual and total emissions. The towers will create strong ground shaking that could damage project structures and homes. A single tower creates 500-kv. If this proposal goes through there will be 94 single-circuits and 76 double-circuits. Land owners will be in constant fear for their children lives. The value of homes and lands will drop dramatically. Owners will not only lose out of their money. They will lose their beautiful scenery; and the peace and quiet. There is absolutely no justification to take away homes and land when existing right-of-ways are sufficient.

C.84-1

C.84-2

## Response to Comment Set C.84: Jennifer Rohletter

- C.84-1 Thank you for submitting your concerns regarding Alternative 5. Your comment is consistent with findings of the EIR/EIS with regards to noise and air emissions during construction. Impacts to noise and air quality as a result of Alternative 5 are discussed in EIR/EIS Sections C.10.10 and C.2.10, respectively. However, contrary to your comment, transmission towers would not cause “strong groundshaking.” As discussed in Section C.5 (Soils, Geology, and Paleontology) of the EIR/EIS, it is possible that strong groundshaking (such as during an earthquake) would naturally occur in the Project area due to the seismically active nature of southern California. If such an event were to occur, there is a possibility for damage to Project-related structures, including the transmission towers. With the required implementation of mitigation measures to prevent such damage, as presented in Section C.5.10 of the EIR/EIS, impacts would not be significant.

Although the transmission lines would be built to accommodate 500 kV, they would initially be energized to 220 kV. You are correct regarding the number of transmission towers that would be constructed under Alternative 5.

- C.84-2 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values and General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition. Thank you for expressing your concern regarding Alternative 5. Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.