## Comment Set D.81: Michael Hester

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Scoping Comments

Proposed Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project

Date: 9/18/06	neceiven		
Name*: MICHAEL HESTER	ECEIVE SEP 2 0 2006		
Affiliation ( <i>if any</i> ):*	ВҮ:		
Address:* 40101 92 NO ST. WEST			
City, State, Zip Code:* LEONA VALLE-1 CA 93551			
Telephone Number:* 661 270-9031			
Email:*NA			
THE ONLY ROUTE THAT IS ACCEPTABLE FOR UPGRADED			
TRANSMISSION LINES WOULD BE THE CURRENT ROUTE.			
THIS IS THE LEAST DISRUPTIVE. THIS MAY DISRUPT SOME			
WILDLIFE IN THE FOREST BUT, THE ANIMALS WITH COME BACK.			
THE OTHER ROUTES HAVE FAMILIES HAVING TO MOVE TO			
ANOTHER LOCATION, FAMILIES CAN'T COME BACK, IT 15			
NOT RIGHT OR MORAL TO TAKE AWAY PEOPLES HOMES			
SO THAT A FEW ANIMALS WON'T BE DISTURBED. PEUPLE			
HAVE BUILT THEIR HOMES AROUND THE EXISTING			
ROUTE. IM OPPOSEDTO ALL THE ROUTES EXCE	Services and the service of the serv		

D.81-1

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

EXISTING ROUTE THAT THE TRADSMISSION LINES ARE ON

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.

NON. MILKE HESTER

## Response to Comment Set D.81: Michael Hester

D.81-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns on the Project and alternatives. Please note that Alternatives 1 through 4 would not require the removal of existing residences. As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, the Alternative 5 alignment would be constructed across approximately 103 privately owned parcels. However, 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. Given that SCE has not conducted any engineering design or routing studies for Alternative 5, the EIR/EIS has assumed that the removal of one or more homes could 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.