Comment Set D.95: Al and Robin Gregg

| | CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION Public Meeting Comments Proposed Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Proje BY: | |
|-----|---|--------|
| _ | ite: Sept 29, 2006 | |
| N | me*: AL + ROBIN GRESG | |
| A | filiation (if any):* | |
| | dress:* 8600 HIERBA ROAD | |
| C | y, State, Zip Code:* Hand Druce, CA 9/390 | |
| - 3 | lephone Number:* 661-268 0070 | |
| E | ail:* KNA 0070@ AOL. com | |
| 4 | Le are writing to you regarding the Proposed abtelope Parke | |
| / | 0-KV Bansmission Preject", planned within 2/10 Da mile from our | |
| n | me. We moved here 15 yrs. ago to raise our 3 children & have a sesene | |
| D | efective. We would find the visual impact very devastating, let | D.95-1 |
| a | love the danger of all the health issues. Our home sproperry is | D.95-2 |
| V | alued in the high 700's. Edisons proposed would most | D.95-3 |
| 0 | existing result in a great equity loss. Our home is in a | D.93-3 |
| 4 | ich före area we now understand that the fire dept. "will not" | |
| 4 | ight near these lines. Fire ricks pare Cyreates than other alternates + | D.95-4 |
| 6 | ill result in the greatest demand for fire protection. Mare homes + | |
| pr | operty would be at risk in the event of a wildland fire. The fire deep | |
| * | ights our fires mostly by air, which would be impossible to navigate | |
| a | round these 200+ towers. In closing we think the original soute | |
| _ | that Edison proposed is the only way to make agua lule | |
| 1 | residents sage & continue our lifestyle that we have spent | |
| *Pl | time + money to achieves, le se print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested. | |
| _ | | |
| ade | e either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert disonal sheets if needed. Comments must be postmarked by September 18, 2006. Comments may also be to the project hotline at (661) 215-5152 or emailed to antelope-pardee@aspeneg.com. | |

Response to Comment Set D.95: Al and Robin Gregg

- D.95-1 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.15.10.2, the change to existing views as a result of infrastructure construction are considered a significant and unavoidable impact of Alternative.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.
- D.95-2 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential EMF health impacts.
- D.95-3 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- D.95-4 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.