## Comment Set C.121: Julianne Feuerhelm

**From:** Boccio, John [mailto:JBX@cpuc.ca.gov]
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 2:26 PM
**To:** JDavidson@aspeneg.com; Flynn, Thomas
**Subject:** FW: Antelope-Pardee Transmission Project ALTERNATIVE %

**From:** Julianne Feuerhelm [mailto:juliannefeuerhelm@msn.com]
**Sent:** Monday, September 25, 2006 1:31 PM
**To:** mantonovich@lacbos.org; Linda.lambourne@mail.house.gov; senator.runner@sen.ca.gov; assemblymember.runner@assembly.ca.gov; assemblymember.strickland@assembly.ca.gov; Catherine.kennedy@asm.ca.gov; L.weste@santa-clarita.com; Boccio, John; mkadota@fs.fed.us; AguaDulce2006@aol.com; rgarwacki@prodigy.net; herdem@aol.com; horsinground@aol.com; alicewollman@adelphia.net; ccoussoulis@earthlink.net; countryjournal@bigplanet.com; reedterito@aol.com; Halligan, Julie; jnoiron@fs.fed.us
**Subject:** Antelope-Pardee Transmission Project ALTERNATIVE %

John Boccio, CPUC, EIR Project Manager
Dian Grueneich, CPUC Commissioner
Marian Kadota, USFS, EIS Project Manager
Jody Noiron, Angeles National Forest Supervisor
Aspen Environment Group

RE: **ANTELOPE-PARDEE PROPOSED 500- kV TRANSMISSION PROJECT**

The above referenced project far exceeds reckless entitlement. I can not comprehend how educated and environmentally astute professionals could have imagined such a project, much less initiated and facilitated it! The Antelope-Pardee 500 k-V Transmission Project was conceived and executed in absolute secrecy. This action bespeaks fore knowledge of how the impacted communities would react. Moving past emotional reactions; I would like to point out some real and apparent flaws in the entire project concept.

First and foremost there is the question of Imminent Domain. A recognizably unpopular concept at all levels of government; Local, State and FEDERAL. It has been estimated by your experts there will be in excess of **100** homes "directly" impacted by this project. This does not take into consideration the additional homes located beyond the required 100 feet. These properties will assuredly be monetarily impacted from corona noise and loss of views. The amount of compensation paid residents for displacement has traditionally never remunerated their loss and emotional upheaval. The line for the towers seems vague (if not misleading). If one were to follow it, there are over fifty impacted homes along Anthony as it crosses Hierba and Sierra Highway. Does that would mean half of the "directly" impacted homes are in this one area? I don't think so. C.121-1

Did consultants from the fire department sit on your planning team? If so, they must have been absent from planning meetings. How could they, with their professional acumen, allow anything so dangerous so close to our community? Thirty percent of all wild fires in this area are results of power lines. Agua Dulce, like most communities you have chosen to invade are tinder boxes. This translates to a realistic hazard to our homes. Will our fire insurance, which is already prohibitive, increase with the presence of these high voltage towers? C.121-2

Agua Dulce is the custodian of one historical and cultural landmark, Vasquez Rocks. These rocks are probably one of the most filmed sights in the entire state. How disappointing for visitors to see in their line of vision, not open space and shrub hugged hills, but rather, monstrous lines hovering in their field of vision. I have traveled extensively. When people ask where I live; a significant number of them have heard of or visited Vasquez Rocks. Once again, were their geologists and environmental specialists on your team? Did they sign off on this? C.121-3

Next is a question concerning the safety of these towers. There is a theory that the ongoing controversy concerning the "safety to the health" of persons living close to or under power lines is the result of power line

advocates (yourselves), not providing accurate study results. Recent literature indicates that one day this conspiracy will no longer be able to be suppressed. When released the reports of power line impact to health will make the tobacco companies seem like minor league players. Alas! This is unlikely to surface anytime during this battle. That being said; I go on record as being aware of this possibility and reserve the right of future redress. This from both existing and future tower health threats. C.121-4

Now, lets talk about costs. In an environment where all state agencies and entities have been requested to cut back...you are suggesting the most prohibitively expensive alternative. It will consist of almost 19 miles of transmission lines outside of a designated utility corridor, homes and businesses will have to be purchased, will take 23% longer to construct and costs will be exponentially higher How can there be a sane argument for this venture. Are there any sane arguments for Alternative 5? C.121-5

If indeed we are going to have to accept Alternative 5, then I would expect you to extend to the community of Agua Dulce the same courtesy you are extending Santa Clarita. That being, place all Towers underground. It is difficult to argue the feasibility of doing this for one community and refusing it to another. That would have to be seen as selective accommodation.

Julianne Feuerhelm
35820 Bass Rock Road
Agua Dulce, Ca. 91390
661. 268.0211 818.631.6852

## Response to Comment C.121: Julianne Feuerhelm

C.121-1 As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, 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. However, given that SCE has not conducted construction or final alignment and design studies for Alternative 5, the EIR/EIS has assumed that the removal of one or more homes may occur. Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects of the Project on property values and General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition.

C.121-2 We recognize that Alternative 5 would constrain the ability to aggressively fight a wildland fire in the vicinity of the route, and could 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 at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.

C.121-3 Vasquez Rocks Natural Area Park would be located approximately 0.8 miles west of the Alternative 5 route, and recreational use of the area would not be affected by the Alternative 5 alignment (see Section C.9.10.1). However, as discussed in Section C.15.10.2 (Impact V-25), impacts to the visual quality of landscape views from Vasquez Rocks as a result of Alternative 5 would be significant and unavoidable.

C.121-4 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.

C.121-5 Although project cost is not discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS, we agree that due to the increased length of Alternative 5, it would cost substantially more than the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.