

Comment Set C.91: Ken Morris

Honorable Julie Halligan
Administrative Law judge
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Ave. Rm. 5101
San Francisco, CA 94103
Email: jmh@cpuc.ca.gov

9060 North Side Dr.
Leona Valley, CA 93551
(661) 270-0560
kcklm@adelphia.net

Honorable Julie Halligan:

I would like to thank you for the meeting we had the opportunity to attend at George Lane Park in Quartz Hill. It was a shock to learn about this power line proposal #5 coming through Leona Valley.

First I would like to say my wife and I are opposed to Alternate route #5. Some of the reasons for this are as follows.

C.91-1

1. Adopting the longer alternate #5 route will jeopardize the health and safety of the people in Leona Valley and other areas. As you know there are possible risks of cancers and miscarriages along with other health problems in populated neighborhoods because of the EMF off of these high voltage lines.
2. Power lines also snap in earthquakes; Leona Valley is on the San Andreas fault. Safety factor.
3. Hazard to homes because of fire. If there is a problem for Forest Service to fight a fire because of the power line when only brush is present, how much worse will it be for Forest Service to fight a fire around power lines with both brush and homes to worry about?
4. Cost of the project. There would be a large added cost using Alternate #5's zigzag route. This dollar cost would be minimal in comparison to the cost of human suffering.

C.91-2

C.91-3

C.91-4

C.91-5

Please forgive me if I misunderstood some things, I am hard of hearing and going through a sign language interpreter I sometimes get things mixed up. Please feel free to correct me if I did.

I understood that a major objection of the new Edison lines following or replacing the existing Edison line through the forest area is because it will hinder fire fighting in the area.

Proposals for consideration.

1. Has it been considered to require Edison to build and maintain a firebreak the length and allotted width of the power line through the forest area?
 - a. This could be used as a major line of defense or attack in this area.
 - b. With the brush removed this firebreak could become a large grazing area for animals. With this added food supply, there is a possibility the animals would not forage down into populated areas.
 - c. The firebreak can be graded to limit erosion.
2. Has it been considered to require Edison to build and maintain a fire road the length of the power line?
 - a. This road along with the firebreak could be a good staging area for fire equipment.
 - b. I am sure a well-maintained road could help the Forest Service in other ways also.
 - c. Edison could also be asked to build access roads to this firebreak road creating better accessibility for fire equipment.

C.91-6

3. Another consideration would be to build cisterns along this firebreak.
- a. These cisterns can be a source of water along this line of defense.
 - b. Referring to item 1-c, the runoff from the firebreak can be directed into the cisterns as a supply of water.
- Note; A few years ago the L.A. County fire crews built cisterns in the forest, I think they were along the old road hwy 99 north of Castaic. This source manpower could probably be used again.

C.91-7

Another objection (I thought I heard) for the Angeles Forest route was that it devalued a movie set someplace, a consideration for that might be.

- 4. Move the towers off the ridge and on to the slope away from the set?
- 5. If the towers are still too tall, could two single circuit shorter towers be used in place of each tall, two-circuit, tower on the backside of the ridge in that area?

C.91-8

One last thought. I understand that the supervisor of Angeles National Forest is one of the final decision makers. My question, is it a conflict of interest for the supervisor of Angeles National Forest to be a decision maker on this project? It seems that the supervisor would have large input like many others but the final decision would be made by people that are not in "the turmoil".

C.91-9

Thank you for consideration,

Ken Morris

c.c. Jody Noiron >jnoiron@fs.fed.us<
Michael Antonovich >
Howard (Buck) McKeon >tellbuck@mail.house.gov
George Runner >
Sharon Runner >
Audra Strickland >
Dr.Keith Richman >
Laurene Weste >
John Boccio >
Marian Kadota >
Terry Kenney >

Response to Comment Set C.91: Ken Morris

- C.91-1 Thank you for submitting your opinion regarding Alternative 5.
- C.91-2 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.
- C.91-3 Crossing the San Andreas Fault is unavoidable for the proposed transmission line as well as many existing transmission lines and other types of infrastructure. The fault crossing as well as other potential hazards and constraints are taken into consideration in the engineering design of the transmission line. Transmission line risk due to earthquake-related ground rupture is discussed in section C.5.5. Also, see Impact G-4 for a discussion of impacts and mitigation measures.
- C.91-4 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 and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.91-5 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 and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.91-6 This analysis did include potential mitigation measures related to adverse impacts to fire suppression/prevention and fire fighting safety. Del Sur Ridge has an existing fuelbreak that is maintained by the Forest. The proposed Project (proposed action) and several alternatives (Alternatives 1, 3, 4) follow a portion of the fuelbreak along the Del Sur Ridge. Mitigation Measure F-7 is proposed in which SCE would aid in any additional costs for maintenance of the fuelbreak that have been caused by this project. In addition, Mitigation Measure F-8 was proposed where SCE would pay for the construction and maintenance for widening the portions of Del Sur Rdige Fuelbreak in locations where the proposed line coujld adversely impact ground firefighting forces safety.
- Grazing the fuelbreak may be considered at a later date but is not within the scope of this analysis. Your comment will be shared with the Forest decision-maker for this project.
- Grading the fuelbreak would not likely limit erosion. Best Management Practices would be implemented when maintaining the fuelbreak to minimize erosion and would be analyzed in a separate environmental document.
- Forest roads are kept to a minimum to service the administrative needs of the Forest. Too many roads promote illegal off-highway usage, graffiti, crime, and other undesirable damage to resources; they also visually scar the land; they cost too much to construct and especially to maintain following heavy rains and fire. Road needs for the construction of this project would be carefully weighed against negative impacts, in determining what roads to construct. Any permanent upgrades to the existing Forest System roads would require a separate study.
- C.91-7 The option of having SCE construct and maintain cistern(s) along Del Sur Ridge was discussed with the Forest Fire Staff. Considering the location, the Forest could not justify asking SCE to pay for

the costs to construct and maintain cisterns in this area. It would have fire suppression value – but considering the cost, it would not be economically reasonable.

- C.91-8 SCE's proposed transmission route crosses a portion of an outdoor television and movie set (the Veluzat Ranch) in Haskell Canyon, which is located on non-NFS land. Therefore, the filming impacts raised by this project are of concern outside the Forest Service's jurisdiction and do not pertain to Del Sur Ridge or other locations in the ANF. Alternative 4 has been proposed to move the line away from the television/movie set in order to avoid impacts to this facility.
- C. 91-9 There is no conflict of interest as the Forest Service is the Lead Federal Agency. Pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 (as amended), the Forest Service is required to respond to an application from SCE for a Special Use authorization to construct, maintain, and use a transmission line (and ancillary improvements) through the Santa Clara/Mojave Rivers Ranger District of the ANF. The FLPMA provides the authority to the Secretary of Agriculture (Forest Service) to issue, renew, or grant authorizations to occupy, use, or traverse NFS lands for the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical power (43 U.S.C. 1761). Please see Section A.1 for a description of the Project application process and the role of each agency in preparing and reviewing the EIR/EIS.