

Comment Set C.170: Dr. David and Janice Gantenbein

From: David Gantenbein [mailto:dajazoo@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2006 1:40 PM
Subject: Antelope-Pardee 500kv Transmission Project

Julie M. Halligan
EIR Project Manager
Administrative Law Judge
California Public Utilities
Commission
505 Van Ness Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Halligan et al,

With regard to the Antelope- Pardee 500k Transmission Project Alternative 5, we, David and Janice Gantenbein, strongly oppose, protest, and reject this proposal. We also oppose the manner in which residents were notified, or not, in our case, of the proposed project and of the first meeting being held with regard to it. Southern California Edison already has an established transmission corridor through Leona Valley's west end which traverses the Angeles National Forest (ANF) to Santa Clarita.

C.170-1

This transmission corridor has been present since the 1920s/30s. The proposed Alternate Route 5 will be 40 - 45% longer than Edison's original proposed route. This will unnecessarily cost all taxpayers more money and will waste electrical power due to longer line resistance loss for as long as the lines are in use. Do you think this 5% or so loss of power will be significant when the price of oil doubles or triples? Alternate Route 5 will cause more significant environmental impacts than the original Proposed transmission route because:

1). No accurate biological studies have been performed on the Alt. 5 route. The wildlife density is much greater along Alt.5 than anyplace along the ANF. Leona Valley is a unique community geographically and supports its own microclimate. Our water table is high and it supports this abundant wildlife population via numerous year round springs, several of which are on my property. Wildlife pattern, that is to say, they run the same paths and they use the same feeding and drinking areas year after year. They also learn which areas to avoid. They are already used to avoiding the areas along the original proposed route as there are already towers in existence there.

C.170-2

2). What about water quality? We have many homes and agri- businesses that are dependant upon wells, many of which have been long established. What effect will these high powered transmission lines have, over time, upon our water supply and, ultimately, upon human and animal life? These aquifers are very sensitive and the erection of these massive towers will disturb and destroy our valuable water source. Some property owners have no water source other than their well.

C.170-3

3). What about access to the towers for maintenance? There will have to be a huge infrastructure of access roads in order to maintain and service these lines. What about water run-off? Were you aware that all of these proposed towers are sited on slopes which will result in major run-off? Who will pay for the continued repair and maintenance of these roads? We know who will pay

C.170-4

for it. Who will pay for the damage to private properties located below these slopes? We know who will pay for that too. Who will pay for the damage caused by motorcyclists and off roaders who will then start to use these roads bringing an increase in trash, noise and fire danger? We, again, know who will pay for that.

4). What about noise? With these 500K towers there will be a substantial increase cracking, popping and buzzing 24/7. Certain weather conditions will increase that noise. Those living downwind of these monsters will never know peace and quiet again. What about the noise caused by te construction and maintenance of these towers? What about the noise ordinances outlined in our Community Standards District?

C.170-5

5). What about seismic activity? Leona Valley is bisected by the San Andreas Fault which these towers will traverse. Since the towers are to be placed on slopes and hillsides, have accurate studies been conducted with regard to landslide/liquifaction and the potential catastrophic consequences of a fallen tower? And speaking of fallen towers, what about fallen power lines? These towers and lines pose an enormous fire hazard. Even more hazardous would be the inaccessibility of fire equipment, should it be needed, either from the air or the ground. How then would what is left of this community defend itself?

C.170-6

On a more personal level, this community is our home. Many of us left the hustle and bustle of city life, and all that comes with it, to live here. We don't want to live with pollution, crime, traffic, gangs, stress or, now, huge transmission towers destroying what we have. True, our way of life may not appeal to everyone, but those who live here, do so for a reason. We know a way of life that does not exist much in today's world. Our kids are free to be kids and grow up in a safe and secure environment.

They ride horses and raise livestock to show at the local fair. They grow up with community support and many go on to do amazing things in this world. Our viewscapes are breathtaking and would be destroyed forever by huge transmission towers. We live in tandem with all sorts of wildlife, and we all appreciate how precious that really is. Many of us work our land and enjoy the fruits of those labors, both figuratively and literally. Over the years, we have, as a community, found ourselves defending our community from those who threaten it. While others see opportunity and dollar signs, we see beauty and appreciate the rural atmosphere and historical significance of our beloved valley. Once it is gone, it is gone, and it will never be again.

Sincerely,
Dr. And Mrs. David Gantenbein
10703 Leona Ave.
Leona Valley, CA 93551
dajazoo@earthlink.net
(661) 270-3253
Mailing address:
P.O.Box 715
Leona Valley, CA
93551-7100

Cc: The Honorable George Runner
The Honorable Sharon Runner
The Honorable Michael Antonovich
Leona Valley Town Council
Jody Noiron
Mr. John Boccio
Aspen Environmental Group
USDA Forest Service, Ms. Marian Kadota
Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

Response to Comment Set C.170: Dr. David and Janice Gantenbein

- C.170-1 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding the Project's noticing procedures and review period. On September 13, the CPUC and the Forest Service formally extended the public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS to October 3, 2006.
- C.170-2 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.3.10.2, the construction and operation of Alternative 5 would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated to both wildlife habitat and species along the Alternative 5 route.
- C.170-3 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.8.10.2, the construction and operation of Alternative 5 would result in less-than-significant impacts to water quality and available groundwater.
- C.170-4 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.8.10.2, the construction and operation of Alternative 5 would result in less-than-significant impacts to water quality and available groundwater.
- C.170-5 As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.10.10.2, Alternative 5 would result in less-than-significant operational noise impacts.
- C.170-6 As discussed in Section C.5.10.2, damage related to earthquake induced phenomena would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.