Comment Set C.202: Leo Rohaley

Date; 10-3-06
Name; Leo Rohaley
Address; 9769 Northside Dr.
City,State,Zip Code; Leona Valley,CA. 93551
Phone: 661-270-9452
Email: mrro@firedept.net

I'm opposed to Alternative 5 because of the following reasons.

Health issues; Cancer, Leukema, abortions and related illness associated with EMF's. C.202-1

increased air pollution, this alternative causes the 2nd highest air pollution according to your own report.

I have property in close proximity of the proposed route which will greatly affect property values. C.202-2

being in a high brush area, with the overhead lines in the area, In the event of a Fire, the overhead wires would hinder Fire Suppression , causing more loss of property. C.202-3

it would also increase Fire Insurance for everyone.

Destroying natural habitat of domestic animals, and existing wildlife

Being on a fixed income,the financial impact added to my electric bill to pay for the project will be a hardship.

This being a Military corridor, the Tower height would require beacons on them, which is against Leona Valley cc&r, where no street lights, intruding flashing lights are not permitted. C.202-4

I moved to Leona Valley 30 yrs. Ago to raise our family in a safe healthy environment.

At this time there are 3 generations of family living here. Raising animals,Learning about life growing up to be responsible citizens and living in a clean envirment.

With your project with SCE,you would be destroying the value to this valley.

This area will be impacted with all the envirmental changes. The personal feelings of everyone, not just The immediate families under the proposed route.

Thank you

Leo Rohaley

Demanding a reply please:

RECEIVED
OCT - 4 2006
BY:.....

Response to Comment Set C.202: Leo Rohaley

C.202-1 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.

C.202-2 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.

C.202-3 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.

C.202-4 The military corridor referred to in the comment is assumed to be associated with Edwards Air Force Base. As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Section C.13, Traffic and Transportation, FAA guidelines state that a project could potentially have a significant impact on aviation activities if a structure is positioned such that it would be more than 200 feet above the ground. For Alternative 5, the transmission towers within Leona Valley would be single-circuit 500-kV towers which range in height from 113 to 178 feet. As this is below the FAA guidelines limit of 200 feet, no lighting or "beacons" are proposed for the transmission towers, similar to other 500-kV towers that traverse through the Antelope Valley. As such, Alternative 5 would not conflict with Leona Valley CC&Rs. Please note that CC&Rs are not applicable to projects approved by State or federal agencies.