

**Comment Set C.208: Richard and Susan Cull**

Richard and Susan Cull  
40068 92nd Street West  
Leona Valley, Ca 93551

RECEIVED  
OCT - 4 2006

BY:.....

October 3, 2006

Dear Sirs,

This letter is to state our emphatic opposition to the proposed power line route through Leona Valley. We are long-time residents of this beautiful area bordering the National Forest. We have worked hard to preserve the unique ecology of our rural habitat. Now this proposed power line threatens our property, our lifestyle, and our community.

It is both unnecessary and unwise to place power lines along the proposed route for several reasons:

1) Power lines of such great size and voltage do not belong in a residential area. These enormous towers will be noisy, ugly eyesores, diminishing our quality of life and property values.

C.208-1

2) The human health risks associated with such high voltage lines are only beginning to be investigated. It is irresponsible to place so many people at risk for future cancer and who knows what else, when a different route could avoid the problem.

C.208-2

3) The route is less efficient, requires many more acres of infringement on private property, and is longer than other possible routes. Our United States government must be committed to the respect of private property owners, and use land that is already government owned for projects such as this whenever possible.

C.208-3

4) Because of its greater length, the proposed line will lose 5% more of the total energy conveyed than the proposed alternate route. How hypocritical is it for our government to work so hard to get people to reduce their electric usage by 5%, and then waste this energy (not to mention land and materials) by building the line 12 miles longer than is necessary?!

5) The proposed route conflicts with the Pacific Coast Trail. This trail was designed by the State of California and has been well used. Why interfere with it unnecessarily?

Please use any influence you have to prevent this power line from being routed through Leona Valley or any other rural residential area. It is unwise, unfair, and inefficient to use the new proposed route. We are depending on your good judgment to stop this grave mistake.

Sincerely,



Richard and Susan Cull

## **Response to Comment Set C.208: Richard and Susan Cull**

- C.208-1 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.208-2 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.
- C.208-3 A number of alternative routes were identified during the Scoping process to avoid the impacts of SCE's proposed Project. SCE's proposed Project and several of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS include the use of existing transmission rights-of-way. However, the proposed Project and each of the alternatives would require the acquisition of land for right-of-way purposes, either for new transmission corridors or for widening of existing transmission corridors. Also, please see General Response GR-4 regarding the development of alternative routes outside of NFS lands.