## Comment Set C.32: Eunhee Anne Son and Young T. Son

**From:** anne son [mailto:eunhee.son@gmail.com]
**Sent:** Mon 9/4/2006 8:16 PM
**To:** Antelope-Pardee Project
**Cc:** horsinground@aol.com; steve93030@adelphia.net
**Subject:** Opposition to the Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project

Re: Proposed Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project (Alternative 5: Antelope-Pardee Sierra Pelona Re-Route)

Date: September 4, 2006
Name: Eunhee Anne Son, Young T. Son
Address: Lot #APN 3205-030-007, Palmdale, California 93551.
Telephone Number: 310-503-8029
Email: eunhee.son@gmail.com

Dear California Public Utilities Commision:

We are property owners in Leona Valley who were shocked to learn recently (by sheer accident) that according to Alternative 5 (Antelope-Pardee Sierra Pelona Re-Route) the Southern California Edison proposes to construct electrical towers and lines that will cut through the middle of our property. We oppose such a project, not simply because of property devaluation, but because it is nothing less than killing our lifelong dreams. C.32-1

We have recently had two wells dug on our property, completed a land and topographic survey, and now are poised to begin leveling the land to construct a home that we have been saving and working towards all our lives. We chose this site explicitly because of the pristine natural environment, the abundance of wildlife, and the quiet unspoiled vistas without the pollution of commercial development and electric wires. We also enjoy the small town feel of the community and have even begun to attend church locally. Because of the time, money, and effort we have invested thus far in making the Leona Valley our home, we consider ourselves a part of the community though our house itself has not yet been constructed.

Ironically, we have also paid for the extensive training of our contracted architect in solar energy platforms so that we would be able to build a clean, environmentally friendly and self-sustaining home that would not be dependent on local energy providers and produce unnecessary pollution to the area. To learn that all of our efforts could be quashed because of power lines and electric towers is the ultimate injustice.

We wonder if anyone at the SCE has parents, grandparents or loved ones who they might be able to imagine in this predicament. Would they let their families have their hard earned homes and dreams ruined or taken away from them? This sort of violence to a community should not be able to take place without a fair fight.

We would like to draw attention to the following points of contention regarding the SCE Alternative 5 transmission project.

First, as the legal property owners we were never formally informed of the project. We learned of it only accidentally by word of mouth without much time to respond adequately. We demand that we be given more time to appropriately protect our rights as property owners. C.32-2

Second, the construction of power lines and towers through our property will make our land useless for residential purposes. We have already incurred significant expenses in the process of surveying, digging wells, and otherwise preparing the land for residential construction. These are considerable expenses that we will need to have reimbursed by the SCE should the transmission project be rerouted through our land. C.32-3

Third, the construction of power lines will negate all the reasons that we originally bought the property. It will not only make it impossible for us to construct our residence on our land as planned, but it will be a visual eyesore, will cause sound and air pollution to the immediate area, with the promise of certain damage to our health and safety. C.32-4

Fourth, all the water on our property will be supplied by two wells that have already been constructed. The construction of electric lines and towers has the potential to pollute the underground water supply rendering our property without clean potable water. This will make our land inhabitable as there are currently no city water services supplied to this area. C.32-5

Fifth, the construction of power lines through our property will make the air over and surrounding our residence impassable to any fire and ambulance service in the case of fire or medical emergencies. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention will not fly their helicopters over and provide service to areas obstructed by power lines. C.32-6

Sixth, our land is currently in a pristine natural state and is host to many different forms of wildlife—birds, mammals, reptiles—that we are keen to preserve and protect. These power lines and towers will destroy their natural habitats. This will degrade the local environment significantly. C.32-7

Seventh, we believe that the other alternative route, through the Veluzat Motion Picture Ranch and the Bouquet Canyon Stone Quarry, will affect fewer lives than the proposed Alternative Route 5, which passes through our community. We can only construe any decision to put the *commercial* concerns of the movie and construction industry over the concerns of the residents of the Leona Valley to represent a serious lack of goodwill and concern for the economic and physical well being of all the Californian citizens who live here, pay taxes and vote. It is this information that is the greatest outrage to us because it demonstrates a clear dismissal of human welfare for the sake of business interests. C.32-8

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours,

Eunhee Anne Son
Young T. Son
(Current address: 10627 Ashton Avenue #105, Los Angeles, California 90024)

## Response to Comment Set C.32: Eunhee Anne Son and Young T. Son

C.32-1 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on local property values.

C.32-2 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding the Project's noticing procedures and review period.

C.32-3 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding the Project's potential effect on local property values and General Response GR-2 for a discussion of property acquisition.

C.32-4 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding potential health hazards associated with EMF exposure. Impacts V-20 through V-21 as discussed beginning on page C.15-113 in Section C.15 (Visual Resources) of the Draft EIR/EIS acknowledge that a significant an unavoidable visual impact would occur in the Leona Valley area as a result of implementation of Alternative 5.

C.32-5 The supply and quality of water resources, including groundwater, would not be significantly affected by the proposed Project or an alternative. As discussed in Section C.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the Draft EIR/EIS, implementation of the proposed Project or an alternative is not expected to significantly interfere with groundwater supply and recharge (Criterion HYD2). In addition, best management practices used during construction and operation would protect the quality of groundwater resources. If the proposed Project or an alternative is approved, the required implementation of mitigation measures during construction and operation would ensure protection of surface water and groundwater quality and supply.

C.32-6 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.32-7 The Draft EIR/EIS acknowledges that Alternative 5 would cross lands containing natural plant communities that support populations of native wildlife. Section C.3.10.1.3 (Alternative 5 Existing Conditions) of this Draft EIR/EIS provides specific information addressing the native plant and animal communities that are known to occur along the Alternative 5 alignment. Based on the evaluation of information identified in this EIR/EIS, Alternative 5 is not expected to result in significant unmitigable impacts to biological resources. Section C.3.10.2 (Impacts and Mitigation Measures) provides a description of the proposed impacts and identifies mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

C.32-8 Your comment will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.