

Comment Set C.69: Laurie Ostrom

From: laurieostrom@aol.com [mailto:laurieostrom@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2006 1:29 PM
To: antelope-pardee@aspeneg.com
Subject: Fwd: Antelope-Pardee 500 kV Transmission Project

Good Afternoon,

I respectfully request that you grant additional time to review and comment on the draft environmental impact report/environmental impact statement on the application of Southern California Edison Company (U-338-E) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Concerning the Antelope-Pardee 500kV (Segment 1) Transmission Project ("SCE Transmission Project:")

C.69-1

I am a resident of Agua Dulce, residing at 35431 Anthony Road. I have good cause to request this extension to the public comment period, as my home is directly impacted by the proposed Alternative 5 outlined in the above mentioned report. Alternative 5, as far as I am able to discern from this very lengthy, complicated document, will pass directly through, or very near our home, possibly condemning our home. At the very least, Alternative 5 will impact my family negatively by reducing our home and property value, causing potential health risks to myself and my children as well as my neighbors and community, possibly contaminating my ground/well water, contaminating our air quality, creating visual and audio degradation, disrupting traffic to our streets and highways, impacting the economy of my community as well as disrupting the quality of life of our entire community. I was not made aware of this undertaking until 5:00pm on August 30th, and did not receive specific details until attending the public meeting held at 6:30pm on August 30th. As far as I am aware, none of my neighbors or community officials received prior notice either.

C.69-2

C.69-3

As I have previously mentioned, the DEIR is quite lengthy and difficult to understand. I believe that I will need legal assistance in order to fully understand the impact of this project to my home, family and community. We have only been given two weeks from initial notification to comment.

Some of the key issues regarding Alternative 5 that have given me great cause for concern are:

- Alternative 5 is 45% longer than the originally proposed project, and longer than any other proposed alternative
- Alternative 5 has nearly 19 miles of transmission lines outside of a designated utility corridor
- Alternative 5 will take 23% longer to construct (6:30am to 5:00pm Monday through Saturday through our community and homes)
- Alternative 5 traverses 103 privately owned parcels, and will likely result in the removal of existing homes and businesses, displacing families and community members in both Agua Dulce and Leona Valley
- Alternative 5 is within a mile of Vasquez Rocks Natural Area, a beloved and historic State park often used in film
- Alternative 5 will cost substantially more than the original proposal
- Alternative 5 will expose the greatest number of people to noise associated with construction, operation and maintenance than any other alternative or the original proposal

C.69-4

- Alternative 5 creates a greater fire risk to human life and property than the original proposal or any of the alternatives
- Alternative 5 has 9 more road crossings than the proposed project, including 2 crossing of the 14 freeway
- Alternative 5 is located within 1 mile of Agua Dulce Airport. The 220 foot tall towers will be a hazard to navigation at an already complicated landing strip.
- Alternative 5 introduces a new 19 mile utility corridor and would create a huge visual impact to a currently non impacted area
- Alternative 5 introduces corona noise for the first time to 19 additional miles of land, wildlife and residents.

C.69-4
(cont.)

Please understand that I am not recommending any of the other alternatives as a better solution, I am only pointing out the devastating impacts of Alternative 5 as I understand it at this time. I love our forests and wildlife, and also wish to preserve our natural areas, but not at the expense of my home, family, neighbors and community.

Please grant us the time to review, understand and intelligently comment on this important project. We deserve the opportunity to communicate with all involved parties.

Regards,

Laurie Ostrom
35431 Anthony Road
Agua Dulce, Ca. 91390
661-268-7400
Laurieostrom@aol.com

Response to Comment Set C.69: Laurie Ostrom

C.69-1 On September 13, the CPUC, as the CEQA Lead Agency, and the USDA Forest Service, as the NEPA Lead Agency, extended the public review period for the Project from 45 days to 60 days, which ended on October 3, 2006.

C.69-2 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values and General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition.

Potential health risks associated with the project are discussed in Section C.6 (Public Health and Safety) of the Draft EIR/EIS.

The impacts to water quality, air quality, visual resources, noise, and traffic as a result of Alternative 5 have been discussed in the EIR/EIS Sections C.8.10, C.2.10, C.15.10, C.10.10, and C.13.10, respectively.

C.69-3 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding noticing procedures and the review period for the Draft EIR/EIS.

C.69-4 Thank you for submitting your concerns regarding Alternative 5. Your comments are consistent with the findings of the Draft EIR/EIS regarding the increased length of Alternative 5, as well as the requirement of Alternative 5 to establish new utility right-of-way (ROW) areas. However, it should be noted that the proposed Project and each of the other four Project alternatives would also require land acquisition for ROW purposes, either for new transmission corridors or for widening of existing transmission corridors.

Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values and General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition.

Vasquez Rocks Natural Area Park would be located approximately 0.8 miles west of the Alternative 5 route, and recreational use of the area would not be affected by the Alternative 5 alignment (see Section C.9.10.1). However, as discussed in Section C.15.10.2 (Impact V-25), impacts to the visual quality of landscape views from Vasquez Rocks as a result of Alternative 5 would be significant and unavoidable.

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.

The impacts to noise, fire risk, and road crossings as a result of Alternative 5 have been discussed in the EIR/EIS Sections C.10.10, C.7.10, and C.13.10, respectively.

Alternative 5 would require double-circuit 500-kV towers to be constructed within the existing Pardee-Vincent corridor between Mile 18.8 and Mile 37.2. As discussed in Section C.13.10 (Traffic and Transportation) regarding Alternative 5, such towers range in height between 175 and 220 feet above the ground surface. However, pursuant to FAA guidelines, SCE would be required to submit FAA Form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, to the Manager of the FAA Air Traffic Division for review and approval of this alternative route. Therefore, towers associated with Alternative 5 would not present a hazard to airport navigation activities.

The impacts to visual resources and noise as a result of Alternative 5 have been discussed in the EIR/EIS Sections C.15.10 and C.10.10, respectively.