

Comment Set C.149: Maureen M. Hendren

----- Forwarded by Marian Kadota/R5/USDAFS on 10/02/2006 07:32 AM -----

"maureen" <maureen00@adelphia.net>

09/28/2006 08:15P

To
<jmh@cpuc.ca.gov>, <jnoiron@fs.fed.us>

cc

Subject
Antelope-Pardee 500-kv transmission project

Honorable Julie Halligan
Administrative Law Judge
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue Room 5101
San Francisco, Ca 94103

Ms. Jody Noiron
Supervisor Angeles National Forest

I wish to make a few points against the Antelope-Pardee project.

I am a resident of Leona Valley. I have enjoyed the beautiful surroundings and am dismayed that the residents of Leona Valley will have their beautiful valley scared by high tension lines running through our town and in some cases, our houses and yards.

It had occurred to me that Leona Valley is very much in line with the goals of the Angeles National Forestry Services, as far as land conservation. Large parcels of land have been set aside so everyone can enjoy the open spaces. There can be no house built on property less than 2 1/2 acres.

While I do not want our National Forests to be slashed by high tension wires, neither do I feel that our little town should be felled by these unsightly, dangerous and polluting towers of steel particularly to feed the insatiable appetite of Santa Clarita. Santa Clarita has overproduced homes and have become the new concrete jungle.

C.149-1

The SC Valley reminds me of the plant in the Little Shop of Horrors...."FEED ME" It bellows as it grows bigger and bigger while being fed more and more.

It is time for the residents of these densely populated hell holes of stucco to start conserving and it is time for Newhall Land and Dev. To stop building until they can come up with their own solutions to this problem, a solution that does not include destroying small areas that respect and conserve the land including it's wildlife and plantlife.

Some of the most pressing issues regarding to Alternate 5, otherwise known as the Atelope-Pardee 500 kv projects is the devaluation of our property values, increase fire hazards (we are in a very volatile fire area and depend on helicopter drops to put out fires).

C.149-2

C.149-3

Also, to go forward with the Antelope-Pardee 599 kv transmission project will cost millions of dollars more than the other proposals as it is the longest

route proposed and will negatively impact the largest number of private properties.

I hope that you will consider another route for this project or stop the project altogether and let the throngs living in the Santa Clarita Valley do what they should have been doing all along, conserving.

C.149-4

I wish to also take this time to thank you both for providing your employees to speak with us at our Town Council meetings. These women were professional, poised, understanding and knowledgeable while under quite a bit of pressure. You should be proud that these women work for you. I would be.

Thank you so much for your time. Please remember that the Forestry Service and the unincorporated town of Leona Valley are very similar in our goals and hopefully both will last for years in its original form for our future generation.

Respectfully,

Maureen M. Hendren
Leona Valley Resident

Response to Comment Set C.149: Maureen M. Hendren

- C.149-1 Please note that the project's intended purpose is to deliver power from current and future renewable power sources in the Antelope Valley and Tehachapi areas to SCE's high electrical demand areas. Based on the California Independent System Operator (CAISO), power will initially go to the Antelope Valley from Santa Clarita.
- C.149-2 Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC. Please also see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.
- C.149-3 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.149-4 Please see General Response GR-4 regarding the identification, screening, and analysis of proposed Project Alternatives.