Comment Set C.221: Richard A. Monstein

----- Forwarded by Marian Kadota/R5/USDAFS on 10/10/2006 07:42 AM -----

----- Forwarded by Jody Noiron/R5/USDAFS on 10/09/2006 07:53 AM -----

"Richard A. Monstein" <rmonstein@socal. rr.com>

10/03/2006 01:38PM

To
<jnoiron@fs.fed.us>

cc

Subject
Antelope Pardee 500kV Transmission Project by SCE Application No. A.04-12-007

Dear Jody,

Our community is strongly opposed to Alternate 5 – Antelope Pardee Sierra Pelona Re-Route of the above reference project. C.221-1

The Alternate 5 route abandons a designed utility corridor on public National Forest Service land to be replaced by a new 18.8 mile utility corridor on private land. Relocation of this utility corridor will displace people, homes, and businesses. There is no justification for condemnation or removal of personal property or homes when adequate right-of-ways are already present. C.221-2

Operational activities of the transmission project will substantially decrease property values along the Alternate 5 route alignment. The draft EIR/EIS indicates there are 103 parcels what will be traversed by the route. Yet the actual route is unknown and the detailed alignment studies will not be initiated unless this alternate is approved. The number of impacted property owners could be far greater than indicated. C.221-3 C.2214

Additionally, National Forest Service policy and providing adequate fire protection to our National Forests should not outweigh the safety and fire protection of a community in a very high fire danger zone, with limited improved road infrastructure. C.221-5

The significantly longer route of Alternate 5 results in a greater environmental impact to air quality, biological resources, Hydrology and water quality, land use and public recreation, noise, public services, traffic and transportation, and utilities and service systems. C.221-6

The Draft EIR/EIS fails to adequately evaluate the impacts of socioeconomic, cultural and visual impacts of Alternate 5. The decreased quality of Life, condemnation of homes and businesses, and the unsightly towers will destroy our community's value. Overall, this alternate would not substantially lessen any impacts of the proposed project without creating greater impacts of its own. Therefore, Alternate 5 should be eliminated from further consideration. C.221-7 C.221-8

I urge you to take a strong position opposing the proposed Alternate 5 route of the project.

Sincerely,

Embedded image moved to file: pic04488.jpg)

Richard A. Monstein
32920 Agua Dulce Cyn. Rd.
Santa Clarita, CA, 91390-4868
661-268-0888 Fax
661-510-1500 Cell
661-310-0308 Phone
E-Mail: rmonstein@socal.rr.com
Web: www.rammarina.com

Response to Comment Set C.221: Richard A. Monstein

C.221-1 Thank you for submitting your opinion regarding Alternative 5.

C.221-2 As discussed in General Response GR-4, Alternative 5 was considered to respond to USDA Forest Service requirements to consider a route on non-NFS lands, although a relatively small portion of Alternative 5 would continue to cross NFS lands.

C.222-3 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values.

C.222-4 Your findings are consistent with the Draft EIR/EIS.

C.222-5 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.222-6 The impacts of Alternative 5 relative to the proposed Project and other alternatives are discussed in detail in Section D.4 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

C.222-7 Impacts related to these various issue areas are adequately addressed in the EIR/EIS within their respective issue area sections. Please see Draft EIR/EIS Section C.4, Cultural Resources, Section C.12, Socioeconomics, and Section C.15, Visual Resources.

C.222-8 Thank you for your comments and opinions on Alternative 5. These will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.