

Comment Set C.36: William Larry Tyler

09/01/2006 13:59 6612703213

LARRY TYLER4

1.15

September 1, 2006

John Boccio/Marian Kadota
CPUC/USDA Forest Service
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215
Agoura Hills, CA. 91301
FAX: 661/215-5152

Reference: Antelope-Pardee 500-KV Transmission Project

Gentlemen,

At the August 28, 2006 Public Meeting I obtained a copy of the Draft EIR/EIS. I reviewed the document. I also listened to the presentation and the public comments, all from a laypersons point of view, and offer the following thoughts and conclusions:

1. Ratepayers will pay the COST of the project, the users of electricity furnished by SCE. As a ratepayer, it is in my interest to see the project build, if it is to be built, at the lowest possible dollar cost.
2. The Proposed Project would be the lease costly because the ROW is already available and only 2.8 miles of new ROW will need to be obtained. The Proposed Project is also the shortest distance, and will require the fewest number of towers if no underground construction is included. **THAT MAKES THE PROPOSED PROJECT THE MOST ACCEPTABLE TO RATEPAYERS.**
3. Alternate 5 would be the costliest to build. It would require the acquisition of 18.8 miles of new ROW, is the longest in distance at 37.2 miles, and would require the greatest number of new towers. **THAT MAKES ALTERNATE 5 THE LEAST ACCEPTABLE TO RATEPAYERS.**
4. Alternate 5 is also the only alternate that would necessitate considerable infringement on private property. That includes ROW and the outright removal of existing homes, barns or sheds.
5. It is noted in the EIR/EIS that "connection to the power systems of other power utilities is possible". If the Proposed Plan is not acceptable, other means of providing power need to be utilized, not alternate 5.
6. Alternate 5 encroaches on more private property than the Proposed Project, and as such, will cause a hardship fighting forest fires along the route when airborne equipment will not be able to fly and drop when a fire gets close to property. This could cause the loss of many homes, barns, shed and livestock in the area that is agricultural and has an abundance of livestock.
7. Alternate 2 and Alternate 4 were determined to be superior to Alternate 5 when considering environmental impacts, in accordance with Section ES.4.3.
8. Alternate 5 creates numerous Class 1 Visual Resource impacts. These are permanent impacts, and cause a negative impact.
9. A newer technology that has apparently been used in Europe is DC power transmission. It apparently has several advantages, including heat, EMF, and no overhead towers. Have DC installations been considered, and are they feasible?

C.36-1

C.36-2

C.36-3

C.36-4

C.36-5

C.36-6

C.36-7

09/01/2006 13:59 6612703213

LARRY TYLER4

PAGE 02/02

Page 2
John Boccio/Marian Kadota

I urge you to utilize the Proposed Plan for the new transmission system that is needed. I also urge you to EXCLUDE alternate 5 from consideration of the route for the new transmission line. Although the Proposed Plan will require the continued encroachment in the ANF, it is the least intrusive on the lives of numerous property owners along its 37.2 mile route, and will be the least objectionable to viewers of the new towers over the years.

C.36-8

Sincerely



William Larry Tyler
40255 98th Street West
Leona Valley, CA. 93551
661/270-1070

Response to Comment Set C.36: William Larry Tyler

- C.36-1 Thank you for submitting your views regarding Project costs.
- C.36-2 As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, the majority of land uses that would be restricted as a result of Alternative 5 would be the erection of new structures within the alternative ROW. However, given that SCE has not conducted construction or final alignment and design studies for Alternative 5, the EIR/EIS has assumed that the removal of one or more homes may occur. As such, Section C.9.10.2 (Impact L-3) concluded that potential impacts to residential land uses as a result of Alternative 5 would be significant and unavoidable.
- C.36-3 Thank you for your suggestion. Although not consistent with the stated Project objectives, connections of future wind energy projects to the transmission systems of other utilities may be possible, but has not been studied in detail. Your comment will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.36-4 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.36-5 Your comment will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.36-6 As noted in Section D, Table D.4-14, Alternative 5 would result in twenty (20) Class I, significant, unavoidable visual impacts.
- C.36-7 As discussed in Section B.3 of the Draft EIR/EIS a range of alternatives were identified through the scoping process. The use of High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) transmission was not a consideration for this Project since for overhead and underground transmission lines HVDC systems are very similar to High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) transmission lines.

To meet the Project need would require an HVDC line in the 250-kV dc range which would use lattice support structures or multiple underground cable ductbanks similar to the other alternatives evaluated for the HVAC line. Furthermore, HVDC transmission lines are substantially different in terms of the additional ac-dc converter station facilities that are required at each end of an HVDC transmission line. In addition, HVDC transmission lines are significantly different from an operating standpoint creating some questions for integrating an HVDC line into the transmission network in a way to reliably meet the Project need.

In view of the additional construction and impacts associated with ac-dc converter station facilities and the similarity of the overhead support structures or underground cable ductbanks to HVAC lines, an HVDC alternative does not warrant further consideration.

- C.36-8 Thank you for submitting your opinion on the Project.