Comment Set C.78: Jeanne Pickering

From: Boccio, John [mailto:JBX@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 3:05 PM
To: JDavidson@aspeneg.com; Flynn, Thomas
Subject: FW: Antelope-Pardee 500-kv Transmission Project

From: jmpick@cwaveisp.net [mailto:jmpick@cwaveisp.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 2:24 PM
To: Boccio, John
Subject: Antelope-Pardee 500-kv Transmission Project

I can't believe any person or government agency(ie CPUC/US Forest Service) would consider Alternate Route 5 as a possibiley for Edicson to build a new high tension transmission lline, insted of the desolate forest service land. I question the ethics and legality how this decision process has come about, since the proerty owners affected by your Alternate Route 5 were not proerly personally notified about this impending project. I thought I was living in the United States. This is an underhanded and unAmerican way to take what individuals have worked for- **their homes.** Put the line through the proposed route, through the forest service land. It is shorter, thus costing less. Less of a fire risk than Alternate 5. Alternate 5 will expose the grestest number of residences to noise associated with construction, operation, and maintenance activites than any other alternate or proposed project. No person would obect to the proposed project route except for the US Forest Service.

C.78-1

C.78-2

Jeanne Pickering
35740 Brian Ave.
Agua Dulce, CA 91390

Response to Comment Set C.78: Jeanne Pickering

C.78-1 Thank you for expressing your concern regarding Alternative 5. Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.

C.78-2 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.

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.

Alternative 5 would result in significant and unavoidable (Class I) noise impacts during construction and operation, specifically inspection and maintenance activities. Noise impacts associated with Alternative 5 are discussed in detail in Section C.10.10 of the EIR/EIS.