

Letter EA: Valerie Leatherwood (January 19, 2021)**Emily Hyland**

From: val@samkel.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 12:12 PM
To: estrellaproject@horizonh2o.com
Subject: COMMENTARY - City Council Meeting 1-19-21 Agenda Item #18]

Greetings Mr Mayor, City Council Member and fellow Circle B HOA Members,

This letter is a commentary on this evenings Agenda Item #18, the Draft EIR (DEIR) for PG&E's proposed Estrella Substation and Paso Robles Reinforcement Project and most specifically, the proposed routing of the 70kV Transmission Line. This project is to provide a secondary parallel backup power source for the existing 70kV Transmission line that now runs along North/South River Road from San Miguel to Templeton.

EA-1 Many of my fellow Circle B Springs homeowners have written about our concern of the proposed project and the speculation of health concerns related to the project. Although I am in complete agreement with the health concerns, the argument can be made that these are speculative. What is not speculative is the **PERCEIVED IMPACT ON OUR PROPERTY VALUES.**

Real Estate appraisers do not have to debate or wait for scientific conclusions about the effects of EMF on human health. In the evaluation of properties near power lines, the perceived issues and public awareness of the adverse effects on human health are **major determinants of value and therefore must be considered.**

One survey questioned those members of the American Appraisal Institute holding the RM (Residential Member) designation and found that 84 percent of those surveyed "believe that HVOETLs (high voltage overhead electric transmission lines) reduce the value of residential property located near the lines."

This information is very compelling, considering the source. Another study concluded "that proximity to a power line is associated with diminished selling prices."

Without getting too lengthy, I have done some research on property value impact of relative projects and the successful legal proceedings of filing an inverse condemnation lawsuit may be the only avenue available for the recovery of these losses in value by a property owner. We sincerely hope it does not come to that.

Should this vote go in favor of the proposed substation, I will be urging all of my fellow Circle B Springs owners to obtain appraisals prior to construction to be compared to post construction values to be considered in inverse condemnation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Valerie Leatherwood
 Circle B Homeowner
 408 391-7891

Response to Comment EA-1

This comment is an email that was addressed to the Mayor, City Council for Paso Robles, and other Circle B Homeowners Association (HOA) members (although it was sent to the CPUC's Estrella Project email address). The letter was in response to a City Council Meeting that was held on January 19, 2021, with regards to an Agenda Item #18 discussing the Proposed Project. The comment states that the commenter is in agreement with the concerns raised by fellow HOA members with regards to health concerns (presumably in relation to EMF from transmission lines). The commenter recognizes that such health concerns are speculative, but asserts that the perceived health impacts have adverse impacts on property values. The commenter suggests filing an inverse condemnation lawsuit against the CPUC due to property value impacts from the Proposed Project.

The comment briefly discusses a survey of the American Appraisal Institute finding that 84 percent of those surveyed "believe that...high voltage overhead electric transmission lines...reduce the value of residential property located near the lines." This limited survey given to residential homeowners for their opinion does not provide substantial evidence to support the commenter's conclusion that property values would be affected by the Proposed Project. The comment also briefly discusses an unidentified study concluding "that proximity to a power line is associated with diminished selling prices." These comments constitute unsubstantiated opinion and discussion of economic impacts that neither contribute to, nor are caused by, physical impacts on the environment. These comments do not amount to substantial evidence of any CEQA error. (See CEQA Guidelines Section 15384(a).)

For the CPUC's response to comments related to potential health impacts from EMF, please refer to Master Response 2. For the CPUC's response to comments related to effects on property values, refer to Master Response 7.