Comment Set C.113: Marcella E. Mahan

Mr John Boccio  
CPUC, EIR Project Manager  
Aspen Environmental Group  
30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215  
Agoura Hills Ca. 913011

Reference: Antelope Pardee 500kV Transmission Project  
I wish to state my opposition to Alternative 4 (the pink route) and Alternative 5 both High Tension Line Corridors that cross Leona Valley, Ca. for the following reasons.

1. Potential interference or damage of water resources, due to construction/demolition and erosion caused by such activities.

2. Devaluation of property due to viewscape interference and health risks associated with EMF'S CANCER RATES INCREASED 50 PERCENT FOR PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY CHILDREN, LIVING IN PROXIMITY TO TRANSMISSION LINES.PER PROVEN STATISTICAL STUDIES.

3. Potential of School Closure due to loss of families in Leona Valley.

4. Increased tax basis if you are forced to relocate.

5. Increased insurance premiums due to increased fire risk.

6. Interference with disaster/emergency preparedness (water dropping helicopters would not be able to reach some areas due to the positioning of the towers).

8. Increased fire hazard due to location of transmission lines along the fault line.

9. Health and safety concerns:  
a. Childhood leukemia and spontaneous abortions associated with EMF'S  
b. Increased traffic (demolition and construction vehicle traveling through local school zone).  
c. 4,605 tons of waste created by project (according to their own report).  
d. Increased air pollution (this alternative causes second highest air pollution according to their own report).

10. The greatest number of residences exposed to noise.

11. The greatest demand on public services due to extended route length.

12. Threat to existing wildlife on private lands.

13. Increased cost of completing the project Alternate 4 and 5 is the longest and impacts on the most private property.

14. The greatest demand on public services due to the extended route length.

Signed: Marcella E. Mahan  
8728 Leona Avenue P.O. Box 825  
Leona Valley, Ca. 93551-0825
Response to Comment Set C.113: Marcella E. Mahan

C.113-1 Thank you for submitting your opinion regarding Alternative 4 and 5.

C.113-2 The list of reasons 1 thru 11 are the same as submitted by commenter C.9 and C.44.

1 = See response C.9-3

2 = See response C.9-5 & C.9-11

3 = See response C.9-7

4 = See response C.9-9

5 = See response C.9-8

6 = See response C.9-4

8 = See response C.9-8

9 = See response C.9-11&12 and C.44-7&8

10 = See response C.44-3

11 = See response C.44-5

12 = The Draft EIR/EIS acknowledges that Alternative 5 would cross lands containing natural plant communities that support populations of native wildlife. Section C.3.10.1.3 (Alternative 5 Existing Conditions) of this Draft EIR/EIS provides specific information addressing the native plant and animal communities that are known to occur along the Alternative 5 alignment. Based on the evaluation of information identified in this EIR/EIS, Alternative 5 is not expected to result in significant unmitigable impacts to biological resources. Section C.3.10.2 (Impacts and Mitigation Measures) provides a description of the proposed impacts and identifies mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

13 = Although project cost is not discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS, we agree that due to the increased length it would cost substantially more than the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC

14 = (Comment 11 is the same as this comment)