Comment Set C.3: Senator George Runner, California State Senate, 17th District

August 25, 2006

John Boccio, CPUC, EIR Project Manager
Marian Kadota, Forest Service, EIR Manager
Aspen Environment Group
30423 Canwood St., Suite 215
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Dear Mr. Boccio and Ms. Kadota:

I am strongly opposed to the California Public Utilities Commission’s proposed alternative 5 route to the Southern California Edison proposed Antelope Transmission Project of segment 1.

Southern California Edison’s proposal makes proper use of existing right-of-ways and it is reasonably shorter than the CPUC proposed alternative, making it much less likely to cause negative environmental impacts.

Eminent domain is a governmental power that should be used only as a last resort, especially when we are dealing with a personal property and homes. There is absolutely no justification to take away 30 plus homes when existing right-of-ways are sufficient.

My office and I will continue to monitor the approval process and I look forward to working with you to ensure that eminent domain is not abused in the completion of this project.

Please do not hesitate to contact me regarding this or any other project affecting my district or my constituents.

Sincerely,

GEORGE RUNNER
Senator, 17th District

Cc: President Michael Peevey
    Commissioner Dian Grueneich
    Commissioner Geoffrey Brown
    Commissioner John Bohn
    Commissioner Rachelle Chong
    Delaney Hunter, Director CPUC Governmental Affairs
    Alis Clausen, Southern California Edison

WWW.SEN.CA.GOV/RUNNER
Response to Comment Set C.3: Senator George Runner, California State Senate, 17th District

C.3-1 Thank you for submitting your opinion on Alternative 5.

C.3-2 Alternative 5 would not entail the removal of 30 homes. As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, the alternative alignment would be constructed across approximately 103 privately owned parcels. 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 any engineering design or routing studies for Alternative 5, the EIR/EIS has assumed that the removal of one or more homes could 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.