Comment Set D.20: Patrick E. Hood

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Scoping Comments
Proposed Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Project

Date: 9-7-06
Name*: PATRICK E. HOOD
Affiliation (If any):* BY:-------------------------
Address*: 39625 N. 87 ST. W.
City, State, Zip Code*: LEONA VALLEY, CA. 93551
Telephone Number*: 661-270-1057
Email*: I CAN'T BELIEVE THAT ANY ALTERNATIVE TO S.C.E. PROPOSAL IS A Viable solution to this problem. There have been high voltage lines and towers in the S.C.E. proposed area for over a half century. The power lines cross the san andreas fault which poses a potential hazard. Alternative S. would run the power lines parallel to the san andreas fault zigzagging through our community. This has the potential for a catastrophic disaster. The forest service says that alternative S. would benefit aggressive fire suppression and firefighter safety in the A.M.E. This may be true in the A.M.E. However, it would greatly increase the danger to firefighters and hinder their ability to fight fires in the Leona Valley area. It seems that the forest service is more concerned with saving some brush in the forest than the homes and lives of the folk living in Leona Valley.

It is a fact that children living in areas that have high voltage lines have greater rates of brain tumors and leukemia.

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be postmarked by September 18, 2006. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (661) 215-5152 or emailed to antelope-pardee@aspeneg.com.
A friend, who has worked on similar projects for oil companies, tells me that Alternative 5 could cost 100 times as much as S.C.C.'s proposed route.

Another friend, an electrical engineer, tells me that depending on the number of cables, the diameter of the cables and the material the cables are made of, could cause a 20% dropage in the S.C.C. proposed route. Alternative 5 could be up to a 30% dropage in the voltage.

Do the right thing and keep these power lines away from the people.

Thank you,
Pot Hood
Response to Comment Set D.20: Patrick E. Hood

D.20-1 As discussed in the Draft EIR/EIS Section C.5.10.2, Alternative 5 would be subject to moderate to severe groundshaking from the same major faults in the region as the proposed Project, which could result in damage to Project structures (Impact G-6), a significant impact. To reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels (Class II), Mitigation Measure G-6 (Reduce Effects of Groundshaking) has been recommended.

D.20-2 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.

D.20-3 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding health concerns associated with EMF.

D.20-4 Thank you for submitting your opinion on the Project. Please see the response to Comment C.36-1 regarding Project cost, and the response to Comment C.19-7 regarding transmission loss along Alternative 5.