

July 20, 2009

Dear Mr. Uchida,

My name is Terrance Peltzer; I currently farm 1500 acres of citrus in Tulare County with my family. I strongly oppose Routes 2 & 6 and would like you to reconsider Route 3 for the following reasons:

- We do not know the impact associated during the construction phase or how agricultural lands will be impacted.
- We do not know the impact of construction and the GHG emissions that will result from the construction. We know that Greenhouse Emissions must be part of all environmental studies and reports. From what we have read the EIR does not adequately address these issues.
- Also in reading your report you do not take into consideration the cultural practices for ag and impacts/disruption to activities like pest abatement, aerial applications and dust control management which may be restricted greatly under or around the transmission lines.
- The EIR does not appropriately address the impact that our agricultural lands will have in regards to irrigation. Our land will be significantly impacted, the feasibility of us being able to relocate or replace the wells will be extremely costly and in some cases impossible.
- If we loss acreage it will ultimately affect the quality of life on rural families and farm properties due to route impact. This would reduce profitability and may eliminate jobs in the community.
- According to EIR (as stated on 3-15) Route 3 would meet both the basic project objectives, and meets all legal, regulatory, and technical feasibility criteria. As proposed in Route 1, Route 3 would result in fewer acres of farmland being removed permanently. The impacts would be similar on Cultural Resources as to the Proposed Route (Route 1). Route 3 only major issue is due to the vernal pools, which PACE has figured out an alternative to address this.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,


Terrance M. Peltzer