INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 43: WAIDNER, B. & P.

Response 43-A: Safety of firefighters has been considered in the analysis and comparison of the Alternatives. Firefighting would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Action’s taller towers (refer to Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR). Also please refer to Response 2-A.

September 14, 2011

We believe that moving the power lines to the edge of the forest is a better solution than adding another 60 feet to the current power lines. This would be a benefit to Los Angeles as well as to Green Valley. In case of emergencies and maintenance, the power lines could then have the ability to shut down some of the power lines and not the entire system.

Bob and Patty Waidner
Concerned Green Valley Residents

Bob & Patty Waidner
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 44: WARD, J.

Response 44-A: Safety of firefighters has been considered in the analysis and comparison of the Alternatives. Firefighting would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Action’s taller towers (refer to Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR). Also please refer to Response 2-A.

Response 44-B: The Green Valley Multi-Line Relocation Alternative was considered but eliminated from detailed analysis in the Final EIS/EIR because it did not have the potential to avoid or minimize environmental impacts as compared to the Proposed Action. There is no evidence that costs will be lower over time if LADWP moves the corridor farther to the west as proposed.

Response 44-C: The overwhelming consensus, expressed in multidisciplinary reviews of power line frequency (referred to as ELF or extremely low frequency) electric and magnetic field (EMF) research internationally, is that the epidemiologic evidence is insufficient to demonstrate a causal relationship between EMF and any health effect. These reviews include those made by the most recognized national and international health and research organizations: National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS 1998; NIEHS 1999), the Health Council of the Netherlands (HCN 2001; HCN 2004), the National Radiological Protection Board of Great Britain (NRPB 2001; NRPB 2004b), and the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC 2002). Therefore, moving the power lines for the reason of producing a positive health effect is not reasonable since there are no known health effects for power line frequency EMF.

Response 44-D: We do not expect the maintenance or outage procedures for maintenance would change with the positioning of...
the corridor on the west side of Green Valley. They would remain the same regardless of where the lines are located.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 45: WRIGHT, G. & M.

Response 45-A: Alternative 3 is not the Federal Agency Preferred Alternative, and we understand that your property and that of other private owners would be impacted if Alternative 3 were selected. It is for these reasons and others that Alternative 3 is not the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative as described in Sections 2.7 and 2.8 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Response 45-B: Please refer to Section 3.2.12 in the Final EIS/EIR for a discussion of current international research findings regarding health effects of electric and magnetic fields (EMF). A detailed and comprehensive assessment of electrical effects impacts, including EMF, for each Project Alternative has been presented in Section 4.2.12 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Response 45-C: Alternative 3 is not the Federal Agency Preferred Alternative, and we understand that your property and that of other private owners would be impacted if Alternative 3 were selected. It is for these reasons and others that Alternative 3 is not the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Response 45-D: Your comments will be considered in the decision-making processes prior to final decisions on the Proposed Action by the BLM, USFS, and LADWP.

Response 45-E: Crossing of existing lines is difficult and may result in reliability concerns for both transmission lines, but it is not impossible. Please note that Alternative 3 is not identified as the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative as described in Sections 2.7 and 2.8 of the Final EIS/EIR. Your comments will be considered in the decision-
making processes prior to final decisions on the Proposed Action by the BLM, USFS, and LADWP.

Response 45-F: As described in Sections 2.7 and 2.8 of the Final EIS/EIR, Alternative 3 is not the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative. Your concern for the impacts to private lands will be considered in the decision-making processes prior to final decisions on the Proposed Action by the BLM, USFS, and LADWP.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 46: WRIGHT, G.

Response 46-A: Alternative 3 is not identified as the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative, as described in Sections 2.7 and 2.8 of the Final EIS/EIR, and we understand that your property and that of other private owners would be impacted if Alternative 3 were selected. It is for these reasons and others that Alternative 3 is not the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative.

Dear Commissioner Sayles,

We are very disappointed and upset to see our small community yet again targeted in Alternative 3 for another yet another power transmission line. We certainly understand the desire for power generated from renewable sources. We were also selected and chosen as the preferred alternative in 2006 for the Southern California Edison project, for which construction has been ongoing just above our home for years. In that case we were successful in convincing SCE to reroute the portion of the lines in our area to avert the necessity to impact our ranch and take our neighbors homes. Although the many power lines that are near our home are of concern to us, we were grateful that SCE worked with us to avoid taking our property under the Fifth Amendment.

There is absolutely nothing on the other side of the existing corridor! If our alternative must be chosen, please could you consider supporting routing the line on the other side, avoiding the acquisition of homes and property?

We would be grateful for your advice and any possible support to help us save our homes and horse ranch that we love and want to eventually hand over to our daughters who share our passion for horses and Leona Valley. Please find attached our formal Public Comment Letter and our requests to our Town Council and Congressman McKeon for their support as well.

Sincerely,

George Wright, Capt, USCG (Ret)
5707 Elizabeth Lake Rd.
Leona Valley, CA 93551
661 753 2765 (H)
661 723 2705 (W)
661 803 3772 (C)

Enclosure (1) George and Marian Wright Letter re Barren Ridge Comment to Draft EIR
Enclosure (2) Wright letter to Congressman McKeon
Enclosure (3) Wright letter to Leona Valley Town Council
Enclosure 1.

21 October 2011

BRRTF — Forest Service/NUM/A0WP

c/o POWER Engineers, Inc.
711 Ball Road, Suite 100
Anaheim, CA 92805

George & Marian Wright

Public Comments re the Barren Ridge Project Alternative 3

This letter provides additional comments to those presented at the public meeting held at Leona Valley Elementary School on 25 September, 2011. We are opposed to Alternative 3 of the Barren Ridge Renewable Transmission Project, which if it proceeded would place a power line over our property and existing home. This would impact both the environment and lives of our family and the other families residing in our small community of seven ranches. It is wrong to place a power line over existing homes where there are other alternatives that do not require the taking of homes at all. Alternative 3 is the only alternative that would take any private residences and should not be allowed to proceed to the final Environmental Impact Report as an option for the Barren-Ridge Project.

Power lines produce electromagnetic radiation (EMF) which is a known and/or suspected carcinogen. There has been research and studies showing a relationship between power line EMF and increased incidence of cancer including leukemia, depression, anxiety, Alzheimer's disease and stroke; dementia, spontaneous abortion and birth defects, impairment of cell function, and erosion of the immune system, as well as other adverse health impacts. Children, pregnant women and the elderly face even greater health risks from EMF exposure than other individuals. We have children, pregnant women and elderly people in this area. Alternative 3 would subject homeowners and their families to EMF exposure causing adverse public health risks and impacts. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) these health risks and impacts must be avoided by selecting another feasible alternative, moreover, a detailed and comprehensive environmental impact report (EIR) and/or environmental impact statement (EIS) is required to candidly and comprehensively analyze and disclose all public health impacts of the power line on nearby homeowners and their families should alternative 3 be selected or even seriously considered.

Moreover, alternative 3 because of EMF and the public health impacts and fears and also because of adverse visual and other aesthetic impacts would cause greater loss of fair market value to the homeowners in the area than the other alternatives and thus would lead to greater recoveries by the homeowners for the taking of their property under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. That would increase the economic cost of the project to the rate payer and tax paying public.

We here in Leona Valley have already been significantly impacted by the construction of the new Southern California Edison electrical Transmission Project segment 2. Now towns and power lines construction work has been ongoing just above our house for the past two years. The government agencies involved in this project should consider this and select one of the other remaining alternatives that do not require the acquisition of any private residences and are clear of family areas.

In the event the decision is made to pursue Alternative 3, we do not understand why the line can not be run to the northeast of the existing corridor, where there is only open land and no residential or
commercial properties. There would be no impact to people, livestock or pets in the area and the line would actually be farther away for increased safety to human life.

If the Alternative 3 line proceeds on the southwest side, why can it not crossover to avoid our small community and then cross back to the west one clear of the houses. Crossings are frequently employed in similar projects to avoid these issues.

I served for 27 years in the U.S. Coast Guard, have a Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering and spent a considerable amount of time during my career reviewing and approving engineering proposals for safety of life and environmental protection. I am also dedicated to safety and environmental protection in my current position as a Senior Vice President in a major shipping company. In the Coast Guard and my current company, if we could find a way to not impact existing plans, lives and the well-being of people and the environment, we would do so in every instance. The other alternatives do not cause the disruption of lives and existing homes and should be the preferred options for this project.

As stated in the opening of our letter, it is wrong to take seven existing homes and significantly impact the plans, environment and lives of others when there are good alternatives that have no such impacts. We hope you will agree and eliminate Alternative 3 as an option for this project. If you do not reach this conclusion, then we do regret another opportunity to discuss this after we have had more time to consult with people possessing specific expertise in this type of case.

Sincerely,

George and Morton Wright
5707 Elizabeth Lake Rd.
Los Altos Valley, Ca 93951
651 753 2145 (H)
651 753 2145 (W)
651 885 3772 (C)
21 October 2011

Congressman Howard P. "Buck" McKeon
U.S. House of Representatives
2144 Rayburn HOB
Washington, D.C. 20515
ph: (202) 225-1956
Fax: (202) 225-6613

RE: George & Marlan Wright Public Comments re the Barren Ridge Project Alternative 3

Dear Congressman McKeon,

We are writing to you to seek your advice on a new LAOWP power transmission project that is proposing an alternative line option that, if chosen, would take our home and horse ranch away from us.

Construction of the Southern California Edison transmission line has been ongoing for several years on the ridge just behind our home and away, to provide more renewable energy sources to the LA Basin. LAOWP is proposing yet another line. There are several alternative routes and the one that impacts us, Alternative 3, is the only path that takes any private residences. It is wrong to place a power line over existing homes when there are other alternatives that do not require the taking of homes at all.

Moreover, Alternative 3, because of the EMF and the public health impacts and more and also because of adverse visual and other aesthetic impacts would cause greater loss of fair market value to the homeowners in the area than the other alternatives and thus would lead to greater recoveries by the homeowners for the taking of their property under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. That would increase the economic cost of the project to the rate paying and tax paying public.

Webers in Leona Valley have already been significantly impacted by the construction of the new Southern California Edison Antelope Transmission Project Segment 2. Fewer turbines and power line construction work has been ongoing just above our houses over the past two years. The government agencies involved in this project should consider this and select one of the other remaining alternatives that do not require the acquisition of any private residences and are clear of family areas.

In the event the decision is made to pursue Alternative 3, we do not understand why the line cannot be run on the other side of the existing corridor, where there is only open land and no residential or commercial properties. There would be no impact to people, livestock or pets in the area and the line would actually be further away for increased safety to human life. If the Alternative 3 line proceeds on the northwest side, why can it not crossover to avoid our small community and then cross back to the west once clear of the houses? Crossings are frequently employed in similar projects to avoid these issues.

I served for 27 years in the U.S. Coast Guard, have a Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering and spent a considerable amount of time during my career reviewing and approving engineering proposals for safety of life and environmental petitions. I am also dedicated to safety and environmental protection in my current position as a Senior Vice President in a major shipping company. In the Coast Guard and my current company, if we could find a way to not impact existing places, here and the...
well-being of people and the environment - we would do so in every instance. The other alternatives do not cause the disruption of lives and existing homes and should be the preferred options for the project.

We would be grateful for any support you can provide to assist us in keeping our home and horse ranch that we love and want to pass on to our daughters who share our passion for horses and Loma Valley.

Sincerely,

George Wright, Capt. USCG (Ret)
5797 Elizabeth Lake Rd.
Loma Valley, CA 93551
661.753.2746 (H)
661.753.2746 (W)
661.801.9727 (C)

Enclosure (1) George and Marian Wright letter re Barren Ridge Comment to Draft EIS.
21 October 2011

William Elliott, President
Leona Valley Town Council
P.O. Box 796
Leona Valley, California 93551

RE: George & Marian Wright Public Comments on the Barren Ridge Project Alternative 3

Dear Bill,

Thank you for your letter of October 12, 2011, advising us of the Barren Ridge Renewable Energy Transmission Project. We really appreciate your attention to this and gluing of the alert letter. We were however aware of this project and have studied the EIR and also Marian attended the public meeting last month. We are very disappointed and upset to see our small community yet again targeted by an alternative for another power line. We are certainly aware that we were also selected in 2006 for the Southern California Edison project, for which construction has been ongoing just above our homes for years. In that case we were successful in convincing SCE to reroute the portion of the lines in our area to avoid the necessity to impact our ranch and later our neighbors homes.

We would be grateful for your advice and any possible support to help us save our homes and horse ranch that we love and want to eventually hand over to our daughters who share our passion for horses and Leona Valley. Please find attached our formal Public Comment letter and our request to Buck McKeen for his support as well.

Thank you for your support Bill.

Sincerely,

George Wright, Capt. USCG (Ret)
5707 Elizabeth Lake Rd.
Leona Valley, CA 93551
661 741-276 (H)
661 741-2745 (V)
661 801-3772 (C)

Enclosure (1) George and Marian Wright Letter re Barren Ridge Comment to Draft EIR
Enclosure (2) Wright letter to Congressman McKeen
Response 47-A: Please refer to Response 2-A. Safety of firefighters has been considered in the analysis and comparison of the Alternatives. Firefighting would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Action’s taller towers (refer to Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR).

As a resident of Green Valley, I would like to say: Don’t ignore us please as we will hold you personally responsible. I would like to request for the new AC and the old AC & DC power lines to be relocated above the homes in the lower mountain ridges of the forest. Fire safety is the number one concern in one area. By having these power lines away from homes would assist fire fighters in concentrating on fighting the fires with less concern of having to stay on the road side of the power lines while homes, people, and animals are in danger of burning on the other side of the power lines. After all we, residents of Green Valley, would not want our fire fighters to get hurt. Thank you for listening.

Jossi Wong
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 48: WONG, P.

Response 48-A: Please refer to Response 2-A.

To Mr. John R. Davis

48-A

I, Peter Wong, do not support DP&L’s current plan of extending the power lines an additional 60 feet. Although they claim these power lines have no negative health effects on our residents, I know of no studies on such long power lines that prove this is the case. I do support moving the power lines to the tertiary ridge where it is a safe distance away from neighbors homes.  

Sincerely,

Peter Wong

SEP 23 2011
42532 Century Ave
Lake Elsinore, CA 92530

RECEIVED
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 49: BEELER, J.

Response 49-A: Please refer to Response 2-A.
Dear LADWP,

I am writing you to tell you of my opposition to your power line upgrade-alternative 2 route. Right now, your lines go across my property, and almost directly above my house. There is no way, my house can remain where it is, if the arms of you towers with lines on them are extended out.

For the people, the animals, and our surrounding national forest, the best route is Alternative 1. I have been to your meetings, and I know you say it will cost Dept. of Water and Power to upgrade the bridges that cross your aqueduct, but you will continue to have these type of public conflict uproars every time you have to change lines and towers. Let’s put an end to this, and keep your lines with your aqueduct. No one wants to live by them or hike through our forests, with looming power lines. They snap and pop (loudly) when there is even a little bit of moisture in the air.

I am sure there are temporary bridges that can be used to get your heavy equipment from side to side of your aqueduct. Edison used helicopters to get towers and lines into remote areas of the national forest.

Jennifer Beeler
Green Valley Resident- La County
P.O. box 711, Leona valley CA 93551
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 50: WAIDNER B. & P.

Response 50-A: Please refer to Response 2-A.

September 14, 2011

We oppose the Department of Water & Power’s proposal to extend the power lines an additional 60 feet high in Green Valley. I agree with the Green Valley Town Council that installing the new and moving the old power lines to the edge of the forest is a better solution. This would cause less destruction of the area and prove to be more cost effective in the long run.

Bob and Patty Waidner
Concerned Green Valley Residents

Bob & Patty Waidner