INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 21: HATTON, J.

Response 21-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.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 22: IRWIN, S.

**Response 22-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.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 23: ST. JACQUES, D.

Response 23-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.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 24: JOHNSON, M.

Response 24-A: The impacts to residences in Agua Dulce and other communities are addressed for the Alternatives in Section 3.2.3 and Section 4.2.3 of the Final EIS/EIR.

Response 24-B: Private property necessary for the Project would be acquired from willing sellers where possible. It is not clear which private properties, if any, would require eminent domain to secure the property rights for the BRRTP. Alternative 3 is not the only Alternative where the potential for eminent domain would exist. As described in Sections 2.7 and 2.8 of the Final EIS/EIR, Alternative 3 is not considered to be the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative because of higher overall impacts than Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative.

Response 24-C: The impacts that you describe in your comment were addressed in the Draft EIS/EIR in Section 4.2.3 beginning on page 4-75, Section 4.2.8 beginning on page 4-222, Section 4.2.9 beginning on page 4-234, Section 4.2.13 beginning on page 4-336, and other sections of Chapter 4.

Response 24-D: Cumulative effects have been evaluated, and in fact are found in nearly 100 pages of analysis in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIS/EIR. Reasonably foreseeable projects to be analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR were identified as those projects that have begun the environmental review process and not just those projects that are in LADWP’s interconnection queue. For a full description of the methodology used in the cumulative effects analysis, see Section 5.1.1 of the Final EIS/EIR beginning on page 5-1. It is acknowledged that many projects in the interconnection queue will not be constructed, but it is not possible to know which ones at this
Agua Dulce take very seriously. Brush clearance and water tank storage for firefighting purposes are issues we tackle during every fire season. We are well aware of the risks involved with fire fighting near high voltage transmission lines.

Agua Dulce is an area classified as “very high fire danger zone.” The dry, low humidity climate is hot to the potential of brush fires. According to Los Angeles County Fire Department statistics, over the past 10 years, Fire Station 81, Agua Dulce, has responded on average to 400 calls per year. Generally, most urban fire calls are 80% EMS and 20% fire calls. Agua Dulce is not an urban, dense population. The local Fire Station Captains estimate that the ratio between EMS calls and fire calls is closer to a 50-50 split. Based on those statistics, Agua Dulce has approximately 290 fire calls per year. The addition of a new high voltage transmission line in an established community in a very high fire danger zone will substantially increase the risk of fire.

Response 24-F: Significant fire risk is already present in the areas described in Section 3.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR, and the new transmission line adds an increment of risk. This has been taken into account in the analysis. Fire risk is one of the elements considered by the agencies in determining the Federal Agency Preferred and Environmentally Superior Alternative, which has been identified as Alternative 2 as described in Section 2.7 and 2.8 in the Final EIS/EIR.

Response 24-G: Fire regulations relative to transmission lines was taken into account in the analysis (refer to the Wildfire and Fuels Technical Report in Volume III of the Final EIS/EIR and to Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR). Fire risk is one of the elements considered by the agencies in determining the Preferred Alternative, which has been identified as Alternative 2.

Response 24-H: 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 24-I: A primary benefit of the Project is to bring renewable energy to the City of Los Angeles, but the addition of the BRRTP also makes cleaner, renewable energy more available to the public as a whole and, as such, is a benefit to the region.

The City of Los Angeles is a large municipality with many resources at their disposal. I encourage you to work on finding clean, renewable power sources within the city limits that will service your rate payers and not impact those communities who have nothing to gain from your proposed project.

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the review process of the proposed project. If any of my comments need clarification or further explanation, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Mary Johnson

cc: Don Henry, President, Aqua Duke Town Council
Wayne Atgo, Director, Association of Rural Town Councils
Dale Kimmel, Green Valley Town Council
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 25: KIMMEL, D.

Response 25-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.

As a resident of Green Valley, 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 our area by having the power lines away from homes and the main highway through the town. This would assist the ground fire fighters in concentrating on fighting the fires with less concern of having to stay on one side of the power lines while the homes and animals are burning on the other side of the power lines.

Thank you,
Dale Kimmel
15637 Calle El Capitan
Green Valley Ca. 91390
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 26: KIMMEL, J.

Response 26-A: A primary benefit of the Project is to bring renewable energy to the City of Los Angeles, but the addition of the BRRTP also makes cleaner, renewable energy more available to the public as a whole and, as such, is a benefit to the region.

Also 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).
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 27: KLEGMAN, D.

Response 27-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.

As a resident of Green Valley, I would like to request that the new and old power lines be placed above the homes in the lower mountain ridges of the forest. Fire Safety is the number one concern in our area and having the power lines away from the homes and the mountains would assist the fire fighters in concentrating on fighting the fire and less concern on saving people, their animals and their homes.

I Debbie Klegman 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 Green Valley as they would have the ability to show down some of the lines rather than the entire line which it came to emergencies and maintenance.

Sincerely, Debbie Klegman
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 28: LYE, J.R.

Response 28-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, as proposed (refer to Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR). Also please refer to Response 2-A.