PART 3: SETS OF COMMENTS FROM INDIVIDUALS AND RESPONSES

Part three of this appendix contains all individual sets of comments received during the public comment period. Comments were submitted via letters, emails, mailed comment forms, and Project hotline messages. A copy of each substantive comment and the response from the lead agencies are provided in this section. The sets of comments are labeled numerically and responses are labeled alphabetically. For example, Response 1-A refers to the response to the first comment in comment letter 1.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 1: AJAX, D.

Response 1-A: Electrical shocks of the type you identify in your comment can and would be mitigated. LADWP’s Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) group can provide complimentary testing of EMF levels around properties. Consequently, any potential anomalies can be identified and appropriate mitigation recommended. The LADWP EMF Inquiry Line can be reached at (213) 367-2616. As described in Section 4.2.12 of the Final EIS/EIR, the addition of the new BRRTP 230 kV double-circuit transmission line would not increase EMF levels above the existing EMF levels because the design and operation of the two 230 kV circuits would cause cancellation effects, which would reduce the EMF levels.
Response 1-B: The Proposed Action would not create any indefensible firefighting spaces, as is the case with Alternative 2a, and this is a significant reason why Alternative 2a was not the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative. Please refer to Section 3.2.11 and Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for the discussion of potential impacts to wildfire and fuels for each Alternative.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 2: AMBROSE, N.

Response 2-A:
As a result of public comments on the Draft EIS/EIR, a new alternative in the Green Valley area, the Green Valley Multi-Line Relocation Alternative, was examined, which would locate the proposed double-circuit 230 kV and relocate the existing single-circuit 230 kV and 500 kV DC lines into a new corridor primarily in the ANF and just outside of the community. See pages 2-31 through 2-36 of the Final EIS/EIR for a full description of this alternative. As described there, the proposed route of the Green Valley Multi-Line Relocation Alternative was determined to be a feasible location for the proposed re-route. The Green Valley Multi-Line Relocation Alternative was considered but eliminated from detailed analysis in the Final EIS/EIR because it would not avoid or minimize environmental impacts as compared to the Proposed Action.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 3: ANDERSON, K.

**Response 3-A:** Firefighting is a very important factor in the BRRTP environmental review process. Please refer to Section 3.2.11 and Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for a complete analysis of the fire risks associated with each Alternative. Also please refer to Response 2-A.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 4: BALE, L.

Response 4-A: Firefighting is a very important factor in the BRRTP environmental review process. Please refer to Section 3.2.11 and Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for a complete analysis of the fire risks associated with each Alternative. Also please refer to Response 2-A.

As a resident of Green Valley, I would like to request that both the new and old power lines be placed above the homes along the lower mountain ridges of the LA County Forest. Fire safety is of the utmost importance in our area, and having the power lines away from the homes and the main highway through town would assist the firefighters in concentrating on fighting the fires and less concern about saving people, their homes, and their animals. Smoke rising through power lines carries electricity, so the smoke is a conductor — this is extremely dangerous for ground fire or working crews or even nearby.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address: 32429 Valley Rd, El Monte, CA 91731]

Aug. 26, 2011
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 5: BALL, W.

Response 5-A: Please refer to Response 2-A.

---

I oppose the DWP's current plan for the Barren Ridge project. I agree with the Green Valley Town Council that moving the power lines to the edge of Forest Ridge is a safe distance from homes.

Wendy Ball
8/27/2011
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 6: BEELER, J.

Response 6-A: Alternative 1 is not identified as the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative in the Final EIS/EIR because of overall higher impacts associated with this Alternative. A description of the rationale to select Alternative 2 as the Federal Agency Preferred and Environmentally Superior Alternative is found in the Final EIS/EIR in Sections 2.7 and 2.8. Documentation and comparison of the impacts of each of the Alternatives, including Alternative 1, are found in the Final EIS/EIR in Section 2.6.6 and Table 2-11.

I know the National Forest does not want the CADWP to use any more than the community, it will run through.

I am asking the CADWP to keep their equipment together by choosing Alternative 1. More people will see it and visit our National Forest through the main roads such as San Francisco and Guadalupe in Green Valley. I will not see the beauty from their use. They will never have a connection to our forest. This is how our forest is kept intact. Big by the masses being able to view it or connect to it. I personally enjoy living next to it and hiking it in it. The majority ride through it in their cars. Please help the CADWP make the right decision in choosing alternative #1.

Thank you
Jennifer Beeler
Response 6-B: As described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS/EIR, Alternative 2, the Proposed Action, would not result in the removal of any private residences with the implementation of the Three-Circuit Mitigation. 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 6-C: Alternative 1 is not identified as the Federal Agency Preferred or Environmentally Superior Alternative in the Final EIS/EIR because of overall higher impacts associated with this Alternative. A description of the rationale to select Alternative 2 as the Federal Agency Preferred and Environmentally Superior Alternative is found in the Final EIS/EIR in Sections 2.7 and 2.8. Documentation and comparison of the impacts of each of the Alternatives, including Alternative 1, are found in the Final EIS/EIR in Section 2.6.6 and Table 2-11.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 7: BISTLINE, A.

Response 7-A: 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 7-B: Impacts to wildlife as a result of constructing and operating any of the Alternatives are examined in detail in the Final EIS/EIR in Section 4.3.1.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 8: BISTLINE, F.

Response 8-A: Firefighting is a very important factor in the BRRTP environmental review process. Please refer to Section 3.2.11 and Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for a complete analysis of the fire risks associated with each Alternative. Also please refer to Response 2-A.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 9: BRAR, S.

Response 9-A: Your comments 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 10: BROWNFIELD, B.

Response 10-A: Firefighting is a very important factor in the BRRTTP environmental review process. Please refer to Section 3.2.11 and Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for a complete analysis of the fire risks associated with each Alternative. Also please refer to Response 2-A.

Response 10-B: Safety of firefighters has been considered in the analysis and comparison of the Alternatives. Firefighting would not be significantly affected by the taller towers, as proposed. Please also refer to Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for a detailed analysis of the firefighting risks associated with the Alternatives.

Response 10-C: The design and engineering of the transmission towers would make it very unlikely they would fall. Additionally, fall distance to homes was considered during the development of the Alternatives and in determining the width of the right-of-way. This line will be designed so as to avoid falling onto homes even in earthquakes or other upset conditions, so there would be a very low risk.

Response 10-D: Please refer to Response 2-A relating to moving of the designated corridor, the BRRTTP, and the existing lines to the top of the mountain to the west of Green Valley. Firefighting would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Action’s taller towers. Please refer to Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for detailed analysis and information.
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTER 11: BROWNFIELD, R.

Response 11-A: Safety of firefighters has been considered in the analysis and comparison of the Alternatives. Firefighting would not be significantly affected by the taller towers, as proposed. Please also refer to Section 4.2.11 of the Final EIS/EIR for a detailed analysis of the firefighting risks associated with the Alternatives. Also please refer to Response 2-A.

Response 11-B: While we agree that the primary benefit of the Project is to bring renewable energy to the City of Los Angeles, the addition of the BRRTTP makes renewable energy more available to the public and, as such, is a benefit to the region.

Response 11-C: BLM and the Angeles National Forest are not opposed to the line being routed on National Forest System lands or on public lands managed by the BLM. The designated corridor that is the proposed location for the BRRTTP was established on the National Forest in suitable locations. Although the acquisition of private property in the Green Valley area would not be necessary to implement the Proposed Action, it would not be possible to avoid siting the line on private lands in all areas because of the mixed land jurisdiction configuration in this part of California. Firefighting would not be significantly affected by the taller towers, as proposed (refer to Section 4.2.11 of the Draft EIS/EIR). Also please refer to Response 2-A.
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