



"Unlock the Bureaucracy."

## American Land Rights Association National Inholders Association

National Headquarters:  
30218 NE 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue (PO Box 400)  
Battle Ground, Washington 98604  
Phone: (360) 687-3087  
FAX: (360) 687-2973

[www.landrights.org](http://www.landrights.org)

Legislative Office:  
507 Seward Square SE  
Washington, DC 20003  
DC Phone: (202) 329-3574  
[alra@pacifier.com](mailto:alra@pacifier.com)

### 120 Private Permit Cabins and Many Private Properties Are Threatened By Fire Because Of A Bad Forest Service Recommendation To Locate New Power Lines Near People In Bouquet Canyon, CA, in the Angeles NF

#### Action Items

1. **Call, write, fax or e-mail NOW!** Jody Noiron, Supervisor, Angeles Nat. Forest, 701 North Santa Anita Ave. Arcadia, CA 91006. -- Phone: (626)-574-1613 -- FAX: (626)-574 5207 -- [jnoiron@fs.fed.us](mailto:jnoiron@fs.fed.us)
2. **Call or fax Mark Rey**, Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment. (202) 720-7173. Fax: (202) 720-4732. He has responsibility for the Forest Service.
3. **Time is critical.** Please hand deliver this Fax or Fax this message to any newspapers in your area.

**Ask all to follow the Southern California Edison recommendation** to place the new high power lines on a ridge where another power line already exists. **They can then stop fires AND save lives and homes.**

#### Background -- THE ANTELOPE PARDEE 500 kV TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT

**The Situation:** California has passed legislation requiring renewable energy resources to be on line by specific timetables. The source of the energy in discussion is wind farms in Tehachapi, California. The problem is with the routing of the 500 kV Transmission Lines that will carry the electricity to key distribution points in North Los Angeles County, and is to be completed by the year 2010. Originally, a route was proposed and engineered by Southern California Edison that essentially followed an existing route.

The Angeles National Forest rejected this Original SCE Proposed Route. Alternatives were developed largely by the Forest Service, **but never fully vetted.** Public comment was invited, but the information distributed (and not distributed) by the Forest, the CPUC and Edison was confusing to the public and government agencies alike. On March 1, 2007, Alternative 2 was approved by the CPUC based on flawed, incomplete and misleading information. It is the worst possible route to be selected as it involves significant **threat to human life, structures, forest habitat, and recreation lands** due to Forest fire, and more.

**The objection:** There is no objection to renewable energy, rather the Transmission Lines that are haphazardly planned in a flawed process to be routed through the Angeles National Forest and adjacent to private property contiguous to the Forest. The route, selected from several **Alternatives is identified as Segment 1, Alternative 2.** But, in its rush to meet a deadline, the process became seriously flawed. **Residents were not notified. Town Councils were not notified.** And where notifications did go out, they were difficult to understand. Public outcry has been ignored, and admittedly tossed in drawers, never to be aired. **Homes, cabins and structures were left off of maps** used by the CPUC in judging alternative routes because, as one Project Manager stated, **"it would make the map too messy."**

**Threat to life by fire:** It's the number one concern. Bouquet Canyon Reservoir is a significant fire fighting resource utilized by aircraft. The Reservoir water is used in fire fighting air drops in several neighboring communities, consisting of thousands of residents. Fires burning tens of thousands of acres and multiple homes are an all too frequent occurrence in the area. It is not a matter of if there is going to be a fire, it is when. One fire has already broken out this season along Bouquet Canyon Road, right where the Transmission Lines and Towers are planned. A minor adjustment to the Route could relocate the Lines and Towers to the west, further away from the Reservoir and mitigate this a hazard to fire fighting aircraft.

The planned Alternative 2 Route crosses Bouquet Canyon Road in two places, creating an "Arsonist's Heaven." It is all too easy to ignite a fire by the road, under the Lines and Towers, where the fire can't be fought and would be allowed to grow larger by fire fighting crews. The road allows the arsonist to escape to

the north in two directions. Tens of thousands of acres have been set on fire by arsonists in this area in recent years. Homes were lost, as well. **The lines do not have to cross Bouquet Canyon Road at all. The same minor adjustment to the west side of the Reservoir would keep this from happening.**

Further south, and deeper in Bouquet Canyon, there are over 120 Forest Service permit cabins. The Lines are planned to be moved down closer to the cabins, mid-slope from the existing corridor, which is nearer the top of the ridge.

The EIR/EIS Final Report identifies conditions whereby it is possible that a fire could break out that would have difficulty being fought by aircraft due to arcing of the lines from the retardant, and to create such an electrocution hazard to fire fighting ground crews that they would not be dispatched. The Canyon, the cabins, people, wildlife and habitat would be left to burn. **Several endangered species would also be threatened.**

**The Forest Service says their route is more aesthetically pleasing.** Whom are they pleasing when they move Transmission Lines closer to cabins with their high power 50–60 decibel level corona noise? When one chooses to then move the lines on top of people, better judgment is lost. This route with its 180' tall 500 kV Towers will also harm one of the nation's crown jewels of trails, the Pacific Crest Scenic Trail. A simple, economical solution exists.

Transmission Lines target private landholders in and contiguous to the forest by plotting the lines to run within a few hundred feet of the private property. The lines run close, but not so close that the Forest Service would have to pay the property owners via eminent domain. Just close enough to devalue the property visually and with corona noise and perceived EMF health issues.

**Socio economic and private property impact:** Property will suffer loss of value for cabin and property owners alike. For many Americans their home and equity in that property is all they have to carry them through retirement and their so-called golden years. These Transmission Lines are planned to be so close to rural private property that they will create a significant reduction in property values, changing people's lives and how they will manage to survive until their end days.

**The solution is to return to the original Southern California Edison Proposed Route wherever feasible.**

Moving the Lines and Towers back to the Original Southern California Edison Proposed Route on the west side of Bouquet Canyon reservoir will mitigate the admitted hazard to fire fighting aircraft.

Since the Alternative 2 Route would criss-cross Bouquet Canyon Road, moving the Lines west of the reservoir, where the public is not, would remove the unsightly Lines from public view, and also remove a potential zone for arson-set fires to get out of control.

**Moving the lines from the mid-slope Alternative 2 route, back to the Original SCE Proposed Route** as it travels south down the Canyon would move the lines farther away from the 120 cabins, the stream and recreationists that are there on a daily basis. This would keep the Canyon open to fire fighting air and ground crews to protect human life, wild life and habitat. This SCE Original Proposed route is the existing corridor for Transmission Lines, and the Canyon has a history of being successfully defended from fires with the Lines in this location.

**EXHIBIT A: Extracts from the EIR/EIF Final Report**

“...should a fire start mid-slope in or adjacent to the transmission line, direct ground fire suppression tactics would not occur due to the safety risk of arcing if the transmission line is still energized. Because of this, there would be the potential with fires occurring mid-slope in the project area growing larger than if the transmission line was not located there...” “Because portions of the alternative are less than half a mile from Bouquet Canyon Road, should a fire occur mid-slope in or adjacent to the proposed transmission line and the winds are blowing westerly, the adverse impact to safety...would be significant. ... (Class I)... (C.7.7)”

**Bottom Line: Fire fighters, homes, structures, residents, recreationists and wildlife will be at significantly more risk with this ill-conceived Alternative 2 Route created by bureaucrats. It must be changed to the original Southern California Edison Proposed Route that was well conceived by professional engineers who knew what they were doing.**

**This fax is sent in cooperation with the Coalition of Bouquet Canyon Concerned Citizens.**

**PLEASE TAKE ACTION TODAY!!!**