

## Comment Set C.12: Joseph and Dawn Lucido

Joseph and Dawn Lucido  
9300 Leona Avenue  
Leona Valley, CA 93551

August 29, 2006

John Boccio/Marian Kadota  
CPUC/USDA Forest Service  
c/o Aspen Environmental Group  
30423 Canwood Street, Suite 215  
Agoura Hill, CA 91301

We would like to go on record that we vehemently oppose the rape and pillage of our beautiful town, Leona Valley, as Alternative 5 in the Southern California Edison's Antelope-Pardee 500-kV Transmission Line Project. Our reasons for opposition are the same ones you heard expressed at the meeting last night at Lane Park by the residents of Leona Valley.

C.12-1

The project would necessitate taking property and homes from 30-40 residents, which may not seem like alot - but by percentage in such a small town would be significant. Along with seizing these resident's property it would greatly decrease the property values of many others. In addition, the owner's of the seized property would receive less than market value for their land and residences. They would be unable to replace their homes with a like piece of property. Their tax base would greatly increase when purchasing a new residence. Loss of families in Leona Valley could jeopardize our local elementary school.

C.12-2

C.12-3

C.12-4

We do not want high tension lines creating electromagnetic fields and increasing cancer rates.

C.12-5

We do not want our landscape and vistas ruined with these huge, unsightly towers. We don't want the noise from these tension lines or the disruption to our community in erecting and maintaining these towers, the impact of these lines on our livestock, or the increased fire risk from downed lines.

C.12-6

We object to the lack of timely and proper notification of our residents regarding this project. **Affected property owners were just notified this month. This is absurd given the fact the project was in the works since 2004!** We should have been included in the initial CEQA scoping meetings. As mentioned in the meeting last night we feel there are many issues not addressed in the Draft EIR - because we were not included in these scoping meetings. EIR photos intentionally photo-shopped out homes giving the impression only vacant land was impacted. This is criminally deceptive. The meeting August 28th was intentionally held outside of Leona Valley in an obvious attempt to hide the project from Leona Valley residents. Similar criminal deception was also played out in Agua Dulce and Santa Clarita. It is obvious to us the thugs involved in this deception are hoping we will not be unable to stop this criminal land grab, because it is simply too late. As Mr. Kinney said last night..."shame on you!"

C.12-7

C.12-8

C.12-9

Since there is already an existing pathway - why can't that route continue to be utilized?

C.12-10

Have any of you been to Leona Valley? If you have you know why we chose to move here - quite, beauty, clean air, excellent school, great place to raise children, land to farm and ranch, good neighbors, no crime. Please don't ruin Leona Valley. Please don't ruin our lives.

Respectfully,

Joseph and Dawn Lucido

## Response to Comment Set C.12: Joseph and Dawn Lucido

- C.12-1 Thank you for submitting your opinion on the Project.
- C.12-2 Alternative 5 would not entail the removal of 30 to 40 homes. As discussed in Section C.9.10.2, the alternative alignment would be constructed across 103 privately owned parcels. The majority of land uses that would be restricted as a result of Alternative 5 would be the erection of new structures within the alternative ROW. However, given that SCE has not conducted construction or final alignment and design studies for Alternative 5, the EIR/EIS has assumed that the removal of one or more homes may occur. As such, Section C.9.10.2 (Impact L-3) concluded that potential impacts to residential land uses as a result of Alternative 5 would be significant and unavoidable.
- C.12-3 Please see General Response Comment GR-1 regarding potential effects on property values and General Response GR-2 regarding property acquisition.
- C.12-4 See Response to Comment C.12-2. Alternative 5 would not result in the displacement of a significant portion of the families in the Leona Valley, nor would it necessitate the closure of local schools.
- C.12-5 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.
- C.12-6 Your comment will be shared with the decision-makers who are reviewing the Project and alternatives at the USDA Forest Service and the CPUC.
- C.12-7 Please see General Response GR-5 regarding the noticing procedures for an EIR/EIS.
- C.12-8 No existing homes were deleted out of photographs of existing landscape conditions. In all photographs of existing conditions, no landscape features were removed or altered in any way. If photographs of existing landscape conditions show vacant lands, it is because the view across these existing vacant lands provided excellent observation of landscapes that would be affected by construction and operation of a new 500-kV transmission line. As described in Section C.15.1.1, photographs used in the EIR/EIS were taken from vantage points called key observation positions (KOPs). Each KOP was carefully selected to display the typical or worst-case view from major travel routes or use areas that provide visual access to affected landscapes. From dozens of potential observer positions and in consultation with CPUC and Forest Service personnel, 14 locations were selected as KOPs for detailed analysis of the proposed Project, and 14 additional KOPs were selected for detailed analysis of alternatives.

In addition, the steps taken in the visualization process are described below, with the corresponding software platforms employed:

- **Photo/3D Model Composite Simulation:** Generally, to ensure a high degree of visual accuracy in the simulations, Computer Aided Design (CAD) equipment allows for life-size modeling within the computer. This translates to using real world scaling and dimensioning to portray locations of facilities/structures. Camera locations and bearings, corresponding with 3D simulation viewpoints, were generated using ortho-rectified aerial photography in conjunction with USGS topographical quad maps.
- **AutoCAD & 3D Studio Max Electronic Model Data Integration:** USGS topographical quad maps and ortho-rectified aerial photography were initially employed as a background

references. Auto-CAD drawings of the proposed structure locations and orientations were generated based upon information provided by the Applicant. Corresponding camera positions and orientations were also recorded in the same 3D coordinate space. 3D Studio massing models of the proposed structures, and camera locations, were generated in real world scale and orientation, with respect to each other, including: the USGS topographical quad maps, the ortho-rectified aerial photography, and the 3D AutoCAD drawings on which they were placed.

- **3D Studio Max - Simulation Generation:** An electronic camera lens matching the lens that was actually used in the field was placed at its appropriate position in 3D coordinate space. A Canon 20D digital SLR camera was used with the equivalent of a 50-mm film lens, resulting in a “normal” view, consistently throughout the process. This lens selection allows for viewing of the model generated above in the same way the project would be viewed in the field. Next, the photography was imported into the 3D database and loaded as an environment map, within which, the camera view of the 3D model was generated. To generate the correct view relative to the actual photographs, the electronic camera was placed at a location, (within the computer), corresponding to the location of its physical counter part in the actual field during the photo shoot. This was supported by documented camera location, bearing/ direction, and lens type, which were recorded during the generation of the digital photography itself. From here, the 3D wire frame models of the proposed structures were displayed, along with any significant existing structures, so that proper alignment, scale, angle, and distance could be verified. To complete this phase, the sun angle was set, materials and textures were applied, and finally, the composite image was rendered through computer image processing commonly known as Ray Tracing.
- **Adobe Photo Shop:** Necessary layers were then created within the photography, representing foreground and background, with respect to the 3D model and its appropriate position within the topography. Once the final composite for the simulated view was completed, additional filters designed to achieve atmospheric conditions such as: blur, haze, etc., were applied, as appropriate.

C.12-9 In July 2006, as arrangements were being made to release the Draft EIR/EIS, public meetings were scheduled for August 28, 29, and 30 in Quartz Hill, Santa Clarita, and Agua Dulce, respectively. Meeting locations were picked in Quartz Hill and Santa Clarita with the intent of having a public meeting north of Angeles National Forest and another public meeting south of the Forest. The public meeting in Agua Dulce was scheduled as a central location along the route of Alternative 5. At the time, this was considered to be a reasonable number and distribution of meetings. In addition, the Forest Service made a presentation and answered questions regarding the proposed transmission project at the Leona Valley Town Council meeting on September 11. Please note that public meetings are not a required component of the EIR/EIS process.

C.12-10 SCE’s proposed Project and several of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS include the use of existing transmission rights-of-way. However, the proposed Project and each of the alternatives would require the acquisition of land for right-of-way purposes, either for new transmission corridors or for widening of existing transmission corridors. Please see General Response GR-4 regarding the development of alternative routes outside of NFS lands.