

Comment Set C.38: Joseph and Dawn Lucido

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

August 29, 2006

Re: Southern California Edison Transmission Project. Application # A.04-12-008

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. The project will create a fire and safety hazard and disrupt our rural environment in Leona Valley. Many homeowners being forced out by eminent domain were just given notice of the project and were given insufficient notice to complain. The EIR report is intentionally deceptive using photos that photo-shop out pre-existing homes creating the illusion the project only affects vacant land.

C.38-1

C.38-2

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.38-3

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

C.38-4

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. **Since there is an existing pathway, why can't that route continue to be used?**

C.38-5

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 Aqua 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. Kenney said last night at the public meeting..."shame on you!"

C.38-6

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. Please stop the criminal deception!

Respectfully,

Joseph and Dawn Lucido

cc: Michael Antonovich, 5th Supervisorial District, County of Los Angeles
Sharon Runner, California State Assembly, District 36
George Runner, California State Senator, 17th District
Public Utilities Commission, Utilities Safety Branch

Response to Comment Set C.38: Joseph and Dawn Lucido

Thank you for submitting your opinion on the Project.

Comments C.38-1, C.38-3, C.38-4, C.38-5, and C.38-6 are duplicates of comments submitted earlier by the above commenters (Comment Set C.12: Joseph and Dawn Lucido) and responses are as follows:

C.38-1 See the response to Comment C.12-1.

C.38-2 We recognize that Alternative 5 would constrain the ability to aggressively fight a wildland fire in the vicinity of the route, and would create additional fire risks to inhabited areas such as Leona Valley and Agua Dulce (see discussion in Section D.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS). On September 13, the CPUC and the Forest Service formally extended the public review period for the Draft EIR/EIS to October 3, 2006.

Please see the response to Comment C.12-8 regarding visual simulations.

C.38-3 Please see the response to Comment C.12-2, C.12-3, and C.12-4.

C.38-4 Please see General Response GR-3 regarding EMF concerns.

C.38-5 Please see the response to Comment C.12-6 and C.12-10.

C.38-6 Please see the response to Comment C.12-7 and C.12-8.