Comment Set 23
Letter from Maria C. Klein dated April 6, 2004

April 6, 2004

Michael Rousauer
C/o Aspen Enviromental Group

30423 Canwood St. Ste. # 215
Auguora Hills, Ca. 91301.

Dear Mr. Rousauer:

I am writing to you to express our family concern over SCE's Viejo Project. Our family totally opposes the construction of more overhead power lines over the City of Mission Viejo. 23-1

We believe power lines must be place under the ground, especially if this power lines are going to be near homes and recreations areas like it is our case in Mission Viejo. 23-2
The reasons are quite simple, power lines are blight, they are plainly ugly and power lines will cause irreparable damage to property values, besides the harm they do cause by the emission of EMF. Lives are not to be taken lightly. You have to consider our wish.
These power lines we do want them BUT WE WANT THE POWERLINES TO BE PLACE UNDER THE GROUND!!!!!.

Listen TO THE VOICE OF A CITY, AND PLACE THE POWERLINES UNDER THE GROUND. Over 3,000 Mission Viejo residents did signed NOPE's Petition requesting A FULL ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT TO JUDGE MALCOM AND THE CPUCC and all opposing the placement of more overhead power lines. 23-3
Make the process simple, help stop SCE's attorneys getting rich and use this money and time wisely. At the end it is us SCE's customers who will pay for the placement of this power lines under the ground.

Sincerely,

Maria C. Klein

Maria C. Klein
22561 Sunbrook
Mission Viejo, Ca. 92692

Response to Comment Set 23
Letter from Maria C. Klein dated April 6, 2004

23-1 Thank you for providing your opinion.

23-2 The CPUC appreciates the community's concern for aesthetics and will consider this concern in rendering a decision on the proposed project. Potential economic effects, such as effects on property values, cannot be considered significant under CEQA and, therefore, are not addressed in the MND/IS. The possible health effects of EMF are not fully understood by the scientific community and, therefore, it is not possible to reach a definitive conclusion as to whether the proposed project would cause any adverse health effects. Please note that EMF levels would be reduced overall with the proposed project (see Section B.1.10 of the MND/IS). Please see General Response GR-2 regarding property values and General Response GR-4 regarding aesthetic impacts of the proposed project.

23-3 Thank you for expressing your concerns. Preparation of an EIR is required when there is substantial evidence in the record indicating that a project may have a significant adverse impact. At this time, the CPUC's conclusion is that all potentially significant impacts can be mitigated by measures presented in the MND/IS. The public's concerns will be given serious consideration by the Commission in deciding whether to approve or deny the proposed project, but the existence of public controversy over the environmental effects of a project is not an adequate basis for a decision to prepare an EIR [CEQA Guidelines § 15064(f)(4)]. Please see General Response GR-3 regarding the undergrounding of electrical transmission lines, GR-6 regarding preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration rather than an Environmental Impact Report, , as well as Appendix 8, which discusses various route options considered by the CPUC.