

**Comment Set 22****Letter from Annette Ohuche, Onuora Ononye, Anuli Ononye, and Ezugo Ononye dated April 6, 2004**

23191 Fairfield  
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

California Public Utilities Commission  
ATTN: Mr. Mike Rosauer, Project Manager  
C/O Aspen Environmental Group  
30423 Canwood St, Suite 215  
Agoura Hills, CA 91301



April 6, 2004

Dear Mr. Rosauer:

We are writing this letter in regards to the Viejo System Project in Mission Viejo. We are totally opposed to having new overhead power lines constructed outside our house. We are writing to ask that the power lines be buried underground instead of being put above ground. We would prefer rolling blackouts to the new above ground power lines.

22-1

We purchased our dream home in Mission Viejo in 2000 after relocating from the Bay Area where we couldn't afford a home. When we purchased our home we were concerned about the power lines and we were told by our builder that there would never be more power lines constructed outside our house. As parents of very young children we would not subject our children to more overhead power lines no matter how minimal the risk. This project if not buried underground would force us to move out Mission Viejo – our dream home and city. If this project goes up whether we stay or leave our property values will be severely impacted.

22-2

The first time we heard about the Viejo System project was when we received a flyer from NOPE about a meeting at the Mission Viejo City Hall at the end of last year. We attended that meeting and listened to the discussion.

22-3

On March 25, 2004 we also attended the meeting for the public to voice it's concerns. We are very concerned and take issue with the comments read by Ms. Gaylord (not sure of the spelling of her name), the attorney for Southern California Edison.

- 1) Ms. Gaylord claimed that Southern California Edison mailed all the affected home owners materials about the proposed project. In our house, no mail including junk mail is ever thrown away before it is read. We never received any mail from Southern California Edison. We have talked to numerous neighbors about this mailing and not one person has told us they received this notice.
- 2) Ms. Gaylord also claimed that our Home Owner's Association received notification about the project. From our recollection, at the initial meeting at the Mission Viejo City Council last year – the president of our Homeowners Association – Stoneridge stated that our Homeowners Association did not receive notification from Southern California Edison.

- 3) Ms. Gaylord also stated that notices were posted clearly along the proposed route. We also dispute that fact – we live very near the poles and never saw any postings.

The aesthetic impacts of this project would be pretty substantial. The poles are already very ugly – most visitors to Stoneridge already comment on the power lines. The new power lines would also block views of beautiful Lake Mission Viejo.

22-4


Please do what has been done in other cities like Rancho Santa Margarita. Bury the power lines. As tax payers we are willing to pay more to have those lines buried.

Sincerely,

  
Annette Ohuche

  
Onuora Ononye

  
Anuli Ononye

  
Ezugo Ononye

## **Response to Comment Set 22**

**Letter from Annette Ohuche, Onuora Ononye, Anuli Ononye, and Ezugo Ononye dated April 6, 2004**

- 22-1 Thank you for providing your comments. Please refer to General Response GR-3 regarding undergrounding of electrical transmission lines, as well as Appendix 8, which discusses various route options considered by the CPUC.
- 22-2 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF, and General Response GR-2 regarding property values.
- 22-3 Thank you for this information. The CPUC requires the applicant to send notices to property owners adjacent to the project site – in this case, adjacent to the transmission corridor and proposed substation site. The addresses were obtained according to CPUC procedure. Please see General Response GR-5, Public Notification.
- 22-4 Thank you for expressing your concerns. Please see General Response GR-3 regarding undergrounding and General Response GR-4 regarding aesthetic impacts of the proposed project, as well as Appendix 8, which discusses various route options considered by the CPUC. The CPUC appreciates the community’s concern for aesthetics and will consider this concern in rendering a decision on the proposed project.