

Comment Set 31
Email from Chris Atkins dated March 11, 2004

From: Atkins, Christopher [chris.atkins@ugsplm.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2004 1:37 PM
To: 'viejosystem@aspeneq.com'
Cc: 'nowires@cox.net'
Subject: SCE Viejo Project

I wish to indicate my support of improvement of our electricity delivery infrastructure, in general. However, I do not fully understand the need to establish increased delivery capacity outlined by this project. Inasmuch as the proposed project is intended to service a fully-developed community and area, the actual need for the Viejo Project upgrade is unclear to me. I would like to know if there has been a recent history of service interruption for the affected areas that can be attributed solely to system demand, and that is not the result of maintenance or upstream issues. Is there specific history or capacity studies available to support this project?

31-1

As a potentially affected homeowner, I can tell you that the presence of the existing power lines is perceived as a negative by both existing and prospective homebuyers. Whether or not there exists the science (and resulting documented studies) to dispute any concerns for health-related issues re high voltage lines, the public perception still remains that there may be long-term health concerns that are either not understood, or are not being studied by electric utility companies. In any case, this perception directly results in lower values for our residences when compared with other equivalent homes in the area and county. Adding more lines will most assuredly amplify this concern and further drive our home values downward. Also, clearly there is not anything aesthetically pleasing about the towers-adding more of them is not going to improve any homeowners' views, or property values.

31-2

31-3

If the Viejo Project is truly about serving the community at large, I believe that it is essential for SCE to consider the will of that community when determining the need, method, and timing for such a high visibility project. Affected citizens are asking for fair representation and consideration of their concerns and issues by SCE and the CPUC. I believe that failure to reach a point of accommodation and agreement will likely result in feelings of distrust of those companies, agencies, representatives and individuals involved. More polarity between local government, agencies and the people they serve, is not beneficial to anyone.

31-4

If the reticence on the part of SCE to burying the power lines is largely related to the cost of doing so, as an affected homeowner, I would consider a proposal for structuring a cost-sharing arrangement with the community and city(ies). Given the choice of more wires vs. underground wires, I would bet that most homeowners would opt for such a cost-sharing proposal from SCE if it serves to beautify our neighborhoods, and maintain or improve our home values.

31-5

Regards,

Chris Atkins
 (949) 842-0691
 23371 Rockrose, Mission Viejo, CA

Response to Comment Set 31
Email from Chris Atkins dated March 11, 2004

- 31-1 As discussed in SCE's Application for a permit to construct and the MND/IS (both available at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/aspen/viejosystem/viejosystem.htm>), the proposed project is intended to improve reliability and meet projected electrical load requirements in the south Orange County area. While there has not been a recent history of service interruptions, SCE estimates interruptions would begin in 2005 if the Viejo System Project is not implemented. SCE has indicated that projected demands for electricity in the system service area would exceed the capability of the current system, based on a 3.9 percent annual growth rate. Section B.1.9.1 of the MND/IS identifies the projected demand by 2005.
- 31-2 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF.
- 31-3 Please see General Response GR-2 regarding property values.
- 31-4 The CPUC is considering many factors in regard to SCE's application, including community opinion.
- 31-5 Comment noted. Cost issues related to the proposed project will be considered separately by the Commission in the proceeding, but are not part of the CEQA environmental analysis.