



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

Wednesday, January 29, 2003

Name*: JAMES F. MAHON

Affiliation (if any):* _____

Address:* 2047 TICONDEROGA DR

City, State, Zip Code:* SAN MATEO CA 94402

Telephone Number:* 650-345-6146

Email:* JNMAHON@AOL.COM

I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE PG&E POWER^{TOWER} PROJECT WHICH WOULD BORDER THE SAN MATEO HIGHLANDS. WE DO NOT WANT OUR FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS EXPOSED TO THE DANGERS OF E.M.F. THE OBVIOUS SOLUTION IS UNDERGROUND. WHY ARE WE REVERTING BACK TO THE EARLY (1900) WINTER HUNDREDS WHEN TOWER WERE NECESSARY THIS IS A MODERN AGE, TOWERS ARE NO LONGER NEEDED IF THIS UNDERGROUND IS MORE EXPENSIVE, THE USERS SHOULD BE WILLING TO PAY MORE. IT SEEMS UNCONSCIONABLE THAT INNOCENT MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN BE EXPOSED TO LIFE THREATENING DANGERS FOR THE BENEFIT OF PG&E AND UNKNOWN USERS.

James F. Mahon
2-24-03

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 27, 2003. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (650) 240-1720 or emailed to jeffmartin@aspenerg.com.

Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project

From: HwangST@aol.com
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2003 8:50 AM
To: Jeffmartin@aspenerg.com
Subject: PG&E POWER TOWER PROJECT

We own a home and live in the Highlands and have serious concerns about the proposed new electrical towers immediately adjacent to our neighborhood. We think that they will be too close to our residences and another site would be much more appropriate (e.g. west of hwy 280). The project has the potential to negatively impact views and property values because of safety and health concerns. Please make note of our concerns.

Sharon and Herbert Hwang



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

Wednesday, January 29, 2003

Name*: Ms. AGNES A. SERRA

Affiliation (if any):*

Address:* 2068 TICONDEROGA DR.

City, State, Zip Code:* SAN MATEO, CALIF. 94402

Telephone Number:* 1-650-349-8571

Email:* I have been a resident of Eichel Highlands at above address for 45 years. I would hope that I have some voice in the matter regarding the vicinity of my home, especially now a senior citizen. How could a determination be made that this location is necessary, as I understand that it would serve residents of Sausalito, that really isn't needed at all - why can't it be in S.F. I see no beneficial reason to Highlands - Furthermore, there is environmental risks carrying them electricity - a fire fuel increase - and especially impact on property values - why should our lives be disrupted and health jeopardized to benefit another area - There are too many bad possibilities to consider such a project - health fumes and EMF emissions, noise current I'm greatly concerned as a senior - and detrimental to the construction of my Eichel Home, The project is too close to our home - Movement of Earth - No, No, No to PGE Power Line Project in Eichel Area.

Agnes Serra

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 27, 2003. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (650) 240-1720 or emailed to jeffmartin@aspenerg.com.



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

Wednesday, January 29, 2003

Name*: Rita Castello
Affiliation (if any)*: Tiny Tots Teacher, student, volunteer in San Mateo County
Address*: 509 Vera Ave.
City, State, Zip Code*: Redwood City, CA 94061
Telephone Number*: (650) 365-1139
Email*:

Some alternatives to the Transmission Line Project:

- Decide whether the power is really needed in San Francisco, then look for more local alternatives.
- Make the power lines West, further away from the Highlands residential area and the Highlands School and Recreation Center.
- Put the power line underground, or at least where they are close to the houses.

* Please reconsider this project. The health and safety of many children and family are at risk.

Thank You.

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 27, 2003. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (650) 240-1720 or emailed to jeffmartin@aspenerg.com.

To Billie Blanchard

2/27/03

C.P.U.C.

Dear Billie,

C/O the C.P.U.C. is about to embark on creating the Environmental Impact Report for the Jefferson-Martin 230 kv Transmission Project, I feel it is important that alternatives be included in the EIR Analysis.

Alternatives:

1. No project. PG&E's forecasts overestimated growth & underestimated generation capacity within San Francisco.
2. Local electricity generation, which is more reliable than transmission line electricity.
3. Town of Hillsborough - introduces underground/overground route.
4. Move the power lines west, away from residences, preferably west of Hwy 280.

My primary concerns with the Jefferson-Martin 230 kv Transmission Project are as follows:

1. Potential health risks from increased Electric & Magnetic Field (EMF) emissions.

2. Visual & audible aesthetics. Bigger, wider towers with noisier current.

3. Significant negative property value impact because of above concerns.

4. Inconvenience of long construction period, involving loud & heavy equipment (earth movers, helicopters, etc.).

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

Naren Olson Stern
15 Loma Vista Lane
Burlingame, CA 94010

Tel. (650) 348-5639

CPUC
%Aspen Environmental Group
235
Montgomery St. suite 800
S. F., CA. 94104-2906

Dear Billie Blanchard,

Thank you for the opportunity to attend public hearings about the Jefferson Martin project and our comments.

My hope is that PG&E will find ways to produce needed power in a way that is more acceptable to all the people involved. Obviously, people rely on the power, yet those same people do not want to suffer ill health or loss of aesthetic views. Cost to PG&E for the construction only is not a true cost of the project. The total cost of a project is the loss of home values collectively and the loss of tax revenue to the county. If each individual loss of home value is 100,000 to 200,000 plus in value, many revenues are impacted. The project becomes a very high cost alternative for each individual family. Collectively, the tax base cost over the years will have a substantial impact on the county in loss property tax revenue, impacting the programs the property tax supports. Please do not expect a few people to unfairly bare the burden for the delivery of the power to the many. More ways to provide reliable power need to be included in future plans. My hope is that PG&E will hear the loud objection to the present above ground higher voltage line proposal. When PG&E is able to accomplish delivery of power with all involved experiencing a positive outcome, they may find improved public relations will enhance their business.

A few points I hope will be considered are:

1. Has a second high voltage line been considered along the same existing line down by the Bay? If the point is to have a back up, the second line could be that back up. If more power is needed, the second line moving along the same towers as the first line near the Bay could be installed for that reason as well.
2. If the power sub stations need to be updated to be more reliable or to deliver more power, then expand the sub station near the line that runs along

the Bay. Put the substation in a large building, if people near the substation object to the larger substation.

3. New power plants and substations could be placed underground so people do not have to look at them.

If none of the above ideas are considered, then I would hope that the suggestions presented by people objecting to the current plan for a new line along the 280 corridor will be considered.

1. Is there really a need for the power line? Could PG&E be over-stating their need for this project?

2. Moving power lines further west away from homes in the area from hwy 92 to the Ralston substation would be so much better for the people living in the county in the area known as the San Mateo Highlands. I live on Lexington Ave. My home value would be affected dramatically. I purchased my home 2&1/2 years ago. If I had known about the PG&E plan at that time, I would not have purchased the home. I purchased my home for the view. I paid more money for my house because it had a view. I face a large substantial loss of property value with new taller towers. Taller towers will appear to be closer to me, presenting a perceived encroachment of my view. I can not afford to take a loss of my property because I am counting on it to provide for my retirement.

3. I can support a combination of above ground and below ground lines as proposed by the Hillsborough citizens. The lines near the highlands would be placed below ground.

Respectfully,



Patricia J. Doolittle

ph# 650-349-6943

1744 Lexington Ave.

San Mateo, CA. 94402

Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project

From: Steve Shannon [sshannon@nextv.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 02, 2003 10:13 AM
To: Jeffmartin@aspeneq.com
Subject: New Powerlines through Hillsborough

Dear Jeff,

I am sending this email to implore you to find another avenue for getting more electricity to San Francisco other than building bigger, uglier towers with more wattage through our community. Assuming you use the same land, there appears to be no major barriers for you to bury the lines under ground. If you can't bury them, there is a lot of land on the other side of the freeway. In fact, these same set of lines travel much of the way on the other side of the freeway already, hopping back and forth.

I realize that research around EMF is not conclusive one way or the other, but recent studies in California like this one linked to below indicate that some scientists believe there are increased risks. Please don't take unnecessary chances with our children when, in this case, relatively easy alternatives are available.

<http://www.dhs.cahwnet.gov/ps/deodc/ehib/emf/RiskEvaluation/ExecSumm.pdf>

Thank you in advance for helping secure our future health and property values.

Steve Shannon
Hillsborough resident
20 Hampton Ct.
Hillsborough, CA 94010
650.401.6098



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

Wednesday, January 29, 2003

Name*: MARK NACHTIS Michelle Corbett

Affiliation (if any):* _____

Address:* 1628 Lexington Ave

City, State, Zip Code:* San Mateo, CA 94402

Telephone Number:* 650 349 5434

Email:* MNachtis@HotMail.com

We purchased this house in 7/01. If we knew of the project we would NOT have purchased this home. We are very concerned with the increased EMF emissions IT is only going to be 300-400 ft from my young children. I am also very ~~ex~~ concerned about resale values of my home.

We hope you accept this. We just returned from out of town for the past month.

**Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.*

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 27, 2003. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (650) 240-1720 or emailed to jeffmartin@aspenerg.com.

Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project

From: Ellen Peel [epeel@sfsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2003 4:28 PM
To: jeffmartin@aspeneg.com
Cc: Ellen Peel; bill@bush.com
Subject: PG & E Power Tower Project

Dear CPUC:

I am writing because of my extreme concern about the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project currently being proposed.

We live on Lexington Avenue in the San Mateo Highlands and are most concerned about the potential health dangers to our baby and ourselves. Even if those dangers turn out to be a misconception, they can lower our property values. The temporary disruption of building the towers and the permanent disfigurement of the landscape are also a problem.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the project, investigating alternative ways of gaining the electricity actually needed while taking into account the needs of residents and the environment.

Thank you,
Ellen Peel

Professor Ellen Peel
Department of English
Department of Comparative and World Literature
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

Office phone: (415)338-7036
Email address: epeel@sfsu.edu

FACSIMILE COVER PAGE

Date: 03/13/03
Time: 10:37:36
Pages: 4

To: Billy Blanchard
Company: CPUC
Fax #: 240-1720

From: Scott Buschman
Company: Scott Buschman Photography
Address: 731 2nd Ave
San Bruno, Ca 94066
USA
Fax #: 8723207

Message:

I know, according to your info packet, that the deadline for public input on this proposal has passed BUT since this is the first I have heard about it feel I should also be heard, deadline or not. Please submit and include my letter of concern when preparing your Draft EIR. It is shameful that a project such as this can be undertaken when all the stakeholders have not been identified and notified.

Sincerely,
Scott Buschman

SCOTT BUSCHMAN

1780 Claremont Drive.
San Bruno, CA 94066

March 12, 2003

To: CPUC

Re: Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project

I live two blocks from the proposed San Bruno transition station at San Bruno Avenue and Glenview but I was not notified by the California PUC of this project, I learned about it only by reading the local newspaper on March 11. While you may have followed the letter of the law by notifying those within 300 feet of the project, you have not followed the intent which is to notify those that will be impacted by it.

I'm against this project for a number of reasons.

Highway 280, known as the most beautiful freeway in the world, will certainly lose its distinction when 100 - 150 foot towers are placed along this scenic route. There is no way to mitigate the impacts this will cause.

Next, I can't believe you would build this station on top of an active earthquake fault. It's literally a disaster waiting to happen. If power gets knocked out here in this very vulnerable spot, how many customers will be without power? Why would you make a major link, and most of the route for that matter, along an active earthquake fault.

This area is also home to the Red-Legged Frog, an endangered species. If there is a way to mitigate the frog, this prime piece of land is in San Bruno's redevelopment area and slated as potential commercial. How much money will our city be robbed of if PG&E takes over this property?

This station with its gates, power building, and 47 foot tower, will be an eyesore and make this part of town look blighted, and will negatively affect property values. Not just for those properties immediately adjacent, but since this corner (San Bruno/Glenview) is an entrance or gateway to a subdivision, its industrial look will affect property values and quality of life issues for all those in this area.

Across the street from the proposed transition station sits an abandoned gas station. This site has been a problem for years, creating a public nuisance and an eyesore. Finally, the property has been sold and the buyer has plans for new housing units. San Bruno, as well as the rest of the Peninsula, desperately needs more homes. But who will want to live across the street from this power transfer station? Will the buyer of this property back out of this project if the transition station is allowed? And then will the land continue to be an eyesore along San Bruno Ave? This is not right or fair.

I have heard about studies about EMFs, electromagnetic fields, and heard that they may pose a health risk to those that live beneath high power lines or near such high power stations. John Muir Elementary school, which is just south of this site, will lie very close to these new power lines coming in, too. What safety risks will this expose the children and teachers to, not to mention those residents that will be forced to live next to this station.

I understand that stations such as these also create noise. Homes are within 25 feet of the proposed station and nearby residents should not have to endure extra noise in an area where they had moved for the tranquillity.

I remember not that long ago, San Bruno spending 10s of 1,000s of dollars to underground utilities to beautify our city. This proposal runs counter to what our goals for our city are. Is this being forced on us against our will? I say NO! to this station.

For your information, San Bruno has had to suffer a disproportionate percentage of impacts from many state and county-wide projects. BART has come through our city and tore up our streets and threatened to take homes away. We have CalTrain that runs through town and is

now starting a grade-separation project which will have our downtown area torn up for years. We get the impacts from the airport, with planes flying low over our city, giving us noise and pollution caused by them. We have the San Francisco Jail – in San Bruno! We have Highways 280, 101, and 380 crisscrossing through our city. Each time a public entity comes to San Bruno, it means more impacts for our citizens and businesses. It creates chaos and takes away from our quality of life.

I took a quick glance at your proposed project on your web site and noticed a real lack of alternatives. Your alternatives appear to be the same routes basically with only some placement differences. You need to have some alternative routes in your proposal. Maybe along Highway 101 via Hwy. 92. Maybe have the alignment follow Highway 1 down near Serramonte Blvd and tie in at a Daly City station.

Is this project necessary at all? If we get people to conserve more or use alternative sources of energy, maybe we won't need to rely so much on this power. But I hear PG&E is even trying to tax or levy those that use solar power. This is certainly a disincentive to using alternative sources.

Please keep in mind those county residents that will be impacted by this project when making your decision. You must work with the cities to lessen the impacts each will face.

Sincerely,

Scott Buschman