Billie Blanchard, California Public Utilities Commission
% Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94104-2906

February 12, 2003

Dear Commissioner Blanchard,

I am writing you about the changing of the PG&E transmission towers in the Peninsula Watershed.

As a volunteer for San Mateo County Parks, Native Plant Society and Friends of Edgewood I was responsible for the weeding program in Edgewood County Preserve for ten years from 1989 until 1999. We spent thousands of hours getting rid of exotic weeds in this preserve resulting in thousands of pounds of weeds being removed from the area. We found that anywhere that the soil was disturbed was a place where the weeds came in. For instance; the area where the PG&E Gas line was installed underground, and around the Transmission Towers and along the roads was all a breeding ground for exotic weeds. The weeds extended out from these places.

Exotic weeds are a damaging factor in Edgewood Preserve and cannot be overlooked. You should do everything in your power not to disturb this gem we call Edgewood.

As long as you are removing the towers why don't you put the utilities underground along Canada Road where there are already disturbed areas and exotic weeds? The area where you will be working in Edgewood Preserve and the Watershed is a highly sensitive area with serpentine soil, endangered insects and flowers. Edgewood is a pristine area and should not be disturbed anymore!

You could remove the towers by Helicopter and leave the cement footings in place leaving the least amount of damage. As long as you are going underground from San Bruno to Brisbane you might as well do the rest of it underground as well.

With the chance of Terrorism underground installation of the power lines would improve security along the Peninsula.

Sincerely,

Elly Hess

Elly Hess
2411 Graceland Ave.
San Carlos, CA 94079-4404

February 16, 2003

Billie Blanchard, California Public Utilities Commission
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery St Ste 800
San Francisco CA 94104-2906

Re: EIR/EIS for PG&E Jefferson-Martin 230 cV Transmission Line Project

Dear Billie Blanchard,

We are in favor of undergrounding this project.

We are also in favor of undergrounding the existing 60 kV Transmission lines as part of this project, and, after the removal of the lines, we are in favor of removing the existing towers, especially from Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve.

Yours truly,

Bob Young Dorothy Young

Bob and Dorothy Young
1065 Drake Ct
San Carlos CA 94070-3536

**Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project**

**From:** Sam Battles [sbattles@sbcglobal.net]
**Sent:** Monday, February 17, 2003 1:05 PM
**To:** jeffmartin@AspenEG.com
**Cc:** shell (San Carlos)
**Subject:** 1b

**sbattles.vcf**

A community voice for adoption of plan 1b
Resident and homeowner Sam Battles, San Carlos, CA

"shell (San Carlos)" wrote:

> Hi, neighbors. I recently found out that PG&E plans to replace 15 miles of transmission lines along I-280 from San Carlos to San Bruno. Plans call for:
>
> - Increasing the transmission line easement from 50ft wide to 100ft
> - Construction along the easement to enlarge tower footings
> - Replacing about 100 existing 80-100ft towers with 95-150ft towers
> - Increasing one of the two existing 60kV transmission lines to 230kV
>
> Obviously this plan comes with environmental, aesthetic, safety, and health concerns, both from the construction itself, and from the long term effects of larger towers and higher voltages. In particular, a portion of the existing easement runs through Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve, where impacts from construction and long term maintenance would be a significant concern.
>
> This overhead portion of PG&E's proposal is called Segment 1A, but there is an alternative, 1B, which would eliminate the towers and move all the lines underground (as is being done with a related 12 mile segment of the project north of San Bruno). The route for Alternative 1B would be along Canada Rd and Skyline Blvd, rather than along the existing overhead easement, thus minimizing impacts for the project (tower removal in sensitive areas would be done by helicopters).
>
> The Public Utilities Commission is taking comments on this proposal through 2/27/03, by postal mail or email:
>
> Billie Blanchard, California Public Utilities Commission
> c/o Aspen Environmental Group
> 235 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
> San Francisco, CA 94104-2906.
>
> jeffmartin@AspenEG.com
>
> Additional information, including route maps, is available at:
>
> <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/aspen/jefferson_martin/jeffmartin.htm>
>
> >From there, there's a link to the project's official Notice Of Preparation. Or you can link directly at:
>

> <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/aspen/jefferson_martin/pdf/nop.pdf>
>
> Alternative 1B is a rare opportunity to improve the appearance, safety, and enviromental quality of our community. If you'd like to see it chosen over the currently preferred Segment 1A proposal, then send comments to that effect right away so your voice will be heard.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Drew

**Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project**


From: Kris Carey [careyke@pacbell.net]

Sent: Monday, February 17, 2003 1:28 PM
To: jeffmartin@aspeneg.com
Subject: ** Comment: PG&E Transmission towers - Alternative 1B **

Dear Ms.Billie Blanchard,

I am writing to express my strong support for the Alternative 1B for routing the tranmission lines underground for the whole distance. There is already enough of a visual impact on the area with the existing towers, and increasing their size even more is extrememly undesirable...better yet, the towers should be removed, as Alternative 1B would permit.

thanks

kris carey
(650) 573-8779

**Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project**


**From:** The Savarys [savarys@ix.netcom.com]
**Sent:** Sunday, February 16, 2003 2:54 PM
**To:** jeffmartin@aspeneg.com
**Subject:** Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Project


To:

Billie Blanchard,
CPUC Project Manager,
California Public Utilities Commission

This is to express our extreme opposition to the subject project as presently proposed!

As a long time property owner in the immediately affected area we seriously question the right of the utility, PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, to arbitrarily decimate the resale value of our property at 1450 Lexington Avenue, San Mateo by installing the proposed above ground transmission line between our property and Crystal Springs Reservoir.

We purchased our property in 1969 primarily for the pleasant view provided by the reservoir and its surrounding natural beauty. The existing P G & E substation was a relatively unpleasant feature of that view, but bore a low and relatively insignificant detraction from the overall view.

One of the primary assets of our existing property and those properties of our neighbors is the magnificent view of Crystal Springs Reservoir and its natural unspoiled surroundings. The very thought of destroying this magnificent view, not to mention the property value of our and all of our neighbors' property is just plain mind-boggling.

We simply cannot imagine that the California Public Utilities Commission can possibly be as totally inconsiderate of the values of the California taxpayers who it claims to represent as to approve such a desicration of natural beauty as this proposed project would be.

Please register our and our neighbors' strongest opposition to this proposal.

We sincerely trust that as our representatives in the state government the commission will disapprove this project as currently proposed.

Sincerely,


Mr. & Mrs. George W. Savary
1450 Lexington Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94402

Telephone: (650) 574-0149
E-mail: Savarys@ix.netcom.com
FAX: G. W. Savary @ (650) 697-3276


copy to Mrs. Carolyn Healy
1436 Lexington Ave.
San Mateo, CA 94402