D.2 Land Use

D.2.1 Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project

The Proposed Project and alternatives are located within or pass adjacent to the planning boundaries of a variety of local jurisdictions, including San Mateo County and numerous cities. The jurisdictional boundaries are shown on Figures B-2a and B-2b, in Section B, Description of Proposed Project. Following is a description of the existing land uses along the proposed alignment; the city or county land use designations are identified in Section D.2.2.2.

D.2.1.1 Jefferson Substation to Ralston Substation

The existing Jefferson Substation is surrounded by natural open space located within the Edgewood County Park and Natural Preserve. Cañada Road, a rural two-lane road, runs along the site's southwestern border. Interstate 280 (I-280) runs parallel to Cañada Road. On the other side of these roadways lies forested open space lands owned and managed by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) for water storage.

The overhead alignment crosses open space within Edgewood Park until about MP 0.9, at which point it crosses Edgewood Road, then crosses into the Pulgas Ridge Natural Preserve, which is managed by the Mid-peninsula Open Space District. Exiting the park at about MP 1.3 and crossing to the west side of I-280, the alignment continues across undeveloped SFPUC Peninsula Watershed Lands (Peninsula Watershed), passing by the utility's Pulgas Balancing Reservoir and Pulgas Water Temple at approximately MP 2.5.

Starting at MP 3.0, the Upper Crystal Springs Reservoir lies about 1,500 feet west of the alignment. Cañada Road runs parallel to the alignment, about halfway between the alignment and the reservoir. After passing immediately adjacent to Cañada Road around MP 4.1, the alignment crosses I-280 to Tower 4/25, just south of the I-280/Highway 92 interchange, then crosses Highway 92 to Tower 4/26. Tower 4/26 is located next to the Hillcrest Juvenile Home. Just to the north of the Hillcrest Juvenile Home and the San Mateo County Belmont Fire Station, the alignment passes the Ralston Substation, at MP 5.1.

Table D.2-1. Proposed Route from Jefferson Substation to Ralston Substation

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Jefferson Substation	SFPUC	Parks/Open Space	Edgewood County Park and Preserve
Jefferson Substation to Highway 92	SFPUC	Parks/Open Space	Edgewood County Park and Preserve, Pulgas Ridge Open Space and Preserve (east), I-280 crossing, Filoli Estate (west), Pulgas Balancing Reservoir (east), Pulgas Water Temple (west)
Highway 92 to Ralston Substation	SFPUC	West—Open Space East—Open Space/Light Industrial	Hillcrest Juvenile Home (east), San Mateo County Belmont Fire Station (east)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

D.2.1.2 Ralston Substation to Carolands Substation

From the Ralston Substation, the overhead route continues north, running along the top of a grassy slope that is also part of the SFPUC watershed. Single-family residential development (The Highlands area of unincorporated San Mateo County) lies immediately east of this portion of the alignment until the route crosses back west over I-280 at about MP 8.9. Until the alignment crosses Crystal Springs Road, all adjacent residential development is located in unincorporated San Mateo County. North of Crystal

Springs Road, the residences east of the corridor are located in the Town of Hillsborough. To the west of the alignment lie I-280, Skyline Boulevard, and Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir, respectively.

At MP 8.7, just prior to crossing back to the west side of I-280, the alignment passes the Carolands Substation, which is at the western edge of a Hillsborough residential neighborhood. Skyline Boulevard runs immediately west of the substation site, parallel to I-280.

Table D.2-2. Proposed Route from Ralston Substation to Carolands Substation

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Ralston Substation to Crystal Springs Road	SFPUC	West—Parks/Open Space East—Residential/Open Space	Residences of the San Mateo Highlands (east), San Mateo Creek crossing
Crystal Springs Road to Carolands Substation	SFPUC	West—Parks/Open Space/I-280 East—Residential/Open Space	Sawyer Camp Trail (west), residences of the Town of Hillsborough (east)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

D.2.1.3 Carolands Substation to Transition Station

Leaving the Carolands Substation, the alignment travels north 0.1 miles to Tower 8/52 at MP 8.8, then crosses Skyline Boulevard and I-280 to the west side of these roadways. From MP 8.9 to MP 9.9 the overhead alignment runs alongside the west side of the freeway and along the eastern edge of the Crystal Springs Golf Course. The residential neighborhoods of Hillsborough continue on the east side of the freeway along this stretch of the alignment.

Towers 9/54 and 9/55 are approximately 100 feet south and north, respectively, of the golf course parking lot, and about 230 feet from the clubhouse. From Tower 9/62, the alignment again crosses I-280, back to the east side. Continuing north, the alignment is again located in open space (still owned by the public) that lies between single-family residential development to the east and I-280 to the west. At about MP 10.1 and northward, this residential development passes from the Town of Hillsborough into the jurisdiction of the City of Burlingame. The watershed lands of the SFPUC continue west of I-280.

While the alignment itself remains on unincorporated property, at about MP 11.3 the adjacent residential development changes from Burlingame jurisdiction to the City of Millbrae. From about MP 11.4 northward, the San Andreas Reservoir is situated to the west of the alignment, at distances varying between about 500 and 1,000 feet. The alignment closely parallels I-280 from MP 12.1 to about MP 13.4, at which point I-280 veers more eastward and the alignment remains about 150 to 200 feet to the west of Skyline Boulevard until the transition station at MP 14.6. The alignment passes west of a water filtration plant operated by the San Francisco Water Department at about MP 13.0. Just to the northeast of this facility is the Junipero Serra County Park.

At MP 13.3, the land east of I-280 passes into the jurisdiction of the City of San Bruno. The alignment continues in SFPUC open space west of Skyline Boulevard, with residential development on the east side of Skyline. At MP 14.2 there is a small area of commercial development, including the Sky Crest Center, a shopping center east of Skyline. At MP 14.6, the existing overhead alignment continues north of San Bruno Avenue and passes the location of the proposed transition station, which currently consists of a vacant lot used for bus parking. Opposite the site, on the east side of Glenview Drive, is a closed auto repair business enclosed by cyclone fencing. Approximately 600 feet north of this closed facility and the transition station site is single-family residential development, arrayed along Glenview Drive and streets branching off of Glenview. A gas station is opposite the transition station site on the south side of San Bruno Avenue. The Sky Crest Center is on the southeast corner of the intersection.

Table D.2-3. Proposed Route from Carolands Substation to Transition Station

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Carolands Substation to Tower 9/62	SFPUC	West—Open Space/Golf Course East—Golf Course/I-280	Crystal Springs Golf Course (west)
Tower 9/62 to Tower 10/68	SFPUC	West—Open Space/I-280 East—Residential	I-280 crossing, Residences of Burlingame Hills (east)
Tower 10/68 to San Bruno Avenue	SFPUC	West—Open Space East—Open Space/I-280	I-280 crossing, San Andreas Trail (west)
San Bruno Avenue to Transition Station	City of San Bruno	North—Commercial/Open Space South—Commercial	N/A
Transition Station (San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive)	City of San Bruno	Commercial	Sky Crest Center (southeast)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

D.2.1.4 Underground Segment

San Bruno Avenue

Commencing at MP 14.6, the underground segment of the proposed alignment heads in an easterly direction along San Bruno Avenue. The land uses in the vicinity of the proposed transition station are described above in Section D.2.1.3. Just east of the Sky Crest Center is a single-family residential neighborhood that flanks the south side of the alignment until MP 15.3, when it transitions to a business park that is buffered by trees and other vegetation. At approximately MP 14.8 the north side of the alignment is bordered by open space that extends up Crestmoor Canyon toward the northwest. At MP 14.9 this use transitions to more single-family residences, interrupted by more open space further east on San Bruno Avenue. The underground segment would cross I-280 at about MP 15.5.

East of I-280, the south side of the alignment remains in residential use, while the north becomes commercial, with the Bayhill Shopping Center occupying a large parcel. North of Cherry Avenue, the north side of the alignment transitions to office development, then back to commercial uses at about MP 16.2. The south side continues in residential use until Acacia Avenue, then transitions to neighborhood commercial uses. East of El Camino Real, small-scale commercial development lines both sides of San Bruno Avenue until the route turns north at Huntington Avenue.

Table D.2-4. Proposed Route Along San Bruno Avenue

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Transition Station (San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive)	City of San Bruno	Commercial	Sky Crest Center (southeast)
San Bruno Avenue from transition station to I-280	City of San Bruno	North—Open Space/Residential South—Open Space/Residential	N/A
San Bruno Avenue from I-280 to Huntington Avenue	City of San Bruno	North—Commercial South—Residential/Commercial	N/A

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

BART ROW

Heading north on Huntington Avenue, the alignment is flanked on the west by single-family homes until it crosses I-380. Caltrain tracks line the east side of this portion of the alignment, with industrial buildings located further to the east.

North of I-380, the alignment follows the BART right-of-way, passing a large regional shopping center, Tanforan Park Shopping Center, on the west and a single-family residential neighborhood on the east.

Just south of Sneath Lane, the alignment passes just to the east of the San Bruno BART Station and then into the City of South San Francisco. From Sneath Lane to Spruce Avenue, the alignment is flanked on the east by industrial buildings and on the west by mid-size commercial buildings. North of Spruce Avenue, the commercial uses on the west side of the alignment give way to single-family homes for about 800 feet, then the right-of-way (ROW) passes South San Francisco High School, then Los Cerritos School and the Boys and Girls Club.

At Spruce Avenue, the east side of the ROW transitions from industrial to single-family residential uses, then passes Orange Memorial Park. The northernmost portion of the BART ROW alignment is lined on both sides by an alternating mixture of commercial, industrial, and high- and low-density residential uses. The alignment passes the Kaiser Permanente Medical Center and the South San Francisco BART station, both located on the west side of the alignment.

Table D.2-5. Proposed Route Along Huntington Avenue and Bart ROW

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Huntington Avenue from San Bruno Avenue to I-380	City of San Bruno	West—Industrial East—Residential	N/A
Huntington Avenue from I-380 to BART ROW	City of San Bruno	West—Commercial East--Residential	Herman Tot Lot (east), San Bruno BART Station (west)
BART ROW	City of South San Francisco	West—Industrial/Residential East—Industrial/Residential	South San Francisco High School (west), Los Cerritos Elementary School (west), Boys and Girls Club (west), Head Start (east), South San Francisco BART Station (west), Kaiser Permanente Medical Center (west), El Camino High School (east)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

Colma to Martin Substation

Just past the South San Francisco BART station, the alignment makes a 90-degree turn toward the east, following the new Lawndale Boulevard, which is nearing completion and will function as an extension of McLellan Boulevard. North of Lawndale, which extends between El Camino Real and Hillside Boulevard, is the Holy Cross Cemetery. On the south side is El Camino High School, which extends for about 0.3 miles, from Mission Road, followed by single-family homes. This new roadway forms the border between South San Francisco and the Town of Colma.

At the corner of Hillside Boulevard, the underground alignment turns in a northerly direction, continuing to pass the large Holy Cross Cemetery, now on the west side of the alignment, and the Pacific Nurseries on the east side. After the nursery, Hillside Boulevard is lined on both sides by a variety of cemeteries, mausoleums, and cemetery support businesses, such as florists and monument makers/sellers. At the southwest corner of Hillside and Serramonte Boulevard is a casino. Just south of Hoffman Street is a small apartment building on the west side of Hillside Boulevard.

At the intersection of Hillside Boulevard and Hoffman Street, the route heads up Hoffman in an easterly direction. Hoffman Street forms the boundary between the Town of Colma on the south and Daly City on the north. A series of small apartment buildings line the north side of Hoffman Street, while Olivet Memorial Park occupies a large parcel on the south side. The apartments give way to single-family homes after several blocks and the cemetery on the south gives way to more residential development at the corner of Franciscan drive. Jogging north at Orange Street, both sides of the alignment are lined by single-family residences. After passing Chester Street, the Daly City Substation is on the east side of the alignment and the property of Susan B. Anthony High School is on the west, though the school itself is set back approximately 500 feet from Orange Street.

At East Market Street, which soon becomes Guadalupe Canyon Parkway, follows the curving roadway past the substation on the south and single-family homes on the north, followed by the John F. Kennedy Elementary School. After the school, the alignment is fully within the San Bruno Mountain State and County Park for the next couple of miles, with open space being the only land use adjacent to the alignment.

About 2.8 miles east of the start of Guadalupe Canyon Parkway, residential housing in Daly City lies about 500 feet to the north. The route passes into the Brisbane city limits about 0.8 miles west of Bayshore Boulevard. Near the bottom of Guadalupe Canyon Parkway, light industrial uses flank the north side of the alignment. Heading north on Bayshore Boulevard, industrial uses initially line both sides of the alignment, then the west side gives way to undeveloped open space. The project alignment ends at its turn west into the Martin Substation.

Table D.2-6. Proposed Route from Colma to Martin Substation

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Lawndale/McLellan Drive	Town of Colma	North—Open Space (cemetery) South—Open Space/Residential	El Camino High School (south), Holy Cross Cemetery (north)
Hillside Drive	Town of Colma	West—Open Space (cemetery)/Commercial East— Open Space (cemetery)/Commercial	Holy Cross Cemetery (west), Cypress Lawn Cemetery (west)
Hoffman Street	Town of Colma to City of Daly City	North—Residential South—Open Space (cemetery)/Residential	Olivet Memorial Park (south)
Orange Street	City of Daly City	West—Residential East--Residential	Susan B. Anthony High School (west)
Guadalupe Canyon Parkway	City of Daly City to San Bruno Mountain State and County Park to City of Brisbane	North—Parks/Open Space South—Parks/Open Space	John F. Kennedy Elementary School (north)
Bayshore Boulevard	City of Brisbane	West—Industrial/Open Space East—Industrial	N/A
Martin Substation	City of Brisbane	Industrial	N/A

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

D.2.2 Applicable Regulations, Plans, and Standards

This section defines regulations, plans and standards that are relevant to the Proposed Project, and considers whether the project would be consistent with those plans.

D.2.2.1 Federal and State Regulations

Scenic and Recreation Easements

With a few brief interruptions, the overhead portion of the Proposed Project traverses land owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) from approximately MP 1.4 to MP 14.6. On January 15, 1969 the SFPUC granted a Scenic Easement to the United States government, encompassing roughly 19,000 acres of the SFPUC's Peninsula Watershed. A smaller Scenic and Recreation Easement encompassing approximately 4,000 acres of Peninsula Watershed was also granted on the same date. These easements are administered by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) within the National Park Service, a bureau of the Department of Interior (see Figure D.2-1).

The provisions of the two easements are essentially the same, with the exception that outdoor recreation is an explicitly permitted use only on the Scenic and Recreation Easement. The Proposed Project would be

located primarily within the Scenic and Recreation Easement, and subsequent references are to that easement. The easement calls for the preservation of the land in its present natural state, and requires that the land not be used for any purpose other than "for the collection, storage and transmission of water and protection of water quality; outdoor recreation; ecological preservation and other purposes, which shall be compatible with preserving said land as open-space land for public use and enjoyment." The easement prohibits the erection of structures except those directly related to the compatible uses.

The GGNRA has taken the position that these provisions (and others addressed below) indicate that the proposed PG&E project is not a permissible use on the Peninsula Watershed (GGNRA, 2003). However, the easement expressly permits the Grantor (i.e., City and County of San Francisco) the perpetual right to use the property for ". . . their water or other utility operations as now or hereafter conducted, including . . . the right to construct, maintain, repair, expand and reconstruct . . . public utilities and similar improvements . . ." (SMCRO, 1969). Potential conflicts with policies promulgated by the SFPUC for its Peninsula Watershed in the *Peninsula Watershed Management Plan* are identified later in this chapter. Because the modifications to the existing PG&E transmission line appears to fall under the SFPUC's rights to permit utility operations, a review of the Scenic and Recreation Easement conducted during the preparation of this EIR did not reveal any prohibitions of the project.

The GGNRA noted that restrictive covenants in the easement prohibit the granting of further encroachments to adjoining property owners, excavation, and cutting or removal of timber or brush (GGNRA, 2003). Regarding further encroachments, Item 5 of the easement excludes encroachments presently permitted (i.e., at the time the easement was granted) and renewals thereof from this prohibition. PG&E has held a right-of-way easement across the Peninsula Watershed since 1950, so it seems to be clearly excluded from the prohibition on further encroachments. Regarding excavation and brush/timber cutting, Item 8 of the easement provides the Grantor the perpetual right to use the land for purposes they deem necessary or desirable for water or other utility operations, including, among other things, the right to construct or expand public utilities. Item 8 also expressly states that nothing in the grant of easement shall nullify or supersede any rights or interest in the lands in existence at the time the easement was recorded.

The GGNRA also makes a claim to discretionary approval authority over the Proposed Project, citing both the Scenic and Recreation Easement and its enabling legislation (set forth at 16 U.S.C. §460bb), which included the Peninsula Watershed within the legislative boundaries of the GGNRA in 1980 (GGNRA, 2003). As noted above, the easement does not supersede PG&E's right-of-way easement or the SFPUC's right to grant an expansion of the easement. With respect to GGNRA's enabling legislation, Section 460bb-2 states that new construction is prohibited within the GGNRA, but states further

Figure D.2-1. NPS Scenic and Recreation Easements
For security reasons this figure is not included in the online version of the report.

that on lands of the San Francisco Water Department, the GGNRA administration shall be in accordance with the provisions contained in the 1969 Grant of Scenic Easement and Grant of Scenic and Recreation Easement documents. As noted, these documents expressly provide the SFPUC the authority to permit the Proposed Project to proceed on its lands. The following bullet items identify specific policies of the National Park Service Grant of Scenic and Recreation Easements followed by the rationale used to determine the Proposed Project's consistency with the given policy:

- **Statement of Objective**. Whereas, Grantor desires to preserve said real property in its natural condition to the maximum extent possible consistent with the operations and activities carried on and to be carried on by the Grantor, and to limit the use of said property to the uses to which said property is presently devoted in order to discourage conversion of such land to urban use.

  Consistency. The project as proposed would cause adverse visual impacts to the existing landscape and viewing experience within areas subject to the scenic and recreation easements, which would not be consistent with the aspect of this objective to preserve the property ". . . in its natural condition to the maximum extent possible." However, the Proposed Project includes the upgrading of an existing transmission line, which would be consistent with another aspect of the easements objectives in that it represents a continuation of a use that is present on the property (Grant of Scenic and Recreation Easement: Statement of Objectives, page 2). Effective implementation of the Visual Resources mitigation measures presented in Section D.3 would result in a net reduction in the number of transmission towers within or visible from lands subject to the scenic and recreation easements. The visual resources mitigation measures would result in the improved placement of a smaller number of towers than currently exist in new locations, resulting in an overall reduced visibility of the Proposed Project within the watershed lands. Therefore, the resulting mitigated project would be consistent with all aspects of this objective.

  - **Restriction No. 1**. The land shall be preserved in its present natural State and shall not be used for any purpose other than for the collection, storage and transmission of water and protection of water quality; outdoor recreation; ecological preservation and other purposes, which shall be compatible with preserving said land as open-space land for public use and enjoyment.

  Consistency. Although the Proposed Project represents a continuation of an existing use within the watershed and easement lands and can be considered compatible with the ongoing public use of the land for enjoyment, the increased adverse visual impact that would be caused by the project would not be consistent with the preservation intent of this restriction. With effective implementation of the Visual Resources mitigation measures presented in Section D.3, there would be a net improvement in public views of the landscape within the watershed and easement lands, which would make the project consistent with this restriction.

  - **Restriction No. 2**. No structures shall be erected upon said land except such structures as may be directly related to and compatible with the aforesaid uses.

  Consistency. The Proposed Project represents a continuation of an existing use within the watershed and easement lands. The visual characteristics of the Proposed Project (and visually mitigated project) would be compatible with the visual characteristics of the existing transmission line.

  - **Restriction No. 5**. Except as to encroachments presently permitted and renewals thereof, Grantor shall not permit further encroachments of any kind or nature upon said property by any adjoining property owner for the sole benefit of said adjoining land either by way of license, permit, easement or otherwise, unless authorized by a regional representative of the Department of Interior.

  Consistency. The Proposed Project would be consistent with Restriction 5 for the following reasons**:**

  (1) The Proposed Project would not require a new encroachment permit because it would be constructed within the existing PG&E utility corridor; (2) The existing PG&E corridor is a "presently

permitted," authorized, public utility use within the Peninsula Watershed Lands covered by the Easement (CCSF, 1969; CCSF, 2002); and (3) GGNRA authorization does not appear to be required because CCSF retained the right to conduct utility-related activities within the Peninsula Watershed, as set forth by §8(a) and (b) of the Easement (CCSF, 1969; CCSF, 2002). Although GGNRA must concur on certain activities within the Peninsula Watershed — such as *non-utility related* topographic changes or timber cutting — GGNRA concurrence does not appear to be required under the easement for utility related projects.

- **Restriction 6(a):** Except as required to accomplish the improvements hereinafter permitted or as otherwise permitted to the Grantor hereunder, the general topography of the landscape shall be maintained in its present condition and no substantial excavation or topographic changes shall be made, unless authorized by a regional representative of the Department of Interior.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would be consistent with Restriction 6(a) because it qualifies as an allowed improvement, as set forth by §8(a) and (b) of the grant between CCSF and GGNRA. The grant specifically allows for utility projects within the Peninsula Watershed Lands covered by the Easement, and states that GGNRA authorization is not required for improvements permitted by right by the CCSF (such as utility projects) even though topographical changes would result (Grant of Scenic and Recreation Easement: Restriction 6(a), page 6). Therefore, the Proposed Project is consistent with Restriction 6(a).

California Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) is charged with the regulation of certain investor-owned public utilities within the State of California, including electric transmission facilities. The CPUC regulates the terms and rates for service, equipment, practices, and facilities, as well as the issuance of stocks and bonds. As previously noted, the CPUC is the Lead Agency for CEQA review of the Proposed Project and has authority for project approval. Prior to approval, the CPUC will ensure that the project would comply with applicable State and federal regulations, and will require PG&E's compliance with local regulations to the extent feasible, in accordance with its General Order No. 131-D.

San Bruno Mountain State and County Park Master Plan

About 2.7 miles of the underground alignment passes through San Bruno Mountain State and County Park, a 2,266-acre park under the combined jurisdiction of the California Department of Parks and Recreation and San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division. The draft *San Bruno Mountain State and County Park Master Plan*, yet to be formally adopted, incorporates requirements associated with the *San Bruno Mountain Area Habitat Conservation Plan* adopted by the County in 1991, as well as the General Plan developed for the park in 1982.

The portion of the Proposed Project within San Bruno Mountain State and County Park would be located within the right-of-way of Guadalupe Canyon Parkway. A review of the *San Bruno Mountain State and County Park Master Plan* identified no adopted policies relevant to the Proposed Project. Since the Proposed Project, including equipment staging during construction, would be located entirely within the roadway, none of the policies or provisions contained in the 1982 General Plan would apply to the project (SMCPRD, 2003). While construction of the project could create minor temporary noise impacts to recreational trail users on the Bog, Saddle, and Old Ranch Road trails (addressed in more detail in Section D.9, Recreation), the Proposed Project would not otherwise adversely impact established uses in the park.

The following bullet items identify specific policies of the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan followed by the rationale used to determine the Proposed Project's consistency with the given policy:

- **HCP Objectives – Specific Conservation Needs:** Encroachment in habitat areas during PG&E utility maintenance should be minimized. If new disturbance is foreseen, PG&E should consult with the Habitat Manager to avoid particularly sensitive areas. Disturbed areas should be revegetated with Plan Operator approved species.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not directly disturb sensitive habitats within the Park because construction would take place entirely within the existing Guadalupe Canyon Parkway. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure R-2b (Review and approve construction plan for San Bruno Mountain State and County Park; see Section D.9), PG&E will coordinate with Park and HCP administrators to ensure consistency with the San Bruno Mountain HCP.

- **Transmission and Gas Lines Operating Program:** PG&E has the obligation to . . . (2) Participate in the regulatory provisions of the HCP . . . (5) If unforeseen requirements for adding new gas and electric distribution facilities arise, notify the Plan Operator of the proposed activity and give the Habitat Manager a detailed drawing of the areas where the activities will take place. Incorporate Plan Operator suggested design changes into the Proposed Project.

Consistency. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure R-2b (Review and approve construction plan for San Bruno Mountain State and County Park; see Section D.9), PG&E will coordinate with Park and HCP administrators to ensure consistency with the San Bruno Mountain HCP *Transmission and Gas Lines Operating Program*.

- **PG&E Fee Operating Program:** PG&E has the obligation to (1) participate in the regulatory provisions of the HCP, and (2) obtain approvals of any changes in land use or other uses which would alter the current state of the parcel.

Consistency. PG&E would participate in the regulatory provisions of the HCP and would not change any land uses.

- **Management Policies (1-1-01 and1-12-02):** (a) Maintenance activities should be kept to existing disturbed areas where feasible, (b) new disturbance to conserved habitat should be minimized, (c) PG&E maintenance personnel should consult with the Habitat Manager so that any new disturbance can avoid particularly sensitive habitats, and (d) disturbed areas should be re-vegetated.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not directly disturb sensitive habitats within the Park because construction would take place entirely within Guadalupe Canyon Parkway. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure R-2b (Review and approve construction plan for San Bruno Mountain State and County Park; see Section D.9), PG&E will coordinate with Park and HCP administrators to ensure consistency with the San Bruno Mountain HCP.

D.2.2.2 Local Regulations

The entire 14.6-mile overhead portion of the project is located within unincorporated San Mateo County. This portion of the alignment passes nearby numerous municipal jurisdictions, including the Cities of Redwood City, San Carlos, Belmont, San Mateo, Burlingame, Millbrae, and San Bruno, and the Towns of Woodside and Hillsborough. However, the overhead alignment passes into the incorporation limits of only one of these cities — San Bruno — just prior to the transition to the underground segment of the transmission line. Therefore, only the General Plan policies of San Mateo County and the City of San Bruno were evaluated for the overhead segment.

The General Plan land use designations assigned by the relevant jurisdictions are identified for all segments, and generalized maps of the designations are shown on Figures D.2-2a and D.2-2b. However, detailed descriptions of the allowed land uses within each land use category are not presented because such descriptions are typically silent on public utilities such as transmission lines. Most cities and

counties do not include such uses in lists of permitted, conditionally permitted, or prohibited uses, on the assumption that public utilities are a necessity of urban life in all land use categories. Because of this, no impacts have been identified in this EIR pertaining to conflicts with land use designations or zoning districts. The planning conflicts identified in this chapter are related to inconsistencies with adopted policies or regulations.

San Mateo County General Plan

The entirety of the overhead portion of the project is on land designated Open Space by the *San Mateo County General Plan*. None of the property is on lands under Williamson Act contracts (SMCPBD, 2003).

San Mateo County has promulgated many policies aimed at the protection of biological resources, soil resources, mineral resources, visual quality, cultural resources, park and recreation facilities, land use, and more. All General Plan policies were reviewed during the preparation of this EIR. Those deemed relevant to the Proposed Project are listed in Appendix 4.

The following bullet items identify specific policies related to the Proposed Project (including visual resources, biological resources, and recreation) that are identified in the San Mateo County General Plan followed by the rationale used to determine the Proposed Project's consistency with the given policy:

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.1, Protection of Visual Quality.** a. Protect and enhance the natural visual quality of San Mateo County.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would introduce additional industrial character into the existing landscape and would result in increased visual contrast, structural prominence, and view blockage at numerous locations along the proposed route. In all cases where these changes occur the visual impact would be at least adverse. In some cases, these changes would result in significant visual impacts. These changes would neither protect nor enhance the natural visual quality of the existing landscape. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.1, Protection of Visual Quality (cont'd).** b. Encourage positive visual quality for all development and minimize adverse visual impacts.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would introduce additional industrial character into the existing landscape and would result in increased visual contrast, structural prominence, and view blockage at numerous locations along the proposed route. In all cases where these changes occur the visual impact would be at least adverse. In some cases, these adverse visual changes would result in significant visual impacts. These changes would not minimize adverse visual impacts. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

Figure D.2-2a. General Plan Land Use Designation (Southern Segment)

CLICK HERE TO VIEW

Figure D.2-2b. General Plan Land Use Designation (Northern Segment)

CLICK HERE TO VIEW

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.2, Protection of Shorelines.** a. Protect and enhance the visual quality of and from shorelines of bodies of water including lakes, reservoirs, streams, bays, ocean, sloughs.

Consistency. The project as proposed would introduce additional industrial character into the existing landscape and would result in increased visual contrast, structural prominence, and view blockage when viewed from the Sawyer Camp Trail across the San Andreas Lake Dam. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.20, Utility Structures.** Minimize the adverse visual quality of utility structures, including roads, roadway and building signs, overhead wires, utility poles, TV antennae, windmills, and satellite dishes.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would introduce additional industrial character into the existing landscape and would result in increased visual contrast, structural prominence, and view blockage at numerous locations along the proposed route. In all cases where these changes occur the visual impact would be at least adverse. In some cases, these adverse visual changes would result in significant visual impacts. These changes would not minimize adverse visual impacts. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.21, Scenic Corridors.** Protect and enhance the visual quality of scenic corridors by managing the location and appearance of structural development.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would introduce additional adverse visual characteristics (increased visual contrast, structural prominence, and view blockage) into the existing landscape visible from State and County designated scenic routes including Junipero Serra Freeway (I-280) and Skyline Boulevard. These adverse visual changes would not protect or enhance the visual quality of the scenic corridors. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.27, Ridgelines and Skyline.** a. Discourage structures on open ridgelines and skylines, when seen as part of a public view in order to preserve visual integrity.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would cause additional skylining of transmission structures to occur at numerous locations along the proposed route. The result would be degradation of existing visual integrity. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.27, Ridgelines and Skyline (cont'd).** b. Allow structures on open ridgelines and skylines as part of a public view when no alternative building site exists.

Consistency. The project as proposed would cause additional skylining of transmission structures to occur at numerous locations along the proposed route. The result would be degradation of existing visual integrity. Feasible alternative structure placements and reroutes have been identified as part of the visual analysis and have been incorporated into the Visual Resources mitigation measures. Effective implementation of those measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.27, Ridgelines and Skyline (cont'd).** c. Require structures on ridgelines in forested areas, which are part of a public view to: (1) blend with the existing

silhouette; (2) not break or cause gaps within the ridgeline silhouette by removing tree masses; and (3) relate to the ridgeline form.

Consistency. There are locations along the proposed route where the transmission line would cross ridgelines in forested areas. In many of these areas, the project would result in larger structures which would introduce more visual contrast and greater structure prominence into the landscape. No significant effort has been made to blend the upgraded structures into the existing landscape. Effective implementation of the proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would help to blend the project into the existing landscape more effectively and bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.52, Height**. a. Limit the height of structures or appurtenances in forested areas so as not to exceed the height of the forest canopy.

Consistency. There are locations along the proposed route where the upgraded transmission line towers would exceed the height of the existing forest canopy. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would reduce the number of occurrences where this height limitation is exceeded, thus improving the Proposed Project's compliance with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.52, Height (cont'd)**. b. Limit the height of structures in grassland areas in order to maintain a low horizontal profile.
- **Consistency.** There are locations along the proposed route where the Proposed Project would cross grassland areas. In many of these areas, the upgraded structures would introduce more visual contrast and greater structure prominence into the landscape. No significant effort has been made to reduce the project's vertical profile. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would help to reduce the occurrence of this inconsistency and bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.
- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.63, Utilities in State Scenic Corridors.** c. Consider exceptions where it is not physically practical due to topographic features; however, utilities should not be substantially visible from any public road or developed public trail.

Consistency. There are locations along the proposed route where the Proposed Project would cross grassland areas. In many of these areas, the upgraded structures would introduce more visual contrast and greater structure prominence into the landscape. No significant effort has been made to reduce the project's vertical profile. The visual analysis has identified feasible opportunities to reduce the occurrence of this inconsistency and the visibility of the project from public roads and trails. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would help to reduce the occurrence of this inconsistency and bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Visual Quality: Section 4.65. Large Scale Power Transmission Lines**. Encourage PG&E to mitigate the adverse visual impact created by large scale power transmission lines.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would introduce additional industrial character into the existing landscape and would result in increased visual contrast, structural prominence, and view blockage at numerous locations along the proposed route. In all cases where these changes occur, the visual impact would be at least adverse. In some cases, these changes would result in significant visual impacts. Effective implementation of all proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures (which recommend reroutes and other impact reduction measures) presented in Section D.3 would bring the Proposed Project into compliance with this policy.

- **Policy 6.5(a):** Attempt to provide appropriate access and conveniences for all people in park and recreation facilities

Consistency. The Proposed Project would have the potential to impede access to recreational resources temporarily (during construction) under the jurisdiction of the County of San Mateo Parks and Recreation Department. Temporary blockages of trails or bikeways may result during construction activities. However, no permanent impediment of access would result from the project.

- **Policy 6.5(c):** Attempt to provide adequate access for emergency services to recreational facilities.

Consistency. Construction of the Proposed Project would have the potential to temporarily impede access for emergency service providers to recreational resources under the jurisdiction of the County of San Mateo Parks and Recreation Department. However, with implementation of mitigation is proposed (Mitigation Measure T-6a in Section D.12 and the APMs described in Table D.9-7)**,** the Proposed Project would not significantly impede access for emergency service providers, and would be consistent with Policy 6.5(c).

- **Policy 6.18:** Regulate the encroachment into park and recreation facilities by non-park uses. When encroachment is deemed necessary, minimize adverse impacts by considering the following measures**:** (a) minimize environmental effects when improving roadways or building new ones in or through park and restoration resources . . . (c) require restoration or other mitigation measures for damaged parkland.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would be located within the Guadalupe Canyon Parkway ROW and would not represent a new encroachment into the park or its recreation facilities.

San Mateo County Trails Plan

The following are recreation related policies from the San Mateo County Trails Plan followed by the rationale used to determine the Proposed Project's consistency with the given policy:

- **Policy 6.34.1:** Public improvement projects that may impact existing or proposed trails should be designed to facilitate provision of shared use.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not permanently disturb or displace any existing or proposed trails. The project as proposed is consistent with the policy.

- **Policy 6.13.2:** The San Mateo County Planning Department shall monitor proposed development with proposed trail routes. The Planning Department shall work to ensure that the proposed trail routes are considered with all new development.

Consistency. The Proposed Project design, review, and approval process has considered or will consider (through recommended mitigation) proposed trail routes. The project as proposed is consistent with the policy.

- **Policy 6.39.2:** Development projects on lands that include a trail route as shown on the County Trails Plan Map may be required to dedicate and/or improve such trail to the extent it is roughly proportional to the impacts of the proposed development.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not permanently disturb or displace any existing or proposed trails. The project as proposed is consistent with the policy.

Edgewood Natural Preserve Master Plan

From approximately MP 0.1 to MP 0.9, prior to traversing the SFPUC land, the overhead alignment passes through Edgewood Natural Preserve. Formerly a State park, it was jointly acquired from the State by San

Mateo County and the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (District) in 1980, and was redesignated a Natural Preserve in 1992, due to the presence of a substantial number of rare and endangered plant and invertebrate species. The *Edgewood Natural Preserve Master Plan* lists maintenance of existing structures among the permitted uses within the preserve, and acknowledges the presence of PG&E electric and gas transmission lines across the site. These uses are not included in a list of expressly prohibited uses identified in the plan.

A Grant of Park, Recreation, Scenic and Open Space Easement, modified in 1993, requires review by the District and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) for any new structures or improvements within Edgewood Natural Preserve. The review and comment privileges are advisory only, and the County is free to accept, reject, or modify recommendations of the District (and presumably GGNRA, though not explicitly stated in the Master Plan). The plan identifies a 50-foot-wide right-of-way easement for the existing transmission line, and notes that this and other PG&E easements on the site grant PG&E the right to construct, operate, and maintain their facilities at Edgewood (this easement would be expanded to 100 feet wide under the Proposed Project).

The Master Plan promulgates a variety of policies and goals generally intended to protect natural resources while providing for low-intensity recreational uses within the preserve. Policy 42 calls for the cooperation and coordination with surrounding park, open space, recreation, and service providers, including PG&E, while Goal 5 aims to provide access to Edgewood that meets visitor and public service provider needs. The Proposed Project would have the potential to impede access to the Edgewood County Park and Preserve for a short period of time. Temporary access impediments of trails or bikeways may result during construction activities. No permanent impediment of access would result from the project. Implementation of Mitigation Measures L-7a and L-7b (see Section D.2.3.5) would ensure that the project is consistent with Goal 5. In addition, Policy 38 calls for coordination with Edgewood service providers, including fire, utility, and emergency to formally designate service access routes. Any designated route that involves unauthorized trail use or additional development shall require approval by the Parks and Recreation Commission at a public hearing. Although the Proposed Project would expand the utility easement to 100 feet in width, the project would be located along the existing PG&E utility corridor and construction would utilize existing PG&E access roads. It would not involve the unauthorized use of any designated trails, or cause a significant disruption to any authorized trail use. Any current use of the PG&E corridor by hikers is considered unauthorized. Aside from these, no policies or goals are directly applicable to the Proposed Project.

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

Towers 0/6, 1/7, and 1/8, part of the right-of-way between them, and a cable-pulling site would be located just inside the 290-acre Pulgas Ridge Open Space Preserve, located a few hundred feet north of Edgewood Natural Preserve adjacent to Edgewood Road. This public open space is owned and maintained by the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, a multi-county special district dedicated to the acquisition and maintenance of regional greenbelts in southern San Mateo, northern Santa Clara, and western Santa Cruz Counties.

Although the District does not have an adopted policy document for Pulgas Ridge, the District refers to its enabling legislation as establishing its right to exclude incompatible uses in the preserve. The District, in its scoping letters for this project, notes that under Section 554.2.5(a) of the Public Resources Code, its lands are presumed to have been acquired for the best and most necessary public use (MROSD, 2003a, and MROSD, 2003b). No District policy appears to directly prohibit the Proposed Project.

Peninsula Watershed Management Plan

About 12.7 miles of the overhead alignment traverses Peninsula Watershed owned and managed by the SFPUC for the production, collection, and storage of drinking water for the City and County of San Francisco and suburban customers. The *Peninsula Watershed Management Plan* provides a policy framework for the SFPUC's regulation of all activities on its watershed lands, including their management as a water supply resource. The watershed encompasses approximately 23,000 acres of the San Francisco Peninsula and includes three storage reservoirs: Crystal Springs, San Andreas, and Pilarcitos.

Several dozen policies established by the SFPUC in the *Peninsula Watershed Management Plan* were identified that are or may be relevant to the Proposed Project. These policies are listed in Appendix 4.

Policies WQ9 through WQ13 restrict the construction of new roads and creation of new easements, with the objective of protecting water quality. While new maintenance access roads are proposed to Towers 1/10 through 2/14, 4/24, and 11/72, the number and length of the roads have been minimized; the Applicant proposes to utilize existing access roads to the greatest extent feasible. The proposed new roads would be limited in length from about 200 feet to 400 feet, and would generally extend from existing roadways, such as Cañada Road. The roads would generally avoid steep slopes and minimize grading requirements. They would not conflict with Policies WQ9 through WQ13.

Permit requirements and conditions and mitigation measures identified in topical chapters of this EIR pertaining to biological resources, cultural resources, and geology would ensure project consistency with policies pertaining to those resource areas. No conflicts with *Peninsula Watershed Management Plan* were identified.

The following bullet items identify specific policies that are related to the Proposed Project and that are identified in the Peninsula Watershed Management Plan followed by the rationale used to determine the Proposed Project's consistency with the given policy:

- **Policy WQ9:** Minimize and where possible prohibit the construction of new roads and trails.

Consistency. PG&E would minimize the construction of new roads for the Proposed Project by maximizing use of existing facilities and roads associated with the existing PG&E 60 kV transmission line where feasible, located in PG&E's existing utility corridor through the Peninsula Watershed.

- **Policy WQ10:** Where new roads or trails are required, locate and design them to follow natural topography, minimize steep slopes, stream crossings, avoid large cut and fill road designs, minimize excavations and avoid highly erodible areas.

Consistency. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures H-1a and APMs related to erosion control, erosion would be minimized. In addition, Mitigation Measure R-2a (Review and approve construction and grading plan for the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed; see Section D.9), PG&E will submit a grading and construction plan for approval by the SFPUC to ensure consistency with Policy WQ10.

- **Policy WQ11:** Minimize and where possible restrict the construction of new roads or access easements through Watershed Lands to serve new development not in SFPUC ownership to areas of low vulnerability.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not require the construction of a significant amount of new roads. Existing access roads to the transmission towers would be utilized for most project **construction** and operation. PG&E also proposes to use helicopters to transport construction materials and equipment. Development of new access roads would be kept to a minimum.

- **Policy WQ13:** Optimize the existing road system such that there are no more roads than necessary for operations and maintenance purposes.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not require the construction of a significant amount of new roads. **Existing** access roads to the transmission towers would be utilized for project construction and operation except in areas identified in Section B.3.2.2 Construction Activities for Transmission Line, Table B-4.

- **Policy WQ16:** Minimize and where possible prohibit the creation of impervious surfaces on Watershed Lands.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not add a significant amount of new impervious surfaces to the watershed (see Impact H-3, Section D.7, Hydrology and Water Resources). The new transmission towers would **replace** the existing transmission towers, resulting in a minor difference in impervious surface area, which, at existing levels, is a negligible amount of impervious surface.

- **Policy WA2:** Prohibit the construction of new trails and unsupervised access to existing roads and trails not addressed in this Plan.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not construct new trails or unsupervised access to existing roads not addressed in the Plan.

- **Policy WA6:** Restrict new utility lines proposed on the watershed for the transmission of or communications to existing utility corridors, and require that new power lines be buried, where feasible. All proposed alignments shall undergo a scenic impact analysis.

Consistency. The proposed transmission lines would be located within an existing utility corridor (though it would have to be widened) and a thorough scenic impact analysis of the Proposed Project is conducted in this EIR (see Section D.3). These aspects of the project would be consistent with Policy WA6.

The provisions of Policy WA6 specify that utility lines should be buried where feasible, but the Proposed Project would involve the construction of aboveground transmission towers. Therefore, because the Proposed Project would be located in an existing utility corridor and a scenic impact analysis has been completed, the Proposed Project would generally be consistent with the provisions of Policy WA6. Note that this EIR considers alternatives that would feasibly bury the transmission lines (in part or entirely) through and around the Peninsula Watershed (see Appendix 1).

- **Policy WA22:** Proposals for new facilities, structures, roads, trails, projects and leases, or improvement to existing facilities shall be**:** (A) Limited to essential public services and not attractions unto themselves, but incidental to the primary purposes of the watershed (water quality and water protection), or to its enjoyment and conservation in its natural condition; (B) Designed, sited, constructed and maintained to blend with the natural landscape and conform with the goals and policies set forth in this Plan; (C) Reviewed by appropriate SFPUC personnel to ensure compliance; (G) Minimized wherever possible for grading effects and the visibility of cut banks.

Consistency. First, the Proposed Project would meet an essential public service need by increasing the transmission reliability of the region, and would not be an attraction in and of itself. Second, with the implementation of all visual resources mitigation measures the Proposed Project would be designed to blend in with the natural landscape to the maximum extent feasible, in accordance with the Plan. Third, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure R-2a (Review and approve construction and grading plan for the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed; see Section D.9), PG&E will submit a grading and construction plan for approval by SFPUC to ensure consistency with Policy WA22. Finally, with the implementation of all visual resources mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would minimize grading effects and the visibility of cut banks to the maximum extent feasible.

- **Policy WA24:** Require that all proposed development involving any grading of land include the submittal of a grading plan to SFPUC to retain the existing topography where feasible, minimize grading, minimize the impacts on scenic, ecological, and cultural resources and minimize off-site soil loss.

Consistency. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure R-2a (Review and approve construction and grading plan for the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed; see Section D.9), PG&E will submit a grading and construction plan for approval by the SFPUC to ensure consistency with Policy WA24.

- **Policy WA26:** All maintenance, operation, and construction activities shall incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs), as applicable.

Consistency. PG&E has proposed implementation of six detailed measures to reduce erosion and water quality impacts (see Table D.7-2), and seven additional measures are recommended in Section D.7. These measures and the additional implementation of Mitigation Measure R-2a (Review and approve construction and grading plan for the San Francisco Peninsula Watershed; see Section D.9), would ensure consistency with Policy WA26.

City of San Bruno General Plan

The overhead portion of the preferred alignment would first enter into the jurisdiction of the City of San Bruno where it would cross Skyline Boulevard and enter the proposed transition station at Glenview Drive and San Bruno Avenue. The transition station site is designated Neighborhood/Community Commercial on the City's General Plan map. The transition site is located in the Crestmoor Planning Area. The General Plan discussion for the Crestmoor area notes that the transition site, which is bisected by the San Andreas Fault, is suitable for commercial development adjacent to the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and Skyline Drive, with the rest of the 7.5-acre site suitable for low-density residential development. Property along the south side of San Bruno Avenue in the vicinity of the transition site is also designated Neighborhood/Community Commercial. The City has indicated that it intends to redesignate the transition station site as Open Space per Policy 26, which includes a provision to consider open space lands those which are subject to geologic or seismic hazards, erosion, flooding, liquefaction, or other hazards unless such hazards can be adequately mitigated to assure public health and safety for the life of the project. See Section D.2.3.4 for potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with this issue.

Just east of Glenview Drive, the underground alignment passes south of Crestmoor Canyon, which is designated Park/Open Space, a designation that may be applied to private or public lands. The canyon provides about 75 acres of scenic open space that is largely unusable as parkland due to steep slopes. However, the Open Space Element notes it may be used for low-intensity uses such as hiking, photography, and nature study. San Bruno General Plan Action 2-1 states: Through development review, assure that development on City lands is compatible with preservation of Junipero Serra Park and San Francisco Watershed Lands in a natural state. The Proposed Project would not significantly affect the preservation of the Junipero Serra Park and it would pass through San Francisco Watershed Lands in an existing PG&E utility corridor. The south side of San Bruno Avenue transitions to a Low-Density Residential designation just west of Crestmoor Drive. At Crestmoor Drive, the north side of the alignment has this same designation. From this point, a strip along both sides of the roadway is designated Park/Open Space. On the south side, the alignment passes Medium-Density Residential, then the designation becomes Industrial northeastward to I-280. On the north side of San Bruno, the Park/Open Space designation continues until just prior to I-280, where a number of parcels are designated Low-Density Residential.

East of I-280, the alignment briefly passes land designated Park/Open Space on the north side, followed by several blocks of Neighborhood/Community Commercial and Regional Community/Office Commercial. On the south side, these same blocks are designated Low-Density Residential. From Acacia Avenue

eastward, the south side of the alignment is designated Neighborhood/Community Commercial to El Camino Real. This land use designation continues on both sides of San Bruno Avenue to Huntington Avenue.

Heading north on Huntington Avenue, the route is flanked by Industrial land on the east and Low-Density Residential on the west until the alignment crosses under I-380, at which point the east side becomes Low-Density Residential and the west side is designated Regional Community/Office Commercial. At Sneath Lane, the alignment passes into the City of South San Francisco.

None of the Land Use Element policies are applicable to the Proposed Project. The project would be consistent with Seismic and Safety Element policies requiring geotechnical investigation for development projects proposed on sites with seismic or soils hazards.

City of South San Francisco General Plan

At Sneath Lane, the proposed underground alignment would pass from San Bruno into the jurisdiction of the City of South San Francisco. The remainder of the approximately 2.3 miles of BART ROW extends between the San Bruno and the South San Francisco BART stations. The stretch of the alignment is flanked by an alternating patchwork of urban land use designations that include Office, Business Commercial, Community Commercial, Mixed Industrial, Park and Recreation, Public, Transportation Center, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and High Density Residential. In addition, a strip along the BART right-of-way, extending between the two stations referenced above, is designated Park and Recreation.

McLellan Boulevard forms the city boundary between South San Francisco and the Town of Colma. On the South San Francisco side of the alignment, the El Camino High School site, which extends for 0.5 miles, is designated Public. The next 0.2 miles is designated Low Density Residential, at which point the alignment heads northwest on Hillside Boulevard, away from South San Francisco jurisdiction.

The General Plan identifies a future Class I bike path along a planned extension of McLellan Drive. This roadway was under construction at the time of preparation of this EIR, and had been named Lawndale Boulevard; it appears that the bikeway will be completed concurrently with the rest of the roadway. While the proposed alignment does not appear to conflict directly with the bikeway, construction of the underground alignment would likely create temporary disruptions in access to the bikeway.

The only South San Francisco General Plan policies applicable to the Proposed Project are: Policy 5.1-1-6, which requires the City to work with BART, PG&E, and the San Francisco Public Utility Commission to lease and develop linear parks on existing public utility and transportation rights-of-way in the City, where appropriate and feasible; Policy 5.16-4, which requires development of linear parks in conjunction with major infrastructure improvements and along existing utility and transportation ROWs; and Policy 5.1-1-7, that requires development of a network or linkages . . . to connect existing and proposed parks. The project would be within BART ROW through South San Francisco, and BART plans a linear park along a portion of its ROW which would not be in conflict with the Proposed Project.

Town of Colma General Plan

The proposed underground segment would pass into or immediately adjacent to the Town of Colma just east of the BART ROW, where the alignment follows the boundary between Colma and South San Francisco along Lawndale Boulevard. Between the BART alignment and Mission Road, Colma assigns a Commercial designation to the property adjacent to the alignment. Continuing northeast to Hillside Boulevard, the designation is Cemetery/Open Space. This designation continues, flanking both sides of the alignment, when it passes a Commercial designation applied to the auto dealerships located along the south side of Serramonte Boulevard. The Cemetery/Open Space designation continues along both sides

of Hillside Boulevard until F Street, where one or two parcels on the west side of Hillside Boulevard have a Residential designation. The remainder of the segment is designated Cemetery/Open Space, although the Town's primary Residential district is located about 100 feet west of the alignment.

Hillside Boulevard is designated a Scenic Corridor in the Circulation Element of the General Plan; it provides scenic views to the west and southwest of the open space associated with the town's cemeteries, as well as panoramic views of Daly City and South San Francisco. It also affords foreground views to the east of San Bruno Mountain. Hillside Boulevard is also designated a Class II bicycle route, with marked bike lanes.

From the intersection of Hillside Boulevard and Hoffman Street, the alignment straddles the border between the Town of Colma and the City of Daly City. All of the land on the Colma side is designated Cemetery/Open Space.

The only Colma General Plan policy relevant to the Proposed Project is Policy 5.02.361, which requires the undergrounding of power and other utility lines associated with all new construction projects. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy because it would be entirely underground through the Town of Colma.

City of Daly City General Plan

The alignment would straddle the boundary between the Town of Colma and Daly City along Hoffman Street. On the Daly City side of the alignment, there is a small corner designated Neighborhood Commercial, then the next several blocks are designated High Density Residential. Continuing north on Hoffman Street, the Daly City side is designated Medium Density Residential and Medium-Low Density Residential. Commencing just prior to Franciscan Drive, the east side of the alignment is also within Daly City, and is designated Low Density Residential. As the alignment heads northwest at Orange Street, both sides of the street are designated Medium-Low Density Residential. Crossing Chester Street, the alignment is designated Schools on the south side and Public Utilities on the north side.

Heading north as Market Street transitions to Guadalupe Canyon Parkway, the alignment is flanked on the east by Service Commercial land and on the west by Medium-Low Density Residential, which then gives way to another Schools site. Guadalupe Canyon Parkway is designated a Class II bikeway. The small portion of San Bruno Mountain County Park within Daly City jurisdiction (opposite the Schools site) is designated Recreation-Public. The alignment passes out of Daly City and into unincorporated San Mateo County, about three miles north of Orange Street. No policies applicable to the Proposed Project have been identified in the Daly City General Plan.

City of Brisbane General Plan

The proposed underground alignment would pass into the City of Brisbane about 0.8 miles west of the end of Guadalupe Canyon Parkway. The area to the south of the alignment is designated Residential and Open Space, while the area to the north has a Subregional Commercial/Retail/Office designation that continues down to and along the west side of Bayshore Boulevard. The Martin Substation, where Segment 5 terminates, is also designated Subregional Commercial/Retail/Office, but a parcel just to the south is designated Marsh. The area on the east side of Bayshore is designated Trade Commercial from Guadalupe Canyon Parkway to the substation.

A review of the Brisbane General Plan identified only one policy with relevance to the Proposed Project. Policy 189 restricts noise-producing construction activities to daytime hours of operation. If nighttime operations would be required at certain locations, primarily those with high daytime traffic volumes, the

project could conflict with this policy. This potential impact and appropriate mitigation measures are discussed below, in Section D.2.3 (Impact L-4).

Tree Ordinances

Most of the local jurisdictions in the project area have adopted ordinances regulating the removal of trees. In most cases, removal of trees meeting a certain size threshold requires a permit, the approval of which may require the planting of replacement trees. Because the underground segments would be located in existing street rights-of-way, no trees would be removed in the construction of these segments. Although the overhead segment would be located in an existing PG&E easement, expansion of the maintenance right-of-way and creation of some cable-pulling sites would likely require removal of some trees in unincorporated San Mateo County.

Section 12000 of the San Mateo County Zoning Ordinance regulates the removal of significant trees, defined as trees with a circumference of 38 inches or more as measured at 4-1/2 feet above the ground or immediately below the lowest branch, whichever is lower. The ordinance requires a permit, issued by the Planning Director, for the removal of any significant trees. Where substantial alteration of vegetation within a scenic corridor will occur, approval by the Planning Commission is required. The Zoning Ordinance defines a scenic corridor as "those portions of land shown on the Map of Scenic Corridors abutting either side of select rural travel routes" (Section 4.44(b)). Section 4.12 of the General Plan provides a more explicit definition of scenic corridor as "land adjacent to a scenic road right-of-way which, when seen from the road, provides outstanding views of natural landscapes and attractive man-made development." In the vicinity of the Segment 1 alignment, Cañada Road, Edgewood Road, Junipero Serra Freeway (I-280), and Skyline Boulevard are all designated scenic routes. Construction of support towers and poles and utilization of cable-pulling sites would require the removal of trees at numerous locations along the Segment 1 alignment, some of which are visible from these designated scenic routes. It is therefore anticipated that the County would require Planning Commission approval for a tree removal permit for the Proposed Project.

Planting of an unspecified number of replacement trees may be required as a condition of permit approval from San Mateo County. Although replanting at a minimum replacement ratio of 3:1 is required within the Residential Hillside/Design Review (RH/DR) zoning district, none of the project alignment would be located in an RH/DR district.

In addition to the ordinance referenced above, San Mateo County has an ordinance regulating the removal of heritage trees, set forth in Section 11000 of the Zoning Ordinance. A heritage tree is defined as any tree or grove of trees so designated by the Board of Supervisors. In addition, any healthy tree of the species listed in Table D.2-7 meeting the minimum diameter listed is also deemed a heritage tree. A permit is required from the San Mateo County Planning Department in order to lawfully cut down, destroy, move, or trim any heritage tree. The potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures for trees protected by these ordinances are discussed below, in Section D.2.3 (Impact L-2).

Table D.2-7. Heritage Tree Species in San Mateo County

Tree Species	Diameter (at breast height)	Additional Diameter Criteria
Bigleaf Maple (*Acer macrophyllum*)	28–36 inches	28 inches east of Skyline Blvd.; 36 inches west of Skyline Blvd.
Madrone (*Arbutus menziesii*)	48 inches	48 inches for single stem or multiple stems touching each other; or clumps visibly connected above ground with basal area greater than 20 sq. ft. at 4-1/2 ft. above ground level
Golden Chinquapin (*Chrysolepis chrysophylla*)	20 inches	—
Santa Cruz Cypress (*Cupressus abramsiana*)	(all)	—
Oregon Ash (*Fraxinus latifolia*)	12 inches	—
Tan Oak (*Lithocarpus densiflorus*)	48 inches	—
Douglas Fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*)	60 inches	East of Skyline Blvd. and north of Highway 92
Coast Live Oak (*Quercus agriolia*)	48 inches	—
Canyon Live Oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*)	40 inches	—
Oregon White Oak (*Quercus garryana*)	(all)	—
Black Oak (*Quercus kellogii*)	32 inches	—
Interior Live Oak (*Quercus wislizenii*)	40 inches	—
Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*)	48 inches	—
Blue Oak (*Quercus douglasii*)	30 inches	—
California Bay or Laurel (*Umbellularia californica*)	48 inches	48 inches for single stem or multiple stems touching each other; or clumps visibly connected above ground with basal area greater than 20 sq. ft. at 4-1/2 ft. above ground level
California Nutmeg (*Torreya californica*)	30 inches	
Redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*)	72–84 inches	72 inches east of Skyline Blvd.; 84 inches west of Skyline Blvd.

Source: San Mateo County Ordinance, Section 11000

D.2.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

D.2.3.1 Standards of Significance

The CEQA Guidelines (Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form, Sections II and IX), indicate that a significant adverse land use or planning impact would result if a project would:

- Physically divide an established community;
- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan;
- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non–agricultural use;
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; or
- Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non–agricultural use.

In addition, based on standard CEQA practice and previous environmental documents analyzing transmission line projects, the Proposed Project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Permanently displace an established land use;
- Create long-term disturbances that would disrupt an established land use;
- Adversely affect sensitive receptors, such as residences, schools, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, or other facilities with populations of the sick, elderly, or very young; or
- Interfere with agricultural operations such that seasonal agricultural productivity would be substantially reduced.

In addition, Section D.2.2 above considers whether the Proposed Project would conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Potential project impacts on established and/or planned recreational land uses are addressed in Section D.9, Recreation. Visual effects of the project on established land uses are assessed in Section D.3, Visual Resources.

D.2.3.2 Applicant Proposed Measures

PG&E proposes to implement the Applicant Proposed Measures (APM) presented in Table D.2-8 to reduce general land use impacts associated with construction. The CPUC ensures compliance with these measures by monitoring their implementation prior to and during construction.

D.2.3.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the 230 kV/60 kV Overhead Transmission Line

Jefferson Substation to Ralston Substation

Impact L-1: Conflict with Biological Resources Policies

Construction of the overhead portion of the Proposed Project would result in conflicts with adopted San Mateo County policies pertaining to the protection of sensitive habitats. County Vegetative, Water, Fish And Wildlife Resources Policies 1.2 and 1.27 through 1.30 call for the protection of sensitive habitats, the establishment of buffer areas around such habitats, and the regulation of incompatible uses within the habitats and buffers. As discussed in Section D.4, Biological Resources, construction of the overhead portion of the Proposed Project could adversely affect wetland, riparian, and serpentine grassland habitats within the alignment, all of which would be considered sensitive habitats subject to the County's policies. This would be a potentially significant, but mitigable policy conflict impact (Class II).

Table D.2-8. Applicant Proposed Measures – Land Use

APM 5.1	Lift Plan. Should a change in construction temporarily vacate any residence, Mitigation Measure 11.7, Helicopter Lift Plan, will be implemented, including advance notification and coordination with potentially affected residents.
APM 5.2	Public Information Program. A public-liaison representative will provide the public with advance notification of construction activities. Concerns related to dust, noise, odor, and access restrictions associated with construction activities will be addressed within this program.
APM 5.3	No construction that affects trail use will be conducted on holidays.
APM 5.4	All construction activities, including temporary trail closures, affecting the parklands and trail systems of the Peninsula Watershed Lands and Edgewood County Park Preserve will be coordinated, respectively, with the SFPUC and San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Department at least 30 days before construction begins in these areas.
APM 5.5	Signs directing vehicles to alternative park access and parking will be posted in the event construction temporarily obstructs parking areas near trailheads.
APM 5.6	PG&E will coordinate with city officials with jurisdiction over local parks near the route at least 30 days prior to construction. PG&E will also post signs alerting park users to construction activities at least a week in advance of construction near parks.
APM 5.7	Signs advising recreation users of construction activities and directing them to alternative trails or bikeways will be posted on both sides of all trail intersections or as determined through PG&E coordination with the respective jurisdictional agencies.
APM 5.8	Where helicopters are used for construction, signage advising equestrians of construction timeframes with helicopter use will be posted at all equestrian trail-access points within the vicinity of the flight paths. These signs will be checked and maintained daily.
APM 5.9	PG&E will coordinate with nearby schools and provide notification of construction timing, access issues, and any potential construction-safety issues that may arise at least 30 days prior to beginning construction.
APM 5.10	PG&E will coordinate with BART and the Chestnut Avenue car dealership to relocate the vehicles parked in the ROW and to minimize impacts to the business during construction.
APM 5.11	PG&E will schedule construction directly in front of school-access points for school holidays, breaks, weekends, or after-school hours. PG&E will inform schools of the construction schedule at least 30 days before construction begins. No construction will occur in front of school driveways during school hours.

Source: PG&E, 2002

Mitigation Measure for Impact L-1, Conflict with Biological Resources Policies

Implementation of Mitigation Measures B-1b, B-1c, B-3a, and B-3b, set forth in Section D.4, would ensure protection of biological resources.

Impact L-2: Conflict with County Tree Ordinances

Construction of the overhead portion of the Proposed Project would require removal of mature and immature trees, some of which would be subject to San Mateo County's ordinances regulating the removal of heritage trees and/or significant trees. It is presumed that PG&E would obtain required permits, which may be subject to Planning Commission approval, and would not conflict with these adopted County ordinances, promulgated in Sections 11000 and 12000 of the County Ordinance Code, respectively. However, additional protection for trees is presented in Mitigation Measure B-2b to ensure that this potentially significant impact to trees is reduced to less than significant levels (Class II).

Mitigation Measure for Impact L-2, Conflict with County Tree Ordinances

Implementation of Mitigation Measure B-2b, set forth in Section D.4, would ensure that impacts to protected trees would be less than significant.

Impact L-3: Conflict with County Visual Quality Policies

The proposed overhead transmission line across public open space and SFPUC Peninsula Watershed would further degrade visual conditions by increasing the height of towers along the existing transmission line, thereby conflicting with visual quality policies adopted by San Mateo County. These policies are intended to protect and enhance the existing natural quality of the project area; minimize adverse visual effects; protect the visual quality of reservoir shorelines and scenic corridors; minimize the adverse visual effects of utility structures; discourage and restrict construction of structures on open and forested ridgelines; and encourage PG&E to mitigate the adverse visual effects of large transmission lines. The relevant policies include General Plan policies 4.1(a-b), 4.2(a), 4.20, 4.21, 4.27(a-c), 4.52(a-b), and 4.65. As defined in Section D.3, Visual Resources, the Proposed Project would create significant (Class I) impacts at several viewpoints.

Mitigation Measure for Impact L-3, Conflict with County Visual Quality Policies

Implementation of all of the proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures, set forth in Section D.3, would ensure that visual impacts would be reduced to the extent feasible. While significant visual impacts of the Proposed Project remain in some areas, alternatives are considered in this EIR that would eliminate those impacts.

Ralston Substation to Carolands Substation

Impacts L-1, L-2, and L-3 and the mitigation measures recommended for them would also apply to the Ralston Substation to Carolands Substation stretch of the alignment. In addition, the following impact would also apply.

Impact L-4: Construction Nuisances or Disturbances to Residents, Businesses or Sensitive Land Uses

Construction of the 230 kV transmission line would generate noise, dust, and diesel exhaust odors that could adversely affect residents in homes adjacent to or in proximity to the alignment. Within the segment between Ralston Substation and Carolands Substation, residents in The Highlands, the unincorporated neighborhood north of State Route 92 and south of Crystal Springs Road, and residents living along the western edge of the Town of Hillsborough would be adversely affected. In addition, residents of the Hillcrest Juvenile Home would be adversely affected. This would represent a temporary conflict with established land uses.

Temporary impacts would result from clearing and grading tower foundation pads, drilling pier foundations, removal of existing towers, erection of new support towers, and conductor stringing. Dust generation in the vicinity of residences would be quite limited, as no new or expanded access roads would be required in the vicinity. Noise levels and diesel odors would vary by construction activity and equipment in use, ranging from light trucks to heavy ground-working equipment and use of helicopters to carry large segments of transmission towers. Although the noise, dust, and odors generated during construction could constitute a nuisance to neighboring residents, the construction at each location would be of short duration, and construction noise, dust, and diesel odor are commonly accepted by-products of the growing urban development in the Bay Area. This impact would therefore be adverse, but not significant (Class III).

Helicopter operations for personnel and material delivery to tower locations would need to be addressed by PG&E's proposed helicopter operations Lift Plan. The requirements for the Lift Plan are discussed in Section D.12, Transportation and Traffic, of this EIR. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) would need to review and approve the Lift Plan before issuing a Lift Plan Permit. The FAA will require temporary abandonment of streets (within 150 feet laterally) and buildings (within 300 feet laterally) near or under operations of a loaded

helicopter. PG&E estimates that occupants may need to temporarily vacate, for periods of up to 12 hours per day, homes that would be closest to as many as 30 towers. At a minimum, homes near Towers 6/35 through 7/40, in the vicinity of the Crystal Springs Dam, would need to be vacated during helicopter use. Depending on PG&E's Lift Plan, homes, other occupied buildings, or recreational uses near Towers 5/27 through 5/32, 7/41 through 9/55, and 10/63 through 10/68 may also need to be vacated. Although vacating homes would satisfy the FAA requirements, temporary displacement of residents would cause a short-term but potentially significant (Class II) disruption of these established land uses. Mitigation Measure L-4c would be required to compensate those displaced to ensure that impacts are not significant.

The Applicant proposes to avoid short-term construction impacts with APMs shown in Table D.2-8. In APMs 5.1 and 11.7, shown in Table D.12-3, the helicopter operations Lift Plan would be prepared. In APM 5.2, PG&E commits to a public information plan for advance notification of construction activities. The following mitigation measures (L-4a through L-4c) are recommended to further reduce the noise, dust, and odor impacts on residents. These impacts are also addressed in Sections D.10, Air Quality, and D.11, Noise, of this EIR. Note that specific mitigation for reduction of air emissions is presented in Section D.10, Air Quality. Mitigation Measures A-1a (reduce dust), A-2a (control exhaust emissions), and A-3a (asbestos management) would reduce air quality impacts.

Mitigation Measures for Impact L-4, Construction Nuisances or Disturbances

Significant impacts have been identified only for displacement caused by helicopter use. The following measures would reduce that impact (Class II) and general construction impacts (Class III) on residents. In APM 5.2, PG&E commits to a public information plan; however Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b present additional detail. APMs 5.1 and 11.7 define the need for a Helicopter Lift Plan, but Mitigation Measure L-4c is required to provide compensation to displaced residents.

L-4a **Provide Construction Notification**. PG&E or its construction contractor shall provide advance notice, between two and four weeks prior to construction, by mail to all residents or property owners within 300 feet of the alignment. The announcement shall state specifically where and when construction will occur in the area. If construction delays of more than 7 days occur, an additional notice shall be made, either in person or by mail. Notices shall provide tips on reducing noise intrusion, for example, by closing windows facing the planned construction. PG&E shall also publish a notice of impending construction in local newspapers, stating when and where construction will occur. Prior to construction, copies of all notices shall be submitted to the CPUC.

L-4b **Provide Public Liaison Person and Toll-Free Information Hotline**. PG&E shall identify and provide a public liaison person before and during construction to respond to concerns of neighboring residents about noise, dust, and other construction disturbance. Procedures for reaching the public liaison officer via telephone or in person shall be included in notices distributed to the public in accordance with Mitigation Measure L-4a. PG&E shall also establish a toll-free telephone number for receiving questions or complaints during construction and shall develop procedures for responding to callers. Procedures shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to construction.

L-4c **Provide Compensation to Displaced Residents**. If helicopter use requires the displacement of residents from homes along the transmission line route, residents shall be compensated by PG&E for this displacement. Compensation shall be negotiated with each household, depending on the extent and duration of disturbance, and shall include provision for meals and hotels, as well as accommodation of any special medical needs of displaced residents. PG&E shall provide to the CPUC a statement documenting that an agreement has been reached with each affected landowner at least 30 days prior to the start of construction.

Carolands Substation to Transition Station

Impacts L-1, L-2, and L-3, identified for the Jefferson Substation to Ralston Substation segment and Impact L-4, identified for the Ralston Substation to Carolands Substation segment, would apply to this segment and would require implementation of the mitigation measures identified for those impacts. Residents that would likely be affected by noise, dust, odors, or temporary relocation for helicopter operations (Impact L-4) are located along the western edges of the communities of Hillsborough, Burlingame, Millbrae, and San Bruno. The residents in Burlingame and a few residents in Hillsborough would be affected the most, due to their closer proximity to the alignment. Mitigation Measures L-4a through L-4c should be implemented to ensure that impacts are less than significant.

Impact L-5: Interference with SFPUC Maintenance Activities

Project plans provided by the Applicant show the placement of cable-pulling sites adjacent to Tower 13/83 in a maintenance access road used by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The staging and use of equipment on these sites could disrupt the SFPUC's use of its access roads and interfere with maintenance activities on its property. In addition, support towers within the Peninsula Watershed may also interfere with use of maintenance roads both during, and potentially after, construction of the project. Towers that could intrude into Watershed maintenance roads include Towers 11/75, 12/79, 12/80, 12/81, 13/85, and possibly others. While the minor interference with SFPUC maintenance activities during construction would not exceed the significance criteria, if any support towers would encroach into SFPUC roadways, it could be a long-term disruption to an established land use. This would therefore be a potentially significant impact (Class II), mitigable to less than significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure L-5a.

Mitigation Measure for Impact L-5, Interference with SFPUC Maintenance Activities

L-5a **Coordinate with SFPUC within Peninsula Watershed.** PG&E shall coordinate the locations of all support towers and cable-pulling sites within the Peninsula Watershed with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to ensure that construction and operation of the Proposed Project does not interfere with SFPUC maintenance and operations activities. This coordination shall be documented to the CPUC in a letter provided at least 60 days before the start of construction.

D.2.3.4 Transition Station

The proposed transition station would be visually incompatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses, including residences and neighborhood commercial development. This impact is addressed in Section D.3, Visual Resources. Although the transition station would not conflict with the Zoning Ordinance or with any actual existing established land uses or with the General Plan, it would conflict with an approved future use, which is treated as an existing use, as described in the following impact.

Impact L-6: Conflict with Planned Future Development

The proposed transition station is located in a San Bruno Redevelopment Area (Area "B") where the City is attempting to eliminate or reduce blight. The 18-acre redevelopment area encompasses all four corners of the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Avenue. The transition station would be inconsistent with the City's intention to redevelop this area of the City. The City is also in the process of updating the General Plan, and is intending to redesignate the transition station site as Open Space and the two parcels located across Glenview to the east as Medium-Density Residential (City of San Bruno, 2003b). These parcels were formerly occupied by gas stations. The northerly parcel has been cleared of structures and remediated, and remediation of the corner site is nearing completion. A developer is proposing to develop townhomes on these two parcels, which would be consistent with the planned new land use designations for the parcels.

The transition station site itself is planned for development with a parking lot to serve as a satellite lot for the Church of the Highlands and as trailhead parking for a recreation trail located on the west side of Skyline Boulevard. The San Bruno Planning Commission approved plans to construct a 103-space parking lot on the site in April 2001, and the church has a 10-year lease on the site from Caltrans. According to the City, construction of the lot was planned to commence in April 2003 (City of San Bruno, 2003a). While the parking lot is not yet built, it is an entitled use, and is therefore treated as an established land use for purposes of this analysis.

Although the revisions to the General Plan have not been formally adopted, the change in land use designation of the transition station site is anticipated for this year. The transition station would be inconsistent with the planned Open Space designation (the approved parking lot would be consistent), and would be incompatible with the anticipated townhomes directly across the street. In addition, the City plans to redesignate the southeast corner of the San Bruno/Glenview intersection as Mixed Use. It is anticipated that the existing shopping center there may be redeveloped in the future with a mix of residential and commercial uses.

Based on the above conflicts, including a conflict with what is considered an established land use, this would be a significant impact (Class I). The impact could be eliminated with an alternative transition station site or the Route Option 1B Alternative, discussed in Sections D.2.4 and D.2.5, but it would not be mitigable at the proposed site.

D.2.3.5 230 kV Underground Transmission Line

San Bruno Avenue

Impact L-4, described above for construction of overhead project segments, would be somewhat more severe in the underground segments due to the requirement for construction of the trench and splice vaults, which would require operating concrete saws, pavement-breaking machines, jackhammers, backhoes, and other powered construction equipment that would generate noise that could disturb nearby workers. Other noise-generating equipment would include trucks to haul equipment, materials, and personnel; mobile cranes to install prefabricated splice vaults and lay concrete duct banks; a cable-puller truck to pull transmission cables through conduits; air tampers to compact soil; concrete trucks to pour backfill slurry; power generators, air compressors, and more. Trenching and backfilling would generate dust that could settle on parked cars, window ledges, and other exposed horizontal surfaces. This would represent a temporary conflict with established land uses. Disruption at any given location would last from one to three weeks. Although the noise, dust, and odors generated during construction would constitute a minor nuisance to neighboring businesses and residents, the construction at each location would be of short duration, and construction noise, dust, and diesel odor are commonly accepted by-products of the growing urban development in the Bay Area. This impact would therefore be adverse, but short-term and not significant (Class III).

These impacts are also addressed in Sections D.10, Air Quality, and D.11, Noise, of this EIR. While significant impacts have not been identified, measures identified above (A-1a, A-2a, and A-3a) would reduce impacts on residents. As previously noted, in APM 5.2, PG&E commits to a public information plan; however Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b present additional detail. Implementation of those measures would further reduce impacts on businesses and residents.

Impact L-7: Disrupted Access to Businesses and Residences

The underground portion of the proposed transmission line would be located primarily within existing city streets lined by a multitude of businesses and residences. During excavation of the trench for the underground cable, access to side streets, entrances, and driveways would be temporarily disrupted and possibly

blocked. This could potentially deprive business owners of customer patronage and could prevent residents from enjoying full use of their properties. While in most cases and at most times, alternative access would be readily available via minor detours (such as needing to drive an extra block and make a U-turn on a four-lane roadway divided by a median), in a limited number of instances access could be more effectively blocked during construction. This would represent a conflict with an established land use. However, even under a worst-case situation, reasonable pedestrian access would be available at all times to all businesses and residences. In such a worst-case situation, for example, a business patron could be obliged to park up to a few hundred feet away from a destination. Reasonable vehicular and full pedestrian access to private homes located along the alignment would be available at all times. There may be some isolated locations along the underground alignment where construction could block the driveway to a private off-street parking lot serving a business. In these instances, such disruption could potentially deprive a business of patronage, but such disruption would be short-term in nature. Because the potential disruption of established land uses would be short-term, this would be an adverse, but not significant impact (Class III). To further reduce the severity of the impact, Mitigation Measures L-7a and L-7b are recommended.

Mitigation Measures for Impact L-7, Disrupted Access to Businesses and Residences

L-7a **Provide Continuous Access to Properties.** PG&E or its construction contractor shall provide at all times the ability to quickly lay a temporary steel plate trench bridge upon request to ensure driveway access to businesses and residences, and shall provide continuous access to properties when not actively constructing the underground cable alignment.

L-7b **Coordinate with Businesses.** Where private parking lots serving businesses would be effectively blocked during construction, PG&E shall either make prior arrangements with the business owner(s) to provide alternative parking within reasonable walking distance (i.e., no more than 1,000 feet), or shall coordinate the construction schedule so as to prevent disrupting the functions of the business(es).

BART ROW

Impact L-4 (construction disturbance) and the recommended mitigation would also apply to residences located in proximity to the BART ROW. Although this segment of the alignment passes by South San Francisco High School, a track and other school sports fields flank the alignment, while the school buildings are set back 750 feet and more from the alignment. The alignment also passes the Boys and Girls Club, the South San Francisco Kaiser Permanente Medical Center, a Head Start facility, and El Camino High School. Each of these uses is set back sufficiently far from the alignment that construction noise impacts on these land uses would be adverse but short-term and not significant (Class III), and implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b would further reduce the impact. In APM 5.2, PG&E commits to a public information plan; however Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b present additional detail.

Colma to Martin Substation

Impacts L-4 and L-7, identified for the underground segment in San Bruno Avenue, would also apply to the Colma-to-Martin Substation segment of the underground alignment, and the mitigation measures recommended for those impacts would apply as well. The sensitive receptors in this area include El Camino High School, Pollicita Middle School, and John F. Kennedy Elementary School. Due to the closer proximity to the alignment of two of these receptors, the degree of impact would be greater, and they could also be adversely affected by diesel odors and fumes from construction equipment.

The alignment passes in close proximity to El Camino High School in South San Francisco. School buildings are as close as 50 feet to the proposed alignment. The alignment also passes in close proximity to John F. Kennedy Elementary School in Daly City, on the Guadalupe Canyon Parkway. Here, the closest school buildings are about 60 or 70 feet from the proposed alignment. At these distances, noise generated by pavement cutting, trench excavation, and other construction activities would likely be quite disruptive to lessons being held inside the classrooms. The children at the elementary school and older students at the high school would also be exposed to diesel emissions, dust, and odors during recess (at the elementary school), gym classes (at the high school), and other outdoor activities at the schools. PG&E has included Applicant Proposed Measures APM 5.9 and APM 5.11 which would ensure that the impact would be less than significant. This would therefore be an adverse but not significant impact (Class III). These impacts are also addressed in Sections D.10, Air Quality, and D.11, Noise, of this EIR.

D.2.3.6 Substations, Switchyards, and Taps

No land use or planning impacts were identified for any of the substations, switchyards, or taps.

D.2.4 Southern Area Alternatives

D.2.4.1 PG&E Route Option 1B – All Underground

Environmental Setting

With respect to land use, the setting for this alternative is similar to that of the proposed alignment for the first approximately four miles. From the Jefferson Substation, the alignment would be located within Cañada Road, which is flanked on both sides by open space watershed lands under the management of the SFPUC. The distinction from the Proposed Project is that this alternative would remain outside of both Edgewood Natural Preserve and the Pulgas Ridge Open Space Preserve. Rather than passing to the east, this alternative would pass immediately adjacent to the Pulgas Balancing Reservoir and Pulgas Water Temple.

North of Highway 92, the PG&E Route Option 1B Alternative would be located on the west side of I-280, with a substantial separation (generally 1,500 feet or more) from the residential neighborhoods that flank the proposed alignment. North of the Carolands Substation the alignment would remain on the east side of I-280, and would therefore avoid the Crystal Springs Golf Course. Single-family residences line the stretch of Skyline Boulevard between the substation and Trousdale Drive.

Heading east on four-lane Trousdale Drive in the City of Burlingame, the alternative alignment passes multi-family residences on the north side. Continuing east, the alignment is flanked on both sides by single-family residences, then transitions to office uses east of Sequoia Avenue. Franklin Elementary School is about 200 feet south of Trousdale Drive and west of Quesada Way. Just west of the intersection of Trousdale Drive at El Camino Real, there is a commercial shopping center on the north side and Mills-Peninsula Hospital on the south side, which has a future expansion project planned.

The alternative route turns to the north at El Camino Real. This major divided arterial is fully developed with a mixture of neighborhood, community, and regional commercial uses, including numerous hotels, throughout its length from Trousdale Drive to San Bruno Avenue, passing from Burlingame, through the City of Millbrae, and into San Bruno. At San Bruno Avenue, PG&E's Underground Route Option 1B turns to the east and joins the proposed alignment at the corner of San Bruno Avenue. Table D.2-9 lists land uses and sensitive receptors along this alternative route.

Table D.2-9. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors: PG&E Route Option 1B

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Jefferson Substation	SFPUC	Parks/Open Space	Edgewood County Park and Preserve
Cañada Road from Jefferson Substation to Highway 92	SFPUC	Parks/Open Space	Pulgas Ridge Open Space and Preserve (east), Filoli Estate (west), Pulgas Balancing Reservoir (east), Pulgas Water Temple (west)
Highway 92	SFPUC	West—Parks/Open Space East—I-280/Open Space	Ralston Substation (east), Hillcrest Juvenile Home (east), San Mateo County Belmont Fire Station (east)
Skyline Boulevard/ Highway 35	SFPUC	Parks/Open Space	Crystal Springs Dam, Sawyer Camp Trail (west)
Golf Course Road	SFPUC	Crosses under I-280	N/A
Skyline Frontage Road	Town of Hillsborough	West—I-280/Golf Course East—Residential	Crystal Springs Golf Course (west), Hillsborough Fire Department (east), The Nueva School (east)
Skyline Boulevard/ Highway 35	City of Burlingame/SFPUC	West—Residential/Open Space East—Residential	N/A
Trousdale Drive	City of Burlingame	North—Residential/Commercial South—Commercial/Residential	Kingdom of Jehovah's Witnesses (north), Franklin Elementary School (south), Burlingame Intermediate School (south), Mills-Peninsula Hospital (south)
El Camino Real	City of Burlingame to City of San Bruno	Commercial	San Bruno Fire Department (west), San Bruno Public Library (west)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would avoid many of the land use and planning impacts identified for the Proposed Project and would not create any new impacts or warrant additional mitigation measures beyond those already identified for the Proposed Project. While Impact L-1, related to conflicts with biological resource policies, would still apply, it would pertain only to the crossing of the Crystal Springs Dam; the alternative would avoid many miles of sensitive habitat crossed by the Proposed Project. The policies with which the alternative would conflict at the dam crossing include Watershed Plan policies regarding Vegetative, Water, Fish and Wildlife Resources numbers 1.2 and 1.27 through 1.30, which call for the protection of sensitive habitats, the establishment of buffer areas around such habitats, and the regulation of incompatible uses within the habitats and buffers. The alternative also incorporates options for crossing the dam (including the underwater cable option) that would avoid this conflict with sensitive resources on the dam.

This alternative would avoid Impacts L-2 and L-3, pertaining to conflicts with San Mateo County tree ordinances and visual quality policies, respectively. Impact L-5, related to interference with SFPUC maintenance activities, would also be avoided, as would Impact L-6, the conflict of the transition with planned future development. These impacts would be avoided by the change in alignment.

This alternative would increase the intensity of ground-level nuisances or disturbances, while eliminating impacts related to helicopter use during construction, Impact L-4. Although for the southernmost nine miles this alternative would avoid the temporary construction impacts to adjacent residents identified for the Proposed Project, it would create such impacts north of the Carolands Substation for residents living along Skyline Boulevard. Hence, Proposed Project Impact L-4, construction nuisances or disturbances, would apply to this alternative, and the impacts for ground-work would occur along a greater length of alignment. Furthermore, the ground-level impacts would be more severe, due to the continuous nature of trench construction versus construction of support towers at intervals of approximately 500 feet. Thus, some residents that might live 100 or 200 feet away from a tower location under the proposed project might under this alter-

native have the underground transmission line constructed adjacent to the frontage of their property, with construction impacts lasting up to several weeks. This impact (Impact L-4) would be temporary, and is considered to be less than significant (Class III), but Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b are recommended to minimize impacts during construction. In addition to the residents affected along Skyline Boulevard, a substantial number of residents along Trousdale Avenue would be adversely affected.

Because helicopter installation of the towers would be avoided in Route Option 1B, except possibly near the crossing of Crystal Springs Dam(see Impact C-4, Section D.5, Cultural Resources), most occupied structures would not need to be temporarily vacated. However, Mitigation Measure L-4c should be implemented if helicopter construction near homes occurs as a part of the overhead crossing of Crystal Springs Dam.

Sensitive receptors along or in close proximity to Trousdale Avenue that would also be adversely affected by construction noise and dust include the Kingdom of Jehovah's Witnesses, Franklin Elementary School, Burlingame Intermediate School, and Mills-Peninsula Hospital. These uses are sufficiently set back from the roadway that impacts to them would remain less than significant.

Businesses along approximately two miles of El Camino Real would also be affected (a Class III, adverse but less than significant impact), but the noise and dust would not be as disruptive to these businesses as it would further north on the alignment, due to the wide right-of-way for the roadway and the resulting increased distance between the construction trench and the adjacent businesses. Construction noise would affect sensitive receptors along this alternative and would be somewhat greater in severity, due to a larger number of receptors. Implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b would reduce temporary construction impacts.

Under the PG&E Underground Route Option 1B Alternative, Impact L-7, disrupted access to residences and businesses, would potentially affect a greater number of residents, in part because of the greater length of underground alignment and in part due to the greater number of driveways potentially blocked. In particular, along Skyline Drive where there are only two travel lanes, private driveway access could be directly affected by trench construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures L-7a and L-7b would reduce the impact to less than significant levels.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would altogether avoid four of the impacts identified for the Proposed Project, without creating any new impacts. In addition, it would substantially reduce the impact related to a conflict with biological resources policies (Impact L-1). During construction, occupied structures would not need to be temporarily vacated (Impact L-4). These environmental benefits would more than offset the incremental increase in temporary ground-level construction nuisances and disrupted access impacts (Impacts L-4 and L-7, respectively). Overall, the PG&E Underground Route Option 1B Alternative, with implementation of the mitigation measures recommended above, would have fewer land use and planning impacts than the Proposed Project, with implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in Sections D.2.3.3 through D.2.3.5,.

D.2.4.2 Partial Underground Alternative

Environmental Setting

From Jefferson Substation to Edgewood Road, this alternative would parallel Cañada Road and would have the same environmental setting as PG&E's Underground Route Option 1B Alternative, described in Section D.2.4.1. From the vicinity of the Pulgas Water Temple to the north end of the golf course, the

Partial Underground Alternative route would follow a route similar to the Proposed Project, though sections of it would be placed underground, as detailed in Section C. The setting for this stretch of the alignment was described in Section D.2.1.

The crossing of I-280 would be moved to the south to reduce impacts on the residences just north of the Carolands Substation.

From Tower 9/62 to Tower 10/69, this alternative alignment would be located on SFPUC Peninsula Watershed west of I-280 in order to avoid impacts on residential areas. This area consists of open space transected by a maintenance road and a recreational trail (potential construction impacts to recreational trail users are addressed in Section D.9, Recreation). Table D.2-10 lists land uses and sensitive receptors along this alternative route.

Table D.2-10. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors: Partial Underground Alternative

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Jefferson Substation	SFPUC	Parks/Open Space	Edgewood County Park and Preserve
Overhead alignment near Cañada Road	SFPUC	Parks/Open Space	Pulgas Ridge Open Space and Preserve (east), Filoli Estate (west), Pulgas Balancing Reservoir (east), Pulgas Water Temple (west)
Underground in the Proposed Project ROW between Ralston and Tower 8/50	SFPUC/Town of Hillsborough's water storage facility lands	West—Parks/Open Space East—Residential	Ralston Substation (east), Hillcrest Juvenile Home (east), San Mateo County Belmont Fire Station (east), San Mateo Creek Crossing (overhead), Residences along Lexington Avenue and Black Mountain Road (east), Carolands Substation (east)
West of I-280 (Proposed Project ROW from towers 8/53 to 9/62)	SFPUC	West—Crystal Springs Golf Course East—I-280	Crystal Springs Golf Course (west), Residences (east of I-280)
West of I-280 (until Tower 10/69)	SFPUC	West— Parks/Open Space East—I-280	Residences (east of I-280 in City of Burlingame and Burlingame Hills)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would cause impacts similar to those identified for the Proposed Project, although it would not create any new impacts or warrant additional mitigation measures beyond those already identified for the Proposed Project. The avoidance of Edgewood Natural Preserve and Pulgas Ridge Open Space and Natural Preserve would reduce potential biological impacts at these locations and would therefore reduce the degree of conflict with San Mateo County biological resources policies (Impact L-1). It would also reduce temporary construction impacts to these sensitive receptors (Impact L-4), although Mitigation Measures L-4a through L-4c should still be implemented. However, there would be greater impacts to sensitive habitat located along the underground portion extending approximately between Ralston and Carolands Substations. In addition, the first segment of about 2.8 miles could adversely affect biological resources. On balance, Impact L-1 under this alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project, but would be more severe.

Impact L-2, conflicts with County tree ordinances, would still occur with this alternative, though a somewhat reduced number of trees could be affected; this impact is mitigated by Mitigation Measure B-3a (Section D.4, Biological Resources). Impact L-3, conflicts with County visual quality policies, would be substantially reduced by this alternative because the existing 60 kV line would be co-located with the 230 kV line and some existing towers would be removed (see detailed analysis in Section D.3.4.2, Visual Resources)

Impact L-4, construction nuisances or disturbances, would be increased due to the greater length of underground alignment. At residences where the overhead alignment would be replaced by underground alignment, the noise and dust impacts at those locations would be greater in duration and intensity, though still less than significant (Class III). Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b should be implemented to minimize these disturbances. Avoiding helicopter installation of towers would reduce or eliminate the need to temporarily vacate homes (also reducing, but not eliminating, the need for Mitigation Measure L-4c). This relocation impact component of Impact L-4 is potentially significant (Class II).

Impact L-5, interference with SFPUC maintenance activities, would potentially be more severe, as the alternative would possibly interfere with an SFPUC maintenance road between Tower 9/62 and Tower 10/69. With implementation of Mitigation Measure L-5a, the impact would be less than significant (Class II).

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

The construction impacts of the Partial Underground Alternative would be greater than those of the Proposed Project for the underground segments, but this alternative would reduce the need to temporarily vacate homes near areas where helicopters would be used to install towers. The ultimate visual impact of this alternative would be greatly reduced, thereby reducing conflicts with County visual quality policies. However, this benefit would be offset by greater biological impacts in serpentine soils areas where undergrounding would occur. The elimination of towers from Edgewood Park and the Pulgas Ridge Preserve would result in an overall benefit in terms of compliance with County policies regarding biological resources.

D.2.5 Northern Area Alternatives

D.2.5.1 West of Skyline Transition Station

Environmental Setting of the Alternative Transition Station

The West of Skyline Transition Station would be located on undeveloped SFPUC Peninsula Watershed adjacent to Skyline Boulevard. The only immediately adjacent active land use is the San Andreas Trail; residences across Skyline Boulevard are sufficiently far from the site that it would not be visible.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Alternative Transition Station

This alternative could result in conflicts with San Mateo County Vegetative, Water, Fish and Wildlife Resources Policies 1.2 and 1.27 through 1.30, which call for the protection of sensitive habitats, the establishment of buffer areas around such habitats, and the regulation of incompatible uses within the habitats and buffers (Impact L-1). The transition station would occupy an area of approximately 0.2 acres (8,000 square feet) that may contain sensitive habitats that could be adversely affected, as discussed in more detail in Section D.4 (Impacts B-1 through B-4). Similarly, the alternative transition station site may require removal or trimming of trees that are subject to one of the County's tree ordinances, the removal of which would conflict with the applicable ordinances (Impact L-2). Neither of these impacts would result from implementation of the proposed transition station, due to the site location outside of County jurisdiction. Implementation of Mitigation Measures B-1b, B-1c, B-3a, and B-3b, set forth in Section D.4, would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Impact L-3, conflicts with County visual quality policies, would apply to this alternative transition station because it would be located on undeveloped Peninsula Watershed within unincorporated San Mateo County. As addressed in Section D.2.2, Visual Resources, the West of Skyline transition station would be likely to conflict with the County's visual quality policies, but Mitigation Measures V-20a and V-20b are recommended to reduce visual impacts to less than significant levels. The West of Skyline transition

station would avoid the conflict with planned future development that was identified for the proposed transition station (Impact L-6) and it would also avoid the significant (Class I) visual impact of the proposed transition station.

Although a transition station is inherently incompatible with the overall values being protected by the Scenic and Recreation Easement that includes the alternative West of Skyline Transition Station (the impacts of which are addressed in Sections D.3, Visual Quality, and D.9, Recreation), this alternative would not conflict with the actual terms and reservations of the easement. As discussed in Section D.2.2.1, the easement expressly permits the Grantor (i.e., City and County of San Francisco) the perpetual right to use the property for ". . . their water or other utility operations as now or hereafter conducted, including . . . the right to construct, maintain, repair, expand and reconstruct buildings . . . public utilities and similar improvements . . ." (SMCRO, 1969). Furthermore, the easement agreement explicitly states that nothing within the agreement shall be deemed to nullify or supersede any rights or other interest in the lands subject to the easement that were in existence at the time the agreement was recorded, which was in January 1969. Because PG&E has held a right-of-way easement across the Peninsula Watershed since 1950, it appears to have a grandfathered right to maintain and expand its facilities on the SFPUC property. Therefore, no impact with the Scenic and Recreation Easement would result from implementation of this alternative.

While many of the policies contained in the SFPUC's *Peninsula Watershed Management Plan* would apply to this alternative (the potentially relevant policies are listed in Appendix 4 and in Section D.2.2.2 above), no conflicts were identified for the West of Skyline transitions station. No other impacts were identified for this alternative.

Construction of the transition station itself could create disturbances to adjacent land uses (Impacts L-4 and L-7), and Mitigation Measures L-4a, L-4b, L-7a, and L-7b should be implemented to minimize impacts.

Comparison to Proposed Transition Station

This alternative could result in policy conflict impacts with respect to County biological resources policies and tree ordinances that would not occur with the proposed transition station. In addition, implementation of this alternative transition station would result in a visual quality policy conflict impact that would not apply to the proposed transition station because the City of San Bruno has no such policies. Therefore, the West of Skyline transition station would result in up to three land use impacts not identified for the proposed transition station. However, the West of Skyline alternative would avoid the significant (Class I) impact created by conflicts with planned future land uses identified for the proposed transition station, including an approved parking lot on the site and anticipated residential townhomes immediately south of the site.

West of Skyline Transition Station with Proposed Underground Route

Environmental Setting

The short segment between the West of Skyline alternative transition station and where this underground route would meet proposed route on San Bruno Avenue is in open space SFPUC Peninsula Watershed, and within Skyline Boulevard and San Bruno Avenue. East of the alignment are a gas station, a shopping center, and multi-family housing located just to the south of the proposed transition station. Land use and sensitive receptors would be similar to the Proposed Project.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

All of the impacts defined above for the West of Skyline Transition Station would apply to this alternative, and the same mitigation measures should be implemented. The underground route portion of this alternative route would have impacts similar to the Proposed Project; the difference in degree would be negligible. The West of Skyline transition station would avoid the conflict with planned future development that was identified for the proposed transition station (Impact L-6).

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

The West of Skyline Transition Station itself would eliminate the significant (Class I) visual and land use impacts of the proposed transition station site. The underground route segment would be virtually identical to those of the underground route segment of the Proposed Project with respect to land use and planning concerns.

West of Skyline Transition Station with Sneath Lane Underground Route

Environmental Setting

From the West of Skyline Transition Station to Sneath Lane, this alternative route would require that an underground transmission line be installed within Skyline Boulevard, past undeveloped hillsides that are within SFPUC property for the first 3,000 feet or so, and then would be within the City of San Bruno, bordering a single-family residential neighborhood. A church is located at the top of the hill, at the southwest corner of the intersection of Skyline Boulevard and Sneath Lane, and a parking lot occupies the northwest corner.

As the alternative alignment turns east on Sneath Lane, it would pass apartment buildings on the northeast corner of the Skyline Boulevard/Sneath Lane intersection and a small fire station on Earl Avenue at Sneath Lane. Single-family homes spread out to the north and south of Sneath Lane, but they are obscured by terrain and/or vegetation at most locations along the alignment. Near the junction with I-280, a golf driving range is set back from the south side of Sneath Lane.

East of I-280, professional and medical office buildings line the south side of Sneath Lane, while the Golden Gate National Cemetery occupies the north side, extending from I-280 on the west to El Camino Real on the east. Crossing El Camino Real, this alternative alignment passes the Tanforan Shopping Center on the south side and additional commercial development on the north side. The San Bruno BART Station is next to the Tanforan Shopping Center; at this point the alternative alignment turns north to follow the BART right-of-way, rejoining the Proposed Project alignment. Table D.2-11 lists land uses and sensitive receptors along this alternative route.

Table D.2-11. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors: Sneath Lane Underground Route

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Skyline Boulevard/ Highway 35 to Sneath Lane	SFPUC/City of San Bruno	West—Park/Open Space East—Open Space	Highlands Christian Schools (west), Church of the Highlands (west)
Sneath Lane from Highway 35 to I-280	City of San Bruno	North—Open Space South—Open Space/ Residential	San Bruno Fire station #52 (south), Skyline Activity Center (south)
Sneath Lane from I-280 to El Camino Real	City of San Bruno	North—Open Space (cemetery) South—Residential	Golden Gate National Cemetery (north), U.S. Navy lands (south), Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (south)
Sneath Lane from El Camino Real to BART ROW	City of San Bruno	North—Commercial/Open Space South—Commercial	Tanforan Park Shopping Center (south)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

All of the impacts defined above for the West of Skyline Transition Station would apply to this alternative. The underground route portion of this alternative would create construction noise, dust, and odor impacts on businesses and residents (Impact L-4), but would not affect as many businesses as the Proposed Project, both because there are fewer businesses along Sneath Lane than along San Bruno Avenue, and because there would be a greater distance between the alignment and businesses on Sneath Lane than on San Bruno Avenue. Implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b would mitigate the impact of construction disturbance to less than significant levels.

Impact L-7, disrupted access to businesses, would potentially be reduced under this alternative because there are fewer businesses along Sneath Lane than along San Bruno Avenue. Mitigation Measures L-7a and L-7b would be required to ensure that impacts are less than significant (Class II). No additional land use or planning impacts were identified for this alternative.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would have reduced construction impacts (Impacts L-4 and L-7) in comparison to the Proposed Project because it would be within roads with fewer businesses. It would also avoid the land use conflict (Impact L-6) of the proposed transition station, resulting in overall fewer land use and planning impacts than the Proposed Project.

West of Skyline Transition Station with Westborough Boulevard Underground

Environmental Setting

From the transition station to Sneath Lane, this alternative would follow the same alignment as the Sneath Lane Underground segment, described above. It would continue north in Skyline Boulevard, where undeveloped open space hillsides flank the roadway, though single-family residential neighborhoods lie on the other sides of the slopes. An apartment complex occupies the southwest corner of the intersection of Skyline and Westborough Boulevard, where the alternative alignment turns to the east.

Westborough Boulevard, a four-lane road divided by a median, winds down a hillside developed on both sides with single-family homes. East of Callan Boulevard, the alignment passes Westborough Middle School and Westborough Park, both on the north side of the roadway. Continuing east past I-280, the alternative alignment is flanked by the California Golf Club of San Francisco. Single-family homes lie 200 to 300 feet north of Westborough. East of Camaritas Avenue, both sides of Westborough are lined by large-scale commercial uses. Just after crossing El Camino Real, the alignment turns north into the BART right-of-way, rejoining the Proposed Project alignment. Table D.2-12 lists land uses and sensitive receptors along this alternative route.

Table D.2-12. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors: Westborough Underground Route

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Skyline Boulevard/Highway 35 to Sneath Lane	SFPUC/City of San Bruno	West—Park/Open Space East—Open Space	Highlands Christian Schools (west), Church of the Highlands (west)
Skyline Boulevard/Highway 35 from Sneath Lane to Westborough Boulevard	City of San Bruno	West—Residential/Open Space East—Open Space	Fleetwood Park (east)
Westborough Boulevard from Highway 35 to Junipero Serra Boulevard	City of South San Francisco	North—Open Space/Residential/Commercial South—Residential/Commercial	San Andreas Fault crossing, Westborough Middle School (north), Westborough Park (north), Sellick Park (south), Aegis Assisted Living (north)
Westborough Boulevard from Junipero Serra Boulevard to BART ROW	City of South San Francisco	North--Commercial South—Commercial	California Golf Club of San Francisco (south), Buri Buri Park (north)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of the West of Skyline Transition Station would be the same as described above would also apply to this alternative. Similar to the Sneath Lane alternative route, this alternative would have types of impacts similar to those identified for the Proposed Project, with slight variations in degree for some of the impacts, as described below.

One land use conflict impact (Impact L-6, at the proposed transition station) would be avoided, and no additional impacts would be created. Impact L-4, construction nuisances or disturbances, would affect fewer businesses than the Proposed Project, both because there are fewer businesses along Westborough Avenue than along San Bruno Avenue, and because there would be a greater distance between the alignment and businesses on Westborough Avenue than on San Bruno Avenue. Construction noise and dust impacts affecting two sensitive receptors (identified for the Proposed Project) would be avoided. However, two new receptors would be affected by construction noise, dust, and odor impacts under this alternative: Westborough Middle School and the Church of the Highlands. In addition, users of Westborough Park would be similarly affected (this impact to a recreational use is addressed in Section D.9). Impact L-4 (construction disturbance) would be minimized with implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b. Impact L-7, disrupted access to businesses, would potentially be reduced under this alternative, for the same reasons. Impact L-7 (disrupted access) would require implementation of Mitigation Measures L-7a and L-7b.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would have fewer impacts than the Proposed Project with respect to land use and planning concerns. Construction nuisances and disrupted access impacts would affect fewer businesses (Impacts L-4 and L-7). Although students at one additional school would potentially be adversely affected by construction noise and dust, these impacts could be avoided by implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b, and APM 5.11. The alternative would avoid the significant (Class I) land use conflict impact identified for the proposed transition station (Impact L-6).

D.2.5.2 Sneath Lane Transition Station

Environmental Setting of the Transition Station Alternative

The Sneath Lane Transition Station site would be at the top of a hill, adjacent to the existing PG&E Sneath Lane substation, at the southwest corner of the intersection of Skyline Boulevard and Sneath Lane, within the City of San Bruno. The site is within the City's Portola Highlands subarea of Planning Area 1, and has a Low Density Residential land use designation. Although a transition station is not explicitly listed as a permitted use within this land use classification, as noted in Section D.2.2.2, most cities and counties do not include such uses in lists of permitted, conditionally permitted, or prohibited uses, on the assumption that public utilities are a necessity of urban life in all land use categories. The current general plan recommends, but does not adopt, a scenic corridor along Skyline Boulevard.

A church is situated to the south of the Sneath Lane transition station site, with a residential neighborhood extending to the west. At the bottom of the hill, a parking lot occupies the northwest corner of the intersection, and apartment buildings occupy the northeast corner. A small fire station is about 400 feet east of the intersection, on Earl Avenue at Sneath Lane. Development in the area surrounding the transition station site generally consists of single-family homes.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Transition Station Alternative

The Sneath Lane transition station would not conflict with any San Bruno General Plan policies; no land use or planning impacts are identified for this transition station alternative. The alternative would avoid the conflict with planned future development identified for the proposed transition station (Impact L-6). Disturbance to adjacent residences would be minor (Class III) due to the industrial nature of the site, but Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b should be implemented to minimize construction impacts. No access disruption (Impact L-7) would occur with use of this site.

Comparison to Proposed Transition Station

Given the adjacent industrial character of the Sneath Lane Substation, the alternative transition station would be visually compatible with the adjacent land uses. There are fewer uses immediately adjacent or in visual proximity to the Sneath Lane site than near the proposed transition station. This alternative would avoid the significant (Class I) conflicts with planned future land uses that would be caused by the proposed transition station.

Sneath Lane Transition Station with Proposed Underground Route

Environmental Setting

From the Sneath Lane transition station (described above), this alternative route would turn south on Skyline Boulevard and then east in San Bruno Avenue. Land uses along Skyline are generally open space, though there are residences to the west in the route segment closest to Sneath Lane.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The difference between this alternative and the Proposed Project is the location of the transition station and the additional underground route along Skyline Boulevard. All impacts identified for the Proposed Project would apply to this alternative except Impact L-6, conflicts with planned future development in the vicinity of the proposed transition station. Impacts L-4 (construction disturbance) and L-7 (access disturbance) could occur; Mitigation Measures L-4a, L-4b, L-7a, and L-7b should be implemented to ensure that impacts are less than significant (Class II).

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

The underground route segment required for this alternative would create a slightly longer overall transmission line (3,500 feet) than the Proposed Project, but would otherwise not create new impacts in the underground segment along Skyline Boulevard. The alternative transition station would avoid a significant (Class I) impact identified for the Proposed Project, so would have fewer impacts than the Proposed Project due to the greater land use compatibility of the transition station with its surroundings.

Sneath Lane Transition Station with Sneath Lane Underground Route

Environmental Setting

This alternative underground route would leave the Sneath Lane Transition Station and follow Sneath Lane to the east to the BART ROW. Adjacent land uses to the transition station consist of open space Peninsula Watershed to the south and residences to the west. This alternative route would have essentially the same environmental setting as that described for the West of Skyline Transition Station with Sneath Lane Underground Route alternative. As described therein, the eastern portion of Sneath Lane is lined by a small fire station and residential uses. East of I-280, professional and medical office buildings line the south side of Sneath

Lane, while the Golden Gate National Cemetery occupies the north side, extending from I-280 on the west to El Camino Real on the east. East of El Camino Real, Sneath Lane is flanked by regional commercial development. The San Bruno BART Station is adjacent to where the alternative alignment turns north to follow the BART right-of-way, rejoining the Proposed Project alignment.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Because the underground route segment from the Sneath Lane Transition Station to the BART ROW along Sneath Lane would be entirely within roadways, the impacts of this alternative would be similar to those of the underground segment of the Proposed Project. However, Impact L-4, construction nuisances or disturbances, would not affect as many businesses, both because there are fewer businesses along Sneath Lane than along San Bruno Avenue, and because there would be a greater distance between the alignment and businesses on Sneath Lane than on San Bruno Avenue. Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b should be implemented to reduce disturbance, though the impact would be less than significant (Class III). Impact L-7, disrupted access to businesses, would potentially be reduced under this alternative, for the same reasons, but would still be potentially significant (Class II). Mitigation Measures L-7a and L-7b would be required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Impact L-6, the conflict of the transition with planned future development, would be avoided by the alternative.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

The Sneath Lane Transition Station with Sneath Lane route alternative would have reduced construction impacts on businesses and residences and would avoid one impact (Impact L-6), a significant (Class I) land use conflict at the proposed transition station site.

Sneath Lane Transition Station with Westborough Boulevard Underground

Environmental Setting

The setting for the underground segment of this alternative route from the Sneath Lane Transition Station would run north in Skyline Boulevard, where undeveloped open space hillsides flank the roadway, though single-family residential neighborhoods lie on the other sides of the slopes. An apartment complex occupies the southwest corner of the intersection of Skyline and Westborough Boulevard, where the alternative alignment turns to the east.

Westborough Boulevard, a four-lane road divided by a median, winds down a hillside developed on both sides with single-family homes. East of Callan Boulevard, the alignment passes Westborough Middle School and Westborough Park, both on the north side of the roadway. Continuing east past I-280, the alternative alignment is flanked by the California Golf Club of San Francisco. Single-family homes lie 200 to 300 feet north of Westborough. East of Camaritas Avenue, both sides of Westborough are lined by large-scale commercial uses. Just after crossing El Camino Real, the alignment turns north into the BART right-of-way, rejoining the Proposed Project alignment. Table D.2-12 lists land uses and sensitive receptors along this alternative route.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would have impacts similar to those identified for the Proposed Project, with slight variations in degree for some of the impacts, and no additional types of impacts would be created. Impact L-4, construction nuisances or disturbances, would affect fewer businesses than the Proposed Project, both because there are fewer businesses along Westborough Avenue than along San Bruno Avenue, and because there would be a greater distance between the alignment and businesses on Westborough Avenue than on San Bruno Avenue. The alternative would avoid two sensitive receptors identified for the Proposed Project, but affect two new sensitive receptors: Westborough Middle School and Westborough Park. Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b should be implemented. Impact L-7, disrupted access to businesses, would potentially be reduced

under this alternative because of the smaller number of businesses on Westborough Avenue, but Mitigation Measures L-7a and L-7b would still be required. Impact L-6, the conflict of the transition with planned future development, would be avoided by the alternative.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would reduce impacts in comparison to the Proposed Project with respect to land use and planning concerns. Although students at one additional school would potentially be adversely affected by construction noise and dust, these impacts could be avoided by implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b and APM 5.11. The Sneath Lane Transition Station with Westborough Boulevard underground segment would have reduced construction impacts on businesses and would avoid of one impact (Impact L-6, land use conflict at the proposed transition station) of the Proposed Project.

D.2.5.3 Cherry Avenue Alternative

Environmental Setting

This alternative would follow the proposed alignment, then diverge at the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and Cherry Avenue, heading north up Cherry Avenue. On Cherry Avenue, a shopping center is on the west side of the intersection, and office and medical office buildings line the east side for about 1,300 feet. North of the shopping center on the west side, there is a limited amount of additional commercial development, then a large office building. Crossing under I-380, there is a neighborhood park on the east side and apartments on the west side. The remainder of Cherry Avenue until it terminates at Sneath Lane is lined by multi-family residential housing, with the exception of a small neighborhood commercial center, located at the north end of Cherry Avenue, on the west side.

The stretch of this alternative alignment that runs in Sneath Lane (from Cherry Avenue to the BART ROW) is described above for the West of Skyline Transition Station with Sneath Lane Underground Route alternative. Table D.2-13 lists land uses and sensitive receptors along this alternative route.

Table D.2-13. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors: Cherry Avenue Alternative

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Cherry Avenue from San Bruno Avenue to I-380	City of San Bruno	West—Commercial/Light Industrial East—Commercial/Light Industrial	N/A
Cherry Avenue from I-380 to Sneath Lane	City of San Bruno	West—Residential East—Residential	Commodore Park (east), multi-family residences

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative would have impacts very similar to the Proposed Project and no additional impacts. Impact L-4, construction nuisances or disturbances, would affect fewer businesses than the Proposed Project, both because there are fewer businesses along Cherry Avenue and Sneath Lane than along San Bruno Avenue, and because there would be a greater distance between the alignment and businesses on Sneath Lane than on San Bruno Avenue. However, more residential receptors would be affected, due to the concentration of multi-family housing along the northern half of Cherry Avenue. This would be partially offset by the avoidance of single-family homes adjacent to the BART right-of-way between San Bruno Avenue and Sneath Lane. Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b should be implemented to ensure that these impacts are minimized. Impact L-7, disrupted access to businesses, would potentially be reduced under this alternative because of the smaller number of businesses on Cherry Avenue and Sneath Lane, but Mitigation Measures L-7a and L-7b would still be required to ensure that impacts are less than significant.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would reduce the degree of two impacts (L-4 and L-7) due to the reduced number of businesses potentially affected by construction.

D.2.5.4 PG&E's Route Option 4B – East Market Street

Environmental Setting

At the corner of Hoffman Street and Hillside Boulevard, this alternative would diverge from the proposed route by continuing north on Hillside Boulevard. Hillside is lined with a mixture of single-family and multi-family residential and commercial uses, including several auto repair facilities. Heading east on East Market Street, the alternative alignment is flanked on the south by Colma Elementary School and the Pollicita Middle School. The Susan B. Anthony High School is immediately south of the middle school, but is not visible from East Market Street. The north side of East Market is lined entirely by single-family residential development. At the corner of East Market and Orange Streets, this alternative rejoins the proposed alignment. Table D.2-14 below lists land uses and sensitive receptors along this alternative route.

Table D.2-14. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors: PG&E's Route Option 4B: East Market Street Alternative

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Hillside Drive from Hoffman Drive to East Market Street	City of Daly City	West—Commercial/Residential East—Commercial/Residential	Colma Elementary School (east)
East Market Street from Hillside Drive to Guadalupe Canyon Parkway	City of Daly City	North—Residential/Commercial South—Schools	Colma Elementary School (south), T.R. Pollicita Middle School (south), Susan B. Anthony High School (south)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The Option 4B alternative segment would have the same types of impacts as the Proposed Project, but the balance of business and residential receptors that would be affected by construction impacts would be shifted. The alternative would avoid construction impacts (Impacts L-4 and L-7) to a concentration of single- and multi-family residences located along Hoffman and Orange Streets, but would cause similar impacts to a concentration of single-family homes along East Market Street and to a mixture of businesses and residences along Hillside Boulevard north of Hoffman Street. In addition, the alignment would pass adjacent to two schools along East Market Street, with the result that Impact L-4, construction disturbance, would occur to a greater number of school receptors under this alternative. Mitigation Measures L-4a, L-4b, L-7a, and L-7b should be implemented. No new impacts types would be created by this alternative.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would have relatively fewer impacts than the Proposed Project for the following reasons. While two additional schools could potentially be affected, implementation of APM 5.11 would avoid these potentially significant impacts. The number of residences affected by construction impacts would be reduced under this alternative. Although there would impacts to businesses along Hillside that would not occur under the Proposed Project, many of these businesses are of a light-industrial nature, such as auto repair businesses, that would be less sensitive to noise and dust impacts than offices or retail businesses.

D.2.5.5 Junipero Serra Alternative

Environmental Setting

The first portion of this alternative route was previously described for the West of Skyline Transition Station with Westborough Boulevard Underground alternative. The setting for the segment of this alternative route north of the Skyline Boulevard/San Bruno Avenue intersection consists of open space Peninsula Watershed for the first 1,000 feet or so, followed by open space hillsides in the City of San Bruno. Although residences flank the roadway, they are generally on the other sides of the slopes flanking the roadway, and are obscured by terrain and/or vegetation. An apartment complex occupies the southwest corner of the intersection of Skyline and Westborough Boulevard, where the alternative alignment turns to the east.

Westborough Boulevard, a four-lane road divided by a median, winds down a hillside developed on both sides with single-family homes. East of Callan Boulevard, the alignment would pass Westborough Middle School and Westborough Park, both on the north side of the roadway. After crossing I-280, the route would turn north on Junipero Serra Boulevard, which is primarily flanked by open space hillsides, with residential uses set well back from the roadway and obscured by terrain and/or vegetation. Commercial development is found just south of the intersection with Collins Avenue, just before the alternative alignment heads northeast on Serramonte Boulevard. Serramonte is lined by community and regional commercial uses, including a shopping center. The City Hall and Police Station for the Town of Colma is at the northwest corner of Serramonte Boulevard and El Camino Real. East of El Camino Real, a cemetery flanks the north side of the roadway, and the commercial uses on the south side are dominated by auto dealerships. At Hillside Boulevard, the alternative would rejoin the proposed alignment. Table D.2-15 lists land uses and sensitive receptors along this alternative route.

Table D.2-15. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors: Junipero Serra Boulevard Alternative

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
Junipero Serra Boulevard from Westborough Boulevard to Hickey Drive	Cities of South San Francisco/Daly City	West—Open Space/I-280/ Residential East—Open Space/Residential	N/A
Junipero Serra Boulevard from Hickey Drive to Serramonte Boulevard	City of South San Francisco to Town of Colma/City of Daly City	West—Open Space/Commercial East—Commercial at Serramonte	Cypress Lawn Cemetery (both sides)
Serramonte Boulevard from Junipero Serra Boulevard to El Camino Real	Town of Colma	North—Commercial South—Commercial	Serra Center (north), Greenlawn Memorial Park (north), Greek Orthodox Memorial Park (north), Town of Colma City Hall and Police Station
Serramonte Boulevard from El Camino Real to Hillside Drive	Town of Colma	North—Open Space (cemetery) South—Commercial/Open Space (cemetery)	Salem Memorial Park (north), Home of Peace Cemetery (south), Hills of Eternity Memorial Park (south), Olivet Memorial Park (south)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The severity of impacts related to the Proposed Project would be reduced with this alternative, due to a reduced number of businesses and residences affected. The number of residences that would be affected by construction nuisances (Impact L-4) would be substantially reduced. Residences along Skyline Boulevard and Junipero Serra Boulevard would for the most part be buffered by distance and/or terrain. Although residences along Westborough Avenue would be affected, a much greater number of residences located along the BART ROW, and in closer proximity to the transmission line alignment, would be avoided. Similarly, the noise, dust, and potential access disruption impacts to businesses would be reduced because there is a greater distance between the businesses and the trench alignment along Serramonte

Boulevard than along San Bruno Avenue, and additional travel lanes in the roadway make access disruption less likely. Although construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors would still occur under this alternative, a number of receptors set back from the BART ROW would be avoided. El Camino High School would be avoided under this alternative, but Westborough Middle School would be affected. Implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4a, L-4b, L-7a, and L-7b would reduce construction impacts to less than significant levels.

No new impacts were identified for this alternative.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would have the same number of impacts as the underground segment of the Proposed Project along the BART ROW and McLellan and Hillside Drives. The alternative would create no new impacts, and the disruption to businesses, residences, and sensitive land uses during construction would be substantially reduced in comparison with the Proposed Project.

D.2.5.6 Modified Existing 230 kV Underground ROW

Environmental Setting

This alternative would begin at the corner of San Bruno Avenue and Huntington Avenue. Continuing east on San Bruno Avenue, the alignment is flanked by local-serving commercial businesses. Turning north again just east of Seventh, the alignment passes a residential neighborhood on the west and U.S. Highway 101 on the east, then crosses under I-380 to follow Shaw Road, lined by industrial uses. North of the Colma Creek tributary crossing, the alignment crosses through a large I-Fly long-term commercial parking lot used by air travelers. The Golden Gate Produce Terminal is just to the west of this parking lot. After crossing under Highway 101, the remainder of the alternative route within the City of South San Francisco is primarily surrounded by industrial uses, including a PG&E substation on the west side of Gateway Boulevard. However, these uses transition to office buildings and hotels north of Oyster Point, continuing to the Sierra Point parkway.

Crossing back west under Highway 101, the alternative alignment runs along Bayshore Boulevard, which is lightly developed with mixed commercial and light industrial uses, including a small neighborhood commercial center. At the intersection with Guadalupe Parkway, the alternative rejoins the proposed alignment. Table D.2-16 lists land uses and sensitive receptors along this alternative route.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This alternative could be used in combination with the Proposed Project, starting at the corner of San Bruno Avenue and Huntington Avenue, or with PG&E's Route Option 1B. Although this alternative would have most of the same types of impacts identified for the proposed alignment, they would all be reduced in intensity due to the reduced mileage of the underground transmission line with this alternative.

Impacts L-4 and L-7, related to construction nuisances or disturbances and disrupted access to residences and businesses, respectively, would both occur under this alternative. Although this alternative appears to pass by a greater number of businesses, the degree of disturbance and disruption may be smaller, due to greater setbacks, less-sensitive businesses at some locations, and the fact that the alternative route is 3.7 miles shorter. The proposed route would pass adjacent to numerous residential areas in San Bruno, South San Francisco, Colma, and Daly City, and this alternative alignment would only pass adjacent to one residential area in San Bruno. Feasible mitigation could reduce impacts to this residential area; Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b should be implemented. Mitigation Measures L-7a and L-7b would ensure that access to businesses and

Table D.2-16. Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors: Modified Underground Existing 230 kV Collocation Alternative

Street	Jurisdiction	Land Use	Sensitive Receptors and Other Concerns
San Bruno Avenue (from El Camino Real to 7th Avenue)	City of San Bruno	North—Commercial South—Commercial	Railroad crossing at Huntington Drive, multi-family residences at 6th Avenue (south)
East of 7th Avenue in 115 kV Corridor	City of San Bruno	West—Residential East—Open Space/Highway 101	7th and Walnut Park (east)
Shaw Road	City of South San Francisco	West—Industrial East—Industrial/Highway 101	Crossing of Colma Creek tributary
Produce Avenue	City of South San Francisco	West—Industrial East—Highway 101	Cross Colma Creek
South Airport Boulevard	City of South San Francisco	North—Commercial/Highway 101 (overhead) South—Commercial/Highway 101 (overhead)	N/A
Gateway Boulevard	City of South San Francisco	West—Industrial/Commercial East—Open Space/Industrial	UPRR crossing, Embassy Suites South San Francisco (east), The Gateway (west), Caltrain Station (west)
Oyster Point Boulevard	City of South San Francisco	North—Industrial/Open Space South—Industrial/Open Space	N/A
East of UPRR ROW	City of South San Francisco to City of Brisbane	West—UPRR ROW/Highway 101 East—Open Space	N/A
Sierra Point Parkway	City of Brisbane	North—Open Space/Light Industrial South—Open Space/Industrial	Cross under Highway 101
Van Waters and Rogers Road (private)	City of Brisbane	West—Open Space/Industrial East—Caltrain ROW/Open Space	N/A
Bayshore Boulevard to Martin Substation	City of Brisbane	West—Industrial/Open Space East—Open Space/Industrial	SamTrans Park and Ride (west), Fire Station (west)

Source: PG&E, 2002; Thomas Bros Guidebook; staff reconnaissance.

residences was maintained. Mitigation Measure L-4d (for Impact L-4), applicable to this alternative only, is also recommended to reduce impacts specific to residents along the east side of 7th Avenue. With implementation of Mitigation Measure L-4d, this alternative would avoid construction impacts on sensitive receptors. Even absent this mitigation, the alternative would affect many fewer receptors than the Proposed Project. Proposed Project receptors along the BART ROW would be avoided.

Mitigation Measures for Impact L-4, Construction Noise, Dust, and Odor Impacts on Residents

L-4d **Maximize Distance From Residences**. The Modified Underground Existing 230 kV Collocation Alternative alignment shall be revised to maximize the distance from San Bruno residences north of San Bruno Avenue. This objective can be achieved by placing this segment of the transmission line within the existing PG&E 115 kV right-of-way as far east as possible. At least 60 days prior to construction, PG&E shall submit construction plans to the CPUC for review and approval to document compliance with this measure.

In addition to the impacts discussed above, the following new impact (Impact L-8) would result from implementation of the Modified Existing Underground 230 kV alternative.

Impact L-8: Disruption of Commercial Parking Lot

This alternative would pass through the large I-Fly parking lot in South San Francisco that serves travelers arriving and departing from San Francisco International Airport, located less than 2 miles to the south. Construction of the underground trench alignment in this area would create a disruption to the commercial operation of the parking lot and would temporarily displace parking spaces, and thus depriving the lot owner of the use of parking spaces (resulting in lost revenue) and depriving travelers of a convenient parking option. Because this impact would not meet any of the criteria for significance established in Section D.2.3.1, it would be adverse but not significant (Class III). However, implementation of Mitigation Measure L-8a is recommended to minimize the impact to the parking lot operator.

Mitigation Measure for Impact L-8, Disruption of Commercial Parking Lot

L-8a **Compensate Parking Lot Operator.** PG&E shall compensate the affected parking lot operator for the temporarily displaced parking spaces and parking spaces rendered inaccessible during underground alignment construction. Compensation shall be based on the number of spaces displaced or blocked multiplied by the daily parking rate per space multiplied by the number of days the spaces are unusable. PG&E shall provide to the CPUC documentation of negotiation with and compensation to the parking lot operator.

Comparison to Proposed Route Segment

This alternative would create two temporary land use impacts (Impacts L-4 and L7) that are also identified for the Proposed Project; it would create one new temporary construction impact (Impact L-8). It would have reduced construction impacts due to presence of sensitive receptors and it has an overall length that is considerably less than the equivalent Proposed Project segment.

D.2.6 Environmental Impacts of the No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative scenario includes upgrades to PG&E facilities and the development of new generation in the CCSF. The development of new generation, such as new turbines in CCSF, would result in temporary local construction noise, dust, and other nuisance impacts, but the No Project Alternative scenario defines new generation as occurring at existing power plant sites and/or in industrial areas that are not highly noise sensitive. Although residential neighborhoods are located in the vicinity of the existing CCSF power plants, construction noise for installation of turbines in these industrial environments would not be expected to be significant. Long-term operational impacts would include incremental increases in operational noise and air emissions, both of which could potentially result in impacts at the closest residential receptors. The air emissions would incrementally contribute to the pollutant load at these locations, which could also potentially create significant impacts to residential receptors.

Under the No Project Alternative scenario, existing land uses could also be adversely affected by power supply constraints. Residential customers could be inconvenienced, at a minimum, by unanticipated service interruptions. Such interruptions also have the potential to result in health impacts and even death if power-operated medical equipment is shut down, and can create financial costs, such as when a freezer full of food is spoiled. Such impacts on commercial and industrial customers can be more severe, as large quantities of product could be damaged by power outages and costly industrial processes could be ruined. Normal operations of businesses could be disrupted and customers could be deterred from patronizing a business operating in the dark or lost altogether. In the event of a system failure, the duration and degree of adverse effects on residential, commercial, and industrial customers would be magnified, and could even potentially result in business bankruptcies.

An additional land use impact associated with this scenario would be on growth and new development. Businesses desiring to locate in the CCSF service area or existing businesses wishing to expand facilities or operations could be precluded from doing so due to a lack of requisite power supply. This could affect land use development patterns within the CCSF and could deprive the City of revenue from business taxes.

D.2.7 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Table

Monitoring and reporting requirements for the mitigation measures identified in this section are presented in Table D.2-17.

Table D.2-17. Mitigation Monitoring Program – Land Use

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Location	Monitoring / Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Responsible Agency	Timing
L-1: Conflict with Biological Resources Policies (Class II)	PG&E shall implement Mitigation Measures B-1b, B-1c, B-3a, and B-3b set forth in Section D.4.	Section D.4, Biological Resources				
L-2: Conflict with County Tree Ordinances (Class II)	PG&E shall implement Mitigation Measures B-2b set forth in Section D.4.	Section D.4, Biological Resources				
L-3: Conflict with County Visual Quality Policies (Class I)	PG&E shall implement all of the proposed Visual Resources mitigation measures, set forth in Section D.3.	See Section D.3, Visual Resources				
L-4: Construction Nuisances or Disturbances (Class III)	**L-4a: Provide construction notification**. PG&E or its construction contractor shall provide advance notice, between two and four weeks prior to construction, by mail to all residents or property owners within 300 feet of the alignment. The announcement shall state specifically where and when construction will occur in the area. If construction delays of more than 7 days occur, an additional notice shall be made, either in person or by mail. Notices shall provide tips on reducing noise intrusion, for example, by closing windows facing the planned construction. PG&E shall also publish a notice of impending construction in local newspapers, stating when and where construction will occur. Prior to construction, copies of all notices shall be submitted to the CPUC. **L-4b: Provide public liaison person and toll-free information hotline**. PG&E shall identify and provide a public liaison person before and during construction to respond to concerns of neighboring residents about noise, dust, and other construction disturbance. Procedures for reaching the public liaison officer via telephone or in person shall be included in notices distributed to the public in accordance with Mitigation Measure L-4a. PG&E shall also establish a toll-free telephone number for receiving questions or complaints during construction and shall develop procedures for responding to callers. Procedures shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval prior to construction. **L-4c: Provide Compensation to Displaced Residents**. If helicopter use requires the displacement of residents from homes along the transmission line route, residents shall be compensated by PG&E for this displacement. Compensation shall be negotiated with each household.	All residents and property owners within 300 feet of the project alignment; L-4c is applicable to San Bruno residents north of San Bruno Avenue along the Modified Underground Existing 230 kV ROW Alternative	Copy of announcement(s), mailing list, and newspaper notice provided to CPUC. Submit construction plans to CPUC for review and approval at least 60 days prior to the start of construction.	Noise, dust, and odor impacts are limited during construction activities.	CPUC	Prior to construction

Table D.2-17. Mitigation Monitoring Program – Land Use (cont.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Location	Monitoring / Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Responsible Agency	Timing
	depending on the extent and duration of disturbance, and shall include provision for meals and hotels, as well as accommodation of any special medical needs of displaced residents. PG&E shall provide to the CPUC a statement documenting that an agreement has been reached with each affected landowner at least 30 days prior to the start of construction. **L-4d: Maximize Distance From Residences**. The Modified Underground Existing 230 kV Collocation Alternative alignment shall be revised to maximize the distance from San Bruno residences north of San Bruno Avenue. This objective can be achieved by placing this segment of the transmission line within the existing PG&E 115 kV right-of-way as far east as possible. At least 60 days prior to construction, PG&E shall submit construction plans to the CPUC for review and approval to document compliance with this measure.					
L-5: Interference with SFPUC Maintenance Activities (Class II)	**L-5a: Coordinate with SFPUC within Peninsula Watershed.** PG&E shall coordinate the locations of all support towers and cable-pulling sites within the Peninsula Watershed with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to ensure that construction and operation of the Proposed Project does not interfere with SFPUC maintenance and operations activities. This coordination shall be documented to the CPUC in a letter provided at least 60 days before the start of construction.	All project locations with the Peninsula Watershed	Letter of verification submitted by SFPUC to CPUC following review of final construction plans.	Tower locations and cable-pulling sites meet Caltrans approval.	SFPUC, CPUC	Prior to construction
L-7: Disrupted Access to Businesses and Residences (Class III)	**L-7a: Provide Continuous Access to Properties.** PG&E or its construction contractor shall provide at all times the ability to quickly lay a temporary steel plate trench bridge upon request to ensure driveway access to businesses and residences, and shall provide continuous access to properties when not actively constructing the underground cable alignment. **L-7b**: **Coordinate with Businesses.** Where private parking lots serving businesses would be effectively blocked during construction, PG&E shall either make prior arrangements with the business owner(s) to provide alternative parking within reasonable walking distance (i.e., no more than 1,000 feet), or shall coordinate the construction schedule so as to prevent disrupting the functions of the business(es).	Between transition station and Martin Substation	Construction monitor (funded by PG&E Co.) to inspect construction site(s) weekly, with monthly inspection report filed with CPUC.	Field verification of compliance and lack of complaints by residents. Continued access to properties is maintained.	Affected jurisdictions or CPUC	During construction

Table D.2-17. Mitigation Monitoring Program – Land Use (cont.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Location	Monitoring / Reporting Action	Effectiveness Criteria	Responsible Agency	Timing
L-8: Disruption of Commercial Parking Lot (Class III)	**L-8a: Compensate Parking Lot Operator.** PG&E shall compensate the affected parking lot operator for the lost income from temporarily displaced parking spaces and parking spaces rendered inaccessible during underground alignment construction. Compensation shall be based on the number of spaces displaced or blocked multiplied by the daily parking rate per space multiplied by the number of days the spaces are unusable. PG&E shall provide to the CPUC documentation of negotiation with and compensation to the parking lot operator.	I-Fly Parking Lot in South San Francisco along the Modified Underground Existing 230 kV ROW Alternative	Field verification of displaced/ blocked spaces by CPUC. Copy of agreement(s) with affected property owner(s) submitted to CPUC and compensation routed through CPUC.	Property owners satisfactorily compensated.	CPUC	Prior to construction