

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo, 8/12/03

SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST 12, 2003 - 2:00 P.M. and 7:00 P.M.

* * * * *

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE TERKEURST: This is the time and place for public participation hearings before the California Public Utilities Commission in Application No. 02-09-043, which is the application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity authorizing construction of the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV transmission project.

My name is Charlotte TerKeurst. I'm the Administrative Law Judge assigned to this project.

Thank you all for coming. We look forward to hearing from the public today.

I'll take a few minutes to explain the process that the Public Utilities Commission goes through in considering projects like this and then discuss what will happen during the remainder of this hearing.

PG&E filed this application in November of last year. The Commission is in the middle of a review of the environmental aspects of the project. The Draft Environmental Impact Report has been issued. You may be aware of a bit of this.

I have with me today Billie Blanchard, who is the Commission's project manager overseeing the environmental review, and Chris Keller with Aspen Environmental Group, which is the consultant that we have retained to perform the environmental review. They will be providing a brief overview of the proposed project, and their findings and recommendations regarding some alternatives that the Commission can consider as we assess the project.

Also present today is Judy Cooper. She may still be outside. She's with the Public Advisor's Group at the Commission. She's here to assist in signing people up.

We ask that you sign in so we know how many people and who attended the hearing. And also if you wish to speak and haven't signed that list, please see Judy; or toward the end of the hearing, I'll ask if there is anyone else who had not signed up who wants to say something.

She can also give you a broad range of information regarding the Commission and its activities if you have questions or concerns that are broader than the focus of today's hearing.

We also have present today a representative from PG&E, Alain Billot -- if you could raise your hand -- at the back. He's also available to answer questions as needed.

Do we have any other formal participants in the evidentiary hearings here?

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: All right. Let me explain that a little bit.

When we look at projects like this that have the potential for environmental impacts, the Commission undertakes a two-pronged review. As I mentioned, we perform an environmental review that is consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act and have the Environmental Impact Report prepared.

In addition, we have a formal evidentiary process where we consider the results of that Environmental Impact Report review and any other issues that may be raised by the application, in particular, in this instance, questions regarding whether the project is needed and also the potential cost of the project.

There will be formal testimony filed later this year after the final Environmental Impact Report is released and hearings the first week in December where expert witness testimony will be received.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

We anticipate a decision in this application by approximately May of next year if things go as scheduled.

The process today is very informal. People will not be under oath, but we do have court reporters here. There will be a transcript of this hearing available as we proceed.

As a general guide, I'd like people to limit their comments to about three to five minutes a person. I don't think that will be a problem. I think we have plenty of time to hear from everyone, so I'm not going to be terribly strict about that.

Do keep in mind as you speak the needs of the court reporter. Basically, state your name when you begin your presentation, and speak clearly and not too fast so that they can transcribe what you're saying.

With that I believe I'm ready to turn this over to Billie and Chris. I think there may be some technical problems with the overheads, but there are handouts that you can at least follow along if you are having trouble reading the overheads.

Billie.

MS. KELLER: Good afternoon.

Judge TerKeurst has asked us to provide you a brief presentation of the Environmental Impact Report process and findings to date. So I'm going to provide an overview of the project milestones, where we are in the process right now, as well as a description of the proposed project.

Following that, Billie Blanchard will describe the alternatives screening process that was undertaken for this project and the Draft EIR alternatives, and then we will wrap up with where you can provide written comments on the Draft EIR.

With respect to the project milestones, right now we're really in the middle of this process. As Judge TerKeurst mentioned, PG&E filed their application for a CPCN, or a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, last autumn, in September of 2002. The application was reviewed by the CEQA team and deemed complete in January of 2003.

Between January and March, public scoping was completed for the project under CEQA requirement. Scoping meetings were held in January and February, and a scoping report was issued at the beginning of April. During the January-through-June time frame, the EIR analysis has been completed along with an alternative screening process.

As most of you are aware, the Draft EIR was released for public review July 16th of this year.

We also completed at the end of July some public information workshops to provide additional information on the project and the EIR.

In terms of where we go from here, the public comments on the Draft EIR are due August 28th, and following that there will be responses to comments provided. And the final EIR is scheduled to be released in October of this year.

The ALJ proceedings will begin in October and continue through the early part of 2004 with a schedule anticipated to vote on a decision in mid-2004.

It's important to note that the EIR is an information document, not a decision document, although it probably -- it will be referenced in the decision.

If the project or an alternative is approved, the decision will require monitoring of adopted mitigation measures and the definition of mitigation monitoring procedures.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

This next slide essentially just shows — and we apologize again for the technical difficulties that we're having — but right now we are in this part of the process. So this graphic just essentially shows again that we are in the middle of the process with decision anticipated the middle of next year.

In terms of the proposed project, PG&E is proposing the project with the following elements: The installation of a new 27-mile 230 kV transmission line. This transmission line would essentially be composed of 14.7 miles of an overhead line from the Jefferson Substation to a new transition station to be located near San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive and 12.4 miles of an underground line from the transition station to the Martin Substation.

PG&E is proposing that the overhead portion of the project be built by rebuilding the existing 60 kV double-circuit line to basically support both the 60 kV lines and the 230 kV lines.

In addition to the overhead and the underground portions of the project and the construction of a new transition station, PG&E is proposing modifications to a number of their substations within those site boundaries, including the Jefferson-Martin, San Mateo, Millbrae, Monta Vista, and Ralston Substations and the Hillsdale Junction switching station.

With respect to its location, I realize that these maps are difficult to read, and I wanted to just point out that on the wall we do have full graphics that show the location of the proposed project, these first three, as well as the other alternatives we will be talking about.

But, essentially, PG&E's proposed project from the Jefferson Substation to the new transition station would be an overhead line, a rebuild of the existing 60 kV line that generally follows the I-280 corridor and would be located within their existing right-of-way that generally falls within the San Francisco Peninsula watershed lands. It also would cross a portion of the Edgewood County Park, the Pulgas Ridge open space, pass near the San Mateo Highlands -- can we go to the next map, please. It would continue up along the I-280 corridor, passing west along the western edge of the communities of Hillsborough, Burlingame, Millbrae, and San Bruno to the location of their proposed transition station, which again is near the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive.

From the transition station PG&E is proposing to locate the underground portion of the project, the 230 kV circuits, across portions of San Bruno and South San Francisco in city streets, along the BART right-of-way -- the next map, please -- and then continuing north across portions of the cities of Colma and Daly City across the San Bruno state and county park, along the Guadalupe Canyon Road, and then paralleling -- excuse me -- being located within Bayshore Boulevard to the Martin Substation.

And I will turn it over to Billie.

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes. As many of you know by now -- you have the documents -- we went through an extensive alternative screening process for this project, basing it on the three CEQA criteria for alternatives, which is to meet most of the project objectives; that it's feasible in terms of regulatory, technical, legal; and it reduces or eliminated any significant impact of the proposed project.

In the Appendix 1 of the Draft EIR, we describe each of the alternatives that we looked at and the rationale for either carrying them forward or determining that they were eliminated for any of the above criteria.

Also in your Draft EIR, Section C, there is more of a summation of the alternative screening process and the results.

We looked at a lot of alternatives, including total new routes, PG&E's Alternative 1B, Partial Underground Alternative in the Southern Segment. We looked at a number of minor reroutes in the Northern Segment. Also some fairly lengthy alternatives to the San Bruno Avenue route.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

We obviously -- we looked at alternative transition stations at San Bruno, several of those. We looked at non-wires alternatives, local generation, conservation, renewable technology.

These are just sort of a description of some of the maps that show some of the alternatives that we considered, and it was fairly extensive. This was one that was presented, the west of the reservoirs, the Alternative 1B going up through Canada Road, Skyline, up to Trousdale, and then down to El Camino and up to San Bruno Avenue. The partial underground alternative, which is -- partial underground is several reroutes out of that area.

Next, please. And then as you go up, we looked at the two alternative transition stations up at San Bruno Avenue. And then there are -- maybe next slide -- we looked at several -- Sneath Lane, Westboro, Junipero Serra -- as alternative routes in the northern area.

We looked at -- we have the modified 230 collocation, which is a partial collocation with PG&E's existing underground 230.

We looked at the SFPUC water area -- water -- collocating with the water pipeline, collocating with the 60 kV line down by the Millbrae Avenue area.

Okay. And this basically just shows some of the same alternatives up in this area here (indicating), the East Market Alternative, the non-BART alternative that PG&E proposed. And then here's the 230 collocation underground route in here (indicating), in this area down by South San Francisco.

Okay. Go ahead.

And we also looked at another alternative that was presented that goes from Moraga substation over in the East Bay, across the Bay, and then down to the substation in San Francisco.

So based on that, all of those alternatives that we looked at, there was a number of alternatives that were carried forward in the Draft EIR to full analysis. And the one in the Southern Segment was PG&E's underground Alternative 1B, which is Canada Road, Skyline Boulevard, then going down Trousdale, and then looking into El Camino Real up to San Bruno Avenue.

And then of course we also looked at the partial underground alternative which -- several reroutes, one out of Edgewood Park, one out around Burlingame area over to the west side of I-280, and also undergrounding at -- by San Mateo Highlands in the Hillsborough area.

And then in the Northern Segment, of course, we looked at the two alternative transition stations west of Skyline, and being adjacent to the Sneath Lane substation.

We also looked at, in full, the modified existing 230 kV alternative, which is the collocation with the PG&E underground 230 -- existing 230 lines.

And then we looked at underground Cherry Avenue alternative basically to avoid some issues of the grade crossing proposal, Huntington and San Bruno.

Then we also looked at PG&E's Route Option 4-B which is the east Market Street alternative. We also looked at the Junipero Serra alternative.

All of these we had significant impact reduction. They met most of the project alternatives. And they were considered feasible to PG&E's project.

I think we will go ahead and run through the maps now.

Now the conclusion that we came to as far as the environmentally superior alternative, that is with the overall least environmental effects, was PG&E's underground alternative 1-B in the southern segment, which I just described, which is underground in the rows of Canada, Skyline, Trousdale up to El

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

Camino Real to San Bruno, and the modified existing 230 kV alternative for the northern segment, which partially collocates with PG&E's existing underground 230.

These presented a number -- we were only building in underground existing roads, eliminated a lot of impacts relating to biological and visual. You have eliminated the transition station impacts. And the modified existing 230 alternative is mainly in the light industrial, commercial area.

This is the environmental superior alternative.

And then the final decision will depend upon the process we are about to go through.

So with that I am going to turn it over to Chris for a real quick follow-up.

MS. KELLER: I just want to mention that this slide presentation is available outside as a handout.

So I am just going to very quickly go through what it shows at the back.

It is basically, as I mentioned, written comments must be received by August 28th. Information is provided in terms of where to send those comments to.

There is also information in the handout regarding this set of public participation meetings, where they will be held and the times as well as upcoming meetings to be held in November of this year.

Finally, the last slide information gives you guidance on where you can find additional information on the web for the draft EIR.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: One comment that I should make regarding the public participation hearings. The plan is to have another set of two public participation hearings in November, November 18th after the final environmental impact report has come out.

As we are all painfully aware, there are state budget problems. We are in the process of relooking at our Commission budget and what we can afford to do. Some public participation hearings in some other cases are already under consideration for being deleted due to lack of funds.

We have not considered that for these November 18th hearings, but I am just saying that that is a possibility. We will let people know if it is canceled. If you don't hear otherwise, they are planned, as this handout indicates.

Is there anything else before we start hearing from you guys?

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: Again, I thank you all for coming. It is very important to hear from members of the public regarding which of the routes you prefer, the concerns you have about the project in general or specific pieces of the routes that may have impacts which you find unacceptable.

There's no prejudgment on the Commission's part regarding whether the alternatives that our staff and the consultants have identified as environmentally preferable, whether they would be the ones that are ultimately approved if the project is approved.

So the public feedback, the people who will be affected by the project on a day-to-day basis is very important. So please let us know what you think.

With that, the first person on the list is Richard Cole.

Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: I defer.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

STATEMENT OF MS. CHEN

MS. CHEN: I know I don't look like Richard Cole. I am Judy Chen.

I'm sorry to step in his place, but we are supposed to leave for a camping trip and he graciously let me go first.

I am a member of the 280 CCC and a resident of the San Mateo Highlands.

First, I would like to thank you very much for your time today for listening to our concerns. We appreciate your making the arrangements for not just one but four separate occasions to hear from citizens and to make sure that every voice is heard.

I believe I speak on behalf of all persons who reside along the proposed transmission line when I ask you to consider as the top priority in the decision making process the health risks of the citizens.

I am a firm believer that EMF exposure from the proposed transmission lines are a tremendous source of concern. Paul Brodeur, an award-winning author for the New Yorker who uncovered the dangers of asbestos wrote a book called "The Great Power Line Cover-Up," which cited numerous cases of cancer clusters across the country, all of which occurred within close proximity to a high power, high voltage power line.

Brodeur also addressed the Nebraska state Legislature in connection with a proposed 96 mile, 340 thousand volt electric transmission line.

In that report he stated that a majority of the medical and scientific studies published in the peer review medical literature show that children living in homes near high voltage or high current power lines as well as workers exposed to power frequency, electric magnetic fields on the job are developing cancer at significantly higher rates than those who are not.

It is unfortunate I think that here in the United States we don't have a set standard, a safe standard concerning EMF exposure.

In other countries such as Sweden they do regulate these things. In fact, they determined the distance of how far a school should be placed from high voltage power lines.

Electric magnetic fields are measured in terms of milligauss. From what I have read, I believe that a prudent person would want their house to be exposed to no more than one milligauss of EMF. The residents in the San Mateo Highland are currently looking into which alternative best meets their needs. It may be that a hybrid of the 1-B and the partial underground routes perhaps with modifications would best serve the residents along the proposed transmission route. This is considering everybody from San Mateo on north.

Given that it is primarily San Francisco who will benefit from this line and it is the Peninsula who will bear the brunt of the burden in terms of health, aesthetic, property value and environmental impacts, we believe that costs should play a secondary role to the health risks and safety concerns.

Finally, I just want to voice our strong opposition to PG&E's original plan 1-A which would call for higher, larger towers in the present right-of-way, carrying a load of 350, 000 volts of electricity behind the homes on Lexington Avenue, some of which are only 50 feet from the towers.

Thank you very much for your time.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Mr. Cole, do you wish to speak now as well, or were you ceding your --

PPH1-1

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

MR. COLE: If it is all right with the other people on the list, I would be happy to speak now.

ALJ TERKEURST: Please.

STATEMENT OF MR. COLE

MR. COLE: May I leave a copy of my letter with somebody here. Do I have to mail it?

ALJ TERKEURST: You can given it to us.

MR. COLE: My major concerns about the draft EIR have to do with the treatment of project alternatives and related alternatives. I think that treatment is inadequate.

I think it is succumbing to political pressures. I think it is not doing a complete job. In particular, San Francisco has political reasons for not doing what it should do, which is to create power sources close to the users. That is the most efficient way to do things, as I said in my letter to the Commission in February.

And the only thing we have heard about are the four turbines that are proposed in San Francisco and apparently acceptable to San Francisco, which will then allow the Hunters Point plant to be taken out of service. The net result will be a reduction in the power generated in San Francisco.

I think the Commission should go much farther than that and insist on Williams turbines placed all around the city. They have the additional benefit of cogeneration. They can generate steam which could be used to heat other buildings. San Francisco historically in its downtown has used publicly generated steam to heat buildings, and there is no reason it couldn't be done now if imagination is applied.

Under another alternative which was analyzed apparently in the EIR new generation alternatives, San Francisco Williams turbines and distributed generation, DG, both including rationale for elimination on the executive summaries pages ES-24 and ES-25.

For the first, your reasons for elimination from further consideration include, quote, regulatory feasibility constraints to project approval. There may be siting constraints associated with placing the Williams turbines in the City and County of San Francisco.

Who imposes these constraints? Is it Willie Brown and the Board of Keystone Cops?

For the second, your reasons for elimination from further consideration include a number of serious barriers, including technical issues and regulatory policies, make interconnection to the electrical grid for small generators difficult. Lengthy local permitting processes will make it unlikely to construct sufficient quantities of distributed generation within the time frame required, et cetera.

What are these technical issues? They don't seem to prevent PG&E from buying excess power from individual home owners who install solar energy systems. What is the difficulty in providing connections to new turbine plants?

And what are these lengthy local permitting processes? Is that again Willie and the Board of Stupidvisors?

Finally, still on the first area of the no-project alternative, your stated reasons for recommending against the no-project alternative, this is on page ES-59, are, quote, the most significant impact of the no-project alternative is the likelihood of creating long term air

PPH1-2

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

emissions and noise impacts. In addition, no project alternative has the potential to result in electric service disruption.

PPH1-2

I consider that to be a colossal cop-out. You really should give more serious consideration to the no-project alternative and its associated alternatives which would make this project unneeded.

I now proceed to the second area. This is the final point I am going to make.

I think you and PG&E have overstated the need for the project. I will read you a short paragraph that comes from page ES-1 of the executive summary.

PPH1-3

PG&E stated objectives for the proposed project are fourfold: One, to meet future electrical demand; two, to comply with industry planning criteria of the Independent System Operator, et cetera; three, to create a more diverse transmission system; and four, to implement the ISO Board of Governor's April 2002 resolution, et cetera.

Two of these objectives are stated as implementing the orders of other regulatory agencies. A third refers to future electrical demand. I leave it to others to knock that one down.

I want to concentrate on PG&E's and your deferring to the orders of other supervisory regulatory agencies with an obvious lessen. Here I have two paragraphs to read, and then I will be through. But I think this is important to say. Sometimes the regulators are wrong, catastrophically wrong. I refer you to the recent history of production and use of methyl tertiary butyl ether, MTBE, in the State of California. In or about 1990 the California Air Resources Board, CARB, started to require oil refineries to produce automotive gasoline formulated with oxygen-containing compounds. The idea, fundamentally a good one, was to promote more complete combustion of gasoline, thus reducing the formation of precursors to smog formation in California.

I am not sure whether the CARB injunction specified MTBE as the only such compound. The Feds are now requiring use of ethanol, grain alcohol.

But MTBE was certainly emphasized. And MTBE was produced by refineries across California under CARB's aegis. everyone will remember the environmental disaster that ensued. MTBE is a carcinogen, soluble in water, ended up in groundwater all over the state.

Needless to say, MTBE is no longer used as a gasoline additive in California.

Here is my personal development. In 1993 I was an independent environmental consultant, part of a team preparing an EIR for the City of Richmond, California. The subject was the Chevron Richmond Refinery's proposed modification of an entire section of the refinery to produce MTBE under the state's mandate.

We, the consultants, were under specific orders to study the environmental impacts of that refinery modification only, not the environmental effects of the whole program, which presumably had its own environmental review by CARB.

I am not staying that I had the prescience to predict the disaster. Unfortunately, we were never given the chance to consider it because the City of Richmond had deferred to the overriding judgment of the state regulators. Please stop and think. Regulatory mandates, including those of the ISO, can be wrongheaded.

Thank you for your consideration.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you, Mr. Cole

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

Just to comment, we will be, as I mentioned earlier, considering the issue of need for the project through the evidentiary process later this year. PG&E has been instructed to file a fairly detailed showing on need and the 280 Concerned Citizens group as other intervenors can respond to that through the evidentiary process. And we will evaluate it very carefully.

As I indicated earlier, the Commission has not prejudged the issue of need or any other issue that is related to this application.

Mr. McFarland.

STATEMENT OF MR. MC FARLAND

MR. MC FARLAND: Your Honor, my name is Don McFarland, and I'm here with my wife, Rose. We live at 1245 Laurel Hill Drive in the San Mateo Highlands.

I bought my home there in 1967 because I was a kid from the City, born and raised in San Francisco, attended Mission High School, and so forth.

The house I bought, bought brand-new from White Cliff Homes, when I bought it in 1967, there was -- my home is right next door to the Hillsdale Junction switching station, the existing switching station. There's only a fence between me and the switching station. But when I bought it, I had a panoramic view of the Crystal Springs Lake and the watershed. In 1967 there was no 280 freeway. I could go out my back fence and go clear to the Crystal Springs Lake.

In 1969, along came Highway 280. Now I point that out just because there's only, like, 200 foot between my fence line and the 280 freeway. And on this 200 foot of land is the existing power structure, the 60 kilowatt lines, and the towers.

PG&E proposes to now take out the existing towers and put in bigger, larger towers and raise the kilowatts to 230 kilowatts.

I have lived since 1967 right next to the power plant knowing that it had 60 kilovolts in there. I have talked to PG&E, and in 1969 they planted with my approval -- we signed a contract, and PG&E planted ten trees on my half-acre parcel as a break, a screen, so to say, between my home and the PG&E Hillsdale Junction station.

I have here a letter which I'd like to give copies, if possible. This letter I typed and sent to Billie Blanchard in February 24th prior to the deadline. And I'd like to quickly go over some of my concerns that are in this letter.

My name is Don McFarland and I recently attended the CPUC Public Environmental Scoping Meeting held February 4, 2003, in San Mateo City Hall.

I was one of the public speakers against the project because of the severe impact it will have on my home and my family. At this meeting there were maps and pictures of the project showing where the new 230 kV lines and towers would be located. One of these new huge towers would be located within 25 feet of my property and block my fantastic view of the State Game Refuge, Crystal Springs Lakes, and the watershed.

We live at 1245 Laurel Hill Drive in the San Mateo Highlands, an unincorporated area of San Mateo County. I purchased my home from White Cliff Homes new in 1967. My lot is approximately one-half acre with a State Game Refuge on two sides and a fantastic view of the Crystal Springs Lakes and all the watershed property on my west side.

In 1967 there still was no 280 freeway between my home and the lakes. We could watch herds of deer grazing every morning and evening. On the south side of my property is the PG&E Hillsdale switching station. Since my lot was so large, PG&E, with my approval,

PPH1-4

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

planted ten large pine trees and eucalyptus trees on my property to form a screen and barrier so we could not see their switching station.

PPH1-4

The existing towers are currently not blocking my view, although the 60 kV lines are within 100 feet of my property. This project could change the current tower locations, and the planned new 230 kV lines are four times greater than the existing lines and will obviously increase the EMFs generated by them. This is an extreme health hazard and major concern to my family and me and we -- and the potential of any new home buyer if I should decide to sell my property.

PPH1-5

We have lived in our home 36 years, and PG&E has never once disclosed to us any dangers from EMFs generated by their switching station or their 60 kV lines. Now they intend to raise these lines to 230 kVs and are still not disclosing the EMF dangers that will occur.

All of us who have lived in this great State of California have experienced last year what our future will be like unless we do something about it. We all suffered power shortages, blackouts, and high PG&E bills because we don't have enough power-generating plants in California to supply its growing population. Instead we depend on out-of-state companies like Enron Corporation who blackmailed us to either pay huge rate increases or they could turn off our lights.

PPH1-6

The proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV project will cost millions -- I have since found out 240 -- or 140 million is what the cost is -- to complete just to get power 27 miles from the south to the north to San Francisco. It will do nothing towards resolving California's power crisis problem.

The money that would be spent, the 140 million, on this project would be applied -- should be applied to a new rebuilt power-generating plant in or near San Francisco to resolve their problems and help the entire state in the near future.

The impact this project would have on my home and all the others along its 27-mile route will be huge. I just refinanced my home to take advantage of the low interest rates. The appraiser standing in my backyard asked me how much I thought he should deduct from my home's value because the Hillsdale Switching station was next to my property.

PPH1-7

He had no knowledge about this proposed project, or he might have deducted a lot more. However, I am a real estate broker for the past 30 years, and I know that I will have to disclose this proposed project now and in the future should I ever decide to sell my home. Depending on where the new towers are located and if they block my fantastic view, and having to disclose the increased EMFs, the value of my estimated \$1 million home will drop by approximately a hundred to two hundred thousand in value.

My home is just one of hundreds that will be impacted by the project all along the 27-mile route. They will all lose property values depending on how bad each property is affected by the towers and power line. In my case, the impact would be severe.

I will attach and enclose some pictures of my home so that you can see my fantastic view and how close I am to the Hillsdale Switching station, the wildlife in the game reserve, the current tower, power lines, and how the new project would affect my property.

I have attached actual pictures in the documents I just left you to show how close I am to the Hillsdale Switching station and where the towers are, the existing 60 kilowatt lines, and how this would actually affect me.

And winding this up, I found an article in the paper here, and this is from the San Francisco Chronicle just last week, Wednesday, August 6th. And it's about the proposed

PPH1-8

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

Potrero Hill power plant. You probably know that the Mirant Corporation proposed to build and replace a power plant in Potrero Hill, but the neighbors and environmentalists have been fighting the Potrero Hill Project on the grounds that it will add to the southern/eastern neighborhood pollution problems.

PPH1-8

You know, I don't understand. You know, \$140 million that's going to be spent to get electricity to San Francisco, and yet they have the opportunity to generate their own electricity. They are going to get all the benefits, and we get all the problems.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you, Mr. McFarland.

The next speak is Michael Meloni.

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: The next person on the list is Burt Treonor.

STATEMENT OF MR. TREONOR

MR. TREONOR: Hi. My name is Burt Treonor, and I live at 67 Loma Vista in Burlingame and will be directly affected by whatever you decide.

The Draft EIR proposes a Plan 1B with the lines going from the Carolands station down Skyline to Trousdale, down Trousdale to El Camino, and up El Camino to San Bruno, rather than going straight up to San Bruno in the watershed because the main drawback was they were worried about the San Andreas Fault line being close to the substation.

PPH1-9

The whole project is built on top of, or along side of, the San Andreas Fault. If the big one hits on the fault, you know, it's going to get destroyed anyway.

The second thing I'd like to bring up is under Plan 1B it says that they want to tear up Skyline Boulevard all the way down to Trousdale from the Carolands Substation. Rather than doing that, why can't they go on the west side of 280 along where the golf courses are and just stay there until either Trousdale, which is where they propose, or going up to San Bruno, which I've suggested.

PPH1-10

And the other part I'd like to bring up is one thing that wasn't really considered is that when you're going down Skyline, rather than continuing all the way down Skyline to Trousdale, but you follow the lines and go behind the homes between the east side of 280 and Skyline or Loma Vista and Skyview where the existing towers are now and putting the whole thing underground there and continuing up to Trousdale between -- behind there, rather than coming down Skyline, again disrupting a major artery, traffic artery, and -- for months and causing all this confusion and putting everybody, you know, really at danger if there is something with the EMFs. I guess that's basically what I have to say.

PPH1-11

Thank you

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

MR. TREONOR: Ms. Blanchard, do you understand what I'm talking about?

MS. BLANCHARD: Yes. I think I talked to you at the workshop.

MR. TREONOR: Because when I first mentioned it -- somebody else, I think, had mentioned it from Loma Vista -- it's a lot cheaper to tear up land that's already been torn up. There's no environmental impact because it's already been destroyed or violated and -- you know, does it make sense?

Thank you.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

The next person on the list is Wilson Pinney.

STATEMENT OF MR. PINNEY

MR. PINNEY: Good afternoon. My name is Wilson Pinney. I live in the San Mateo Highlands.

Currently, I'm the chairman of the Public Utilities Committee of the Highlands Community Association, but I do not speak for the association because we haven't concluded our studies of this proposal.

However, I have spent time with this, and I appeared before you in February and gave some cautionary statements, and I was pleased to see that those were taken under advisement by you. And thank you very much for including those considerations.

At this time I'm speaking only to one section of the Draft EIR, the Executive Summary. The reason I limited myself to the Executive Summary is that the main Draft EIR is lodged or was to be lodged in our local libraries in San Mateo. But if you have been following our local condition, all of our public libraries are closed at the present time because a massive rebuilding of the public library is under way. And it just so happens that there's no access to the library materials for about a month or six weeks.

So I had to scurry around. I finally found a copy in the Burlingame Library, and I spent some time reading the section on earthquakes. And that is the subject of my comments today.

To reference this, we're referring to Executive Summary 37, to the geology, soils and paleontology section, and particularly to one part of that discussion. And I'm asking that before the Final EIR is published further study and careful consideration be given to the discussion of the impact of earthquakes mainly on the overhead installations.

I would point out a couple of things that may be considered, but I would certainly hope that a representative from the USGS, the geological survey people, or if there's enough money -- who has enough money now? -- to hire a geological expert who is familiar with this particular area and also familiar with the impact of earthquakes to at least review what has been done.

In the Executive Summary, there is a statement that I find very difficult to believe and even understand. And when I referred to the full Draft EIR documents in the Burlingame Public Library, I couldn't find any justification for that statement. And the statement has to do with the -- one of the impacts of an earthquake on overhead lines. And it says that the impacts associated with overhead active fault crossings be can mitigated to less than significant levels because overhead lines -- overhead lines are able to distribute fault displacements over a comparatively long span. You may remember that section in the Draft EIR.

I think that really is either a gratuitous statement to reassure the reader that there is not much of a problem with that, overhead lines, earthquakes, and so forth.

The lines themselves are what I think is called a non-catenary curve. In other words, it's not -- the lines don't just hang down of their own weight. They are strung at great tension from line to -- from tower to tower.

The earthquake predictions that you do include in the Draft EIR point out that there is a relatively high likelihood of earthquake of some magnitude, some considerable

PPH1-12

PPH1-13

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

magnitude, in the whole Bay Area. And, of course, this is our favorite little game, to wonder when the San Andreas Fault is going to let go and we will reap the benefits of that event.

PPH1-13

The lines, though, according to your own documentation, can -- the towers can move on an earthquake fault as much as 20 feet.

If you can imagine a cable, an electric cable under tension then being asked to move in a jerk 20 feet, you can see that the assertion that the lines will take up that stress seems improbable, and that is essentially my point.

I would like a further discussion that can set at ease the reader, not in this way, not as a bald assertion, but with some explanation that goes a bit deeper than that. When you are talking about earthquakes, landslides, instability of soils, the deeper you go, the more reassuring it is to those of us who live right on the edge of the San Andreas Fault.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you, Mr. Pinney.

The next person on the list is Deborah Kemper.

STATEMENT OF MS. KEMPER

MS. KEMPER: My name is Deborah Kemper, 309 Dale Road in Hillsborough.

I want to thank you for your time in coming down to listen to us and everyone's concerns.

I want to start on a personal note, which is that four years ago I barely noticed the 60 kV line that we are looking at being upgraded and expanded. But the area, the watershed and the preserve is one of my favorite areas in California and actually was a big motivator when I was considering moving to California. I was driving that stretch of 280 and felt immediately at home. I consider myself very lucky that now I live right along that stretch of corridor.

PPH1-14

And it makes me very sad that every time I drive down 280 now the thought of bigger towers going through there, an area that is used and enjoyed by people from all over the Bay Area, not just San Mateo, Hillsborough and Burlingame up along the corridor, but from the city they come down, the East Bay. I ride my bike down there on weekends. It makes me very sad about the impact of this project could have.

On a more tactical note, basically what I am saying is I am against 1-A. I am glad the draft report came out against 1-A. I am not an expert. And to choose among all the different options that were laid out, I haven't had time yet to go through the thousands pages of the detailed report. But I guess I have some questions that I would still like to have answered and I can't readily find in what I have been able to get through.

The first is that I want to know why is it still needed? We are in a very different economic reality than we were several years ago when all this got started. I think they are putting a lot of time constraints against some of the other alternatives that I don't know are really realistic anymore. They are saying some things can't be done by 2005 or '6. Is this power really needed by 2005, 2006 when we have huge job losses that we have had?

PPH1-15

We have had a lot of people moving out of state, huge reductions in need. Maybe there are some other alternatives that might be more viable if we extended the time line for when this power is needed.

The second is why does the Peninsula and our community have to be so adversely impacted for the power which is predominantly going to the City? And I just don't see why

PPH1-16

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

we have to have the health risks and impact to our views and our property values, the construction and noise impacts that are going to affect us.

I have two small children. My daughter, if this gets started on time, half her life will be under construction in an area that she lives in because she is now one. Is that something that I signed up for when I bought my home four years ago? Absolutely not.

Obviously, again, most importantly, the health impacts which are really undetermined from what I can tell. European countries say there are health risks. For some reason we can't seem to put the same amount of energy and dollars into determining conclusively whether there are health risks to our children.

I guess in closing, I want to say that I am still quite frustrated that as a parent and resident of this area who lives within a block of the current lines, I can see them from my backyard, I am not notified of these sessions by the CPUC or PG&E. I am notified through neighborhood activism.

And for something that supposedly has such a huge health or could have a huge impact on me, I still find that quite astounding that I can live one block from these power lines and not get a letter, but I can get a letter saying that there's a cell tower going up at the Junipero Serra rest stop that is further away, a cell tower. That's nothing. I get notified for that but not for this session.

So again, thank you for your time. And hopefully these questions will get answered as the final draft comes out.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

I would like Billie to respond to this issue of notice.

MS. BLANCHARD: When they file an application, there is a process of notification that is laid out in what we call our General Order 131(d) for electrical projects. So based upon that there was certain distancing from the project where people are notified; that is, the owners, assessor's parcel addresses. So there is a certain process.

We also put them in newspapers. And we try to elicit as many interested parties as we can. And we put all their names and addresses on our mailing list. So that's part of our problem is we have a notification process. We try to expand as much as we can.

We have a process that we operate under for this type of thing. But anyway, anybody, please give us your names and addresses if you are here so that we can make sure you are on our list.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: There were also bill inserts, correct, regarding the public participation hearings?

MS. BLANCHARD: No.

ALJ TERKEURST: Okay. I thought there were.

Daniel Friedman.

STATEMENT OF MR. FRIEDMAN

MR. FRIEDMAN: Hi. I am Daniel Friedman. I used to go to the Highlands school where you can see the power lines from. And we live like maybe a block away or two blocks away from the power lines. You can see them from our house. And the

PPH1-16

PPH1-17

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

main thing is there is sort of this project in the booklet. It has this issue, significant or nonsignificant. And the only things that are significant seems to be the views from anywhere. I don't know.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Sherri Friedman.

STATEMENT OF MS. FRIEDMAN

MS. FRIEDMAN: Good afternoon. Thank you for this hearing.

I used to work for the City of San Francisco, and I have been on both sides. So I can really appreciate your time and energy that you put into this.

We are 15 year residents of the Highlands. You probably gathered from all the people that are here and want to be here that we are a very closely knit community. On our cul-de-sac alone we have 17 children, all under the ages of 16. And we are particularly concerned with the health risks.

We know already that there is a pocket of cancer close to the wires north of Bunker Hill in the Lexington area right where the towers are, and positions have documented that. So that is a strong concern of ours.

We have Highlands school and many children that go to the rec center for child care. So children are in this area for at least ten hours a day even that don't live directly along the Lexington corridor. So that's a strong concern of many people. And we hope that you will consider the request to reevaluate the need, and secondly, to put the wires underground.

Thank you very much.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

The next person on the list is Han Lee.

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: Michelle Newschoff.

STATEMENT OF MS. NEWSCHOFF

MS. NEWSCHOFF: Hi. I just want to reiterate and thank you for coming down to San Mateo so we don't have to go to San Francisco and for holding these hearings.

My name is Michelle Newschoff. I live on 2020 Lexington Avenue in the San Mateo Highlands.

And we bought our house two years ago. And I have two small children. The only contingency we put on our house was I wanted to know what the EMFs were before I bought it, as the lines really are adjacent to my property line.

So the current lines are probably, I didn't measure, about 50 to 70 feet from my house, probably about 25 to 40 feet from my property line, about 20 feet from my property line.

And I did have somebody from PG&E come out and measure the EMFs before we bought it. Within my house they are no more than 1 milligauss, which was sort of my upper limit of what I had said after doing some research of what I was willing to live with. Of course, they are higher in our backyard and much higher, as we don't have a fence, if you go down into the watershed.

PPH1-17

PPH1-18

PPH1-19

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

As I said, I have two small kids. The thought of 15 months after we bought our house to get this notice from PG&E, which was addressed to the prior residents, and I still get the notice addressed to the prior residents, prior owners even though it has been two years, that they want -- PG&E wants to put larger, higher towers that are 30 feet higher, twice as wide, will increase the right-of-way from 50 feet to a hundred feet, and more importantly, significantly increase the amount of current, electricity, going right behind my house and affecting the EMFs, that is my primary concern with this project.

PPH1-19

As Judy Chen quite articulately noted, lots of studies have been done in the United States. We do not currently have a standard, nor have we come up with what is the real danger. But in many European countries they have.

From all the research that I've done, our community group has done, the experts we have hired have done, it seems that there is a real increased risk of both adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrigs disease. And what scares me the most is childhood Leukemia.

I really think that one milligauss is sort of the maximum amount that we would be willing to live with. The proposed project of 1-A would significantly increase that.

So I wanted to strongly voice my opposition to that.

The other effect in addition to the health risks that I think all the residents along the corridor would be exposed to is sort of the aesthetic impact of if 1-A went through, the bigger, higher towers and how we bought our house because we do about the watershed and have beautiful views. And personally, just the tower that is nearest my house is blocked by some trees. But if it is moved or put somewhere else, the views all along Lexington -- we bike along there, we walk along there, we go to the rec center. There are millions of people. It would be adversely impacted. And all along by Crystal Springs Reservoir, that would be impacted.

PPH1-20

The third issue is a function of both the increase in the health risks and the aesthetics is the negative impact it would have on our property values. Again, we sort of put as much money as we possibly could into our house. And doing some research on other communities where 230 kV lines are, we actually did find a community in Boca Raton, Florida where almost two years ago a 230 kilovolt overground line was put in next to a housing development. And we have spoken to many of the residents there. And they claim, and I haven't seen it personally, but we are going to try to do some more research here, that there is a similar development about a mile and a half away, far away from the power lines, built by the same builders in the same year and the houses were selling at the same price, and currently the houses near the 230 kilovolt line are selling at about 25 to 30 percent less than the houses without the 230 kilovolt line.

PPH1-21

So I do believe there will be a significant and negative impact.

I guess what galls me most about these three issues, that again, as you have heard before, that the project is primarily to serve the needs of San Francisco and yet the residents in the Peninsula are going to bear both the environmental detriment from this project. And San Francisco will derive not only environmental but a lot of economic benefits from this project if it does go through.

PPH1-22

And I think one of the main reasons -- I know this will be addressed in the need testimony -- but one of the main reasons PG&E said they need this project is to improve reliability, and yet it has known that local generation is much more reliable than transmission lines.

PPH1-23

So again, I believe the four turbines from Williams was not included and the possible supply to help with reliability and service reliability -- I know there are issues about

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

building Potrero, the power plants were in Potrero. Those residents don't want it there, but they are fine with having transmission through the Peninsula to service San Francisco.

PPH1-23

And then I know there's been promises, whether they are official or unofficial, to close Hunters Point. Again, therefore San Francisco will derive a lot of benefit and the Peninsula doesn't seem to derive any and yet bears all the brunt of this project.

I guess we just want to say that we think in looking at the EIR, which is very thorough, and obviously I didn't go through the whole thing, there are perhaps variations to some of the routes that will be palatable that will address our concerns and that we really do think that the health risks to the residents should be paramount to some of the environmental concerns about the soil and vegetation.

PPH1-24

There's been lots of notice about the serpentine soil behind our houses on Lexington Avenue and the vegetation that grows there, yet the serpentine soil doesn't miraculously end at our property lines, yet all of our houses, there continues to be construction of houses on serpentine soil. There is a juvenile center being proposed in the Highlands for the county that is on serpentine soil. And my understanding is in their EIR the mitigation techniques for that was to pour water on it and make sure that dust doesn't go up. And at the same time every year the land right behind our house is graded for fire break, and it is at least 50 feet wide and they go through that land, it was like 7 days in a row, churning it up with dust flying everywhere.

If there is a concern about the serpentine soil and asbestos, then that should not be done.

We have consulted with geologists also who have said that asbestos is pretty much a nonissue in this part -- in the coastal serpentine. There might be some rare plants, but I think the health of our children is to me more important than some of the plants in our backyard.

And so we hope with either of the routes that are ultimately picked that the lines will be sufficiently far away from our houses to not increase those EMFs.

And I think that's all I have to say.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

The last person on the list that I have is Lara Lighthouse.

STATEMENT OF MS. LIGHTHOUSE

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: Hi. I'm Lara Lighthouse, and I live at 87 Loma Vista Drive in Burlingame. And I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to address the CPUC and to your Honor for holding this hearing.

And also, thank you to PG&E because without you proposing this project, my neighbors and myself would never have come together and formed such a strong, cohesive group of the 280 CCC, and it's just been such a rewarding experience.

So, firstly, I want to talk about section or Alternative 1B. Alternative 1B, which is the all-underground route, would place a portion of the underground route along Skyline Boulevard, which is 30 feet from my home and from all of my neighbors' homes.

PPH1-25

According to the table that I received from the EMF plan from PG&E, at 30 feet from my home the underground line would expose me and all my neighbors and our children to 4.4 milligauss of EMFs. We find this to be unacceptable because we would like to reduce our risk to -- or our exposure to 1 milligauss or less from the lines.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

In the EIR in the summary, it says on page ES-42 at the top that EMF is classified as a possible carcinogen. And I don't want to live 30 feet from a possible carcinogen, and I especially do not want my four-year-old child to live 30 feet from a possible carcinogen.

PPH1-25

And, secondly, the 230 kilovolt lines that are proposed, at 50 feet they would expose us to -- if they are above ground, they would expose us to 51.3 milligauss of EMFs, between 17 and 53 or 51.3, according to the table that I got from PG&E.

And so on page 42 or ES-42 of the Executive Summary, I think that the numbers are different than on the table I got from PG&E. So I think that should just be double-checked.

Secondly, I think I agree with many of the people who have spoken before me that it is unfair for the Peninsula to bear the burden of providing power to San Francisco. And I -- especially when it's 30 feet away from our house down city streets when behind Loma Vista and Skyview in Burlingame there is the San Francisco watershed. And one of the alternatives that I would like considered is placing the line underground underneath the watershed there. It's between Loma Vista and Skyview and 280.

PPH1-26

And some environmentalists might say -- may say that it's harmful to the serpentine habitat; but every year -- and, in fact, the very week that I received a copy of this in the mail, the truck -- tractors and the disks and the plows were out there going back and forth and back and forth and back and forth completely digging the area up and killing everything in its path.

And so I don't think that burying lines there would be any more harmful. In fact, if you buried both lines, then PG&E would never have to come back and churn it up again.

And also I spoke with the geologist, who's the geologist author of the EIR, and the biologist and the land use expert, and all three of them agreed that the area wasn't really all that serpentine, that the habitat wasn't all that -- all that rare, and that there are many areas of the Bay Area, such as Edgewood Park, which are much, much, much more serpentine, and that's really the area they need to be more concerned about.

Also, when they dig up every year, the grass always grows back. So I'm sure that if they dig up in the watershed to bury a line that the grass would grow back, just like it always does when they dig up every year.

Another alternative we have in mind is -- and we would like to be considered -- is the partial underground alternative for the area north of the Carolands.

PPH1-27

One of the reasons that it was not considered to be the number one alternative or the environmentally superior alternative is because the fire roads -- and I'm on the Executive Summary, page 33, towards the bottom -- it says that the fire roads are not wide enough, and that widening and improving them would be difficult and would create substantially greater disturbance than the underground line under Skyline.

But when I spoke with the -- again, the geologist, the land use person, and the biologist, they said it's not a sensitive habitat over there. It's non-native right along the fire road, so digging it up wouldn't hurt any of the serpentine habitat that people are worried about.

And they said that they would like to have comments to consider changing that statement to make it -- to reflect that there are not sensitive habitats over there, and it wouldn't be very difficult to widen the fire roads so that PG&E could get access.

Also, that another mitigation that would need to be considered would be for PG&E to cooperate with the SFPUC in terms of using the roads. And I think that they should be able to do that because SFPUC needs to get in there also.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

Regarding the notice, people had said that they hadn't received notice. And I did receive notice, but it wasn't addressed to me and it wasn't addressed to the people from whom I bought my house. It was addressed to the people who lived there approximately four years ago, and it was two owners prior to me. And I think that they should have used a more updated list.

PPH1-28

Finally, if Route 1B is selected and -- I would like the EIR, the new EIR, to address the cumulative effects of having power lines underground 30 feet away from our homes in addition to having the 60 kilovolt lines on the other side of us. And we feel like that would be unfairly sandwiching the Loma Vista/Skyview areas with EMFs on either side.

PPH1-29

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: And I have a table from PG&E if -- do you want the table?

MS. BLANCHARD: Is that the one that's the same one that's in our appendix?

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: I'm not positive if this is the same one. I think it is the same one.

MS. BLANCHARD: Why don't you go ahead because we'll double-check that. Because we have certain information that's in there, and that's what we are operating from as we are doing our analysis.

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: This is just -- this is what PG&E sent me, their EMF management plan.

MS. BLANCHARD: And we have that in our appendix, yeah.

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: Okay. So you don't need it.

MS. BLANCHARD: Why don't you go ahead -- if you could leave it. I just want to double-check to make sure we are all on the same page.

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: Okay. I forgot I had one other thing to say. Is that all right?

ALJ TERKEURST: Yes.

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: When -- on page ES-42 of the Executive Summary, it says that PG&E is going to do low-cost and no-cost measures for managing EMF near schools and day care centers.

PPH1-30

Well, if they're admitting that it's -- EMF is dangerous enough to implement these low- and no-cost measures near schools and day care centers, that's an admission of how dangerous this is. And they should be doing these mitigation measures near all of us, and the biggest mitigation measure that they should be doing is moving the power lines away from our homes.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

Yes. Please come forward.

STATEMENT OF MS. PRENTISS

MS. PRENTISS: Good afternoon. My name is Diane Prentiss. I live in San Mateo Highlands.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

Thank you for taking so much time to listen to us.

I moved to the Highlands about four years ago and -- from Georgia where I worked at the Centers for Disease Control. And, you know, I moved there because it was so beautiful, and it was about the only place I could afford. So all these houses now are going for 7-, 800,000, 900,000. It's really, like, the only affordable place in a lot of the Peninsula.

So, you know, what I love about it is it's a really strong community, and we can afford to live there. There are a lot of kids, and there's a school and a recreation center right there on Lexington Avenue. And I am really concerned about the electromagnetic fields that are potentially emitted from such huge towers because the research is not conclusive. And the research for a lot of things that eventually become well-known carcinogens are -- the research is inconclusive for a long time. It was inconclusive that passive smoke was dangerous until it could be determined by many, many well-designed studies.

Well, so far the research has not been, you know, well designed and conclusive. And one of the reasons is that it's very difficult to measure electromagnetic fields and differentiate from background EMF exposure, you know, over a lifetime.

I moved into a house that was owned by a family that lived there for 45 years, and the woman, the mother, she died of brain cancer. Now I live on Lexington. I see the power lines. They are probably 200 feet from my house. It's very possible that that exposure came from the power lines. But maybe not, you know. Maybe it was something else. But it's something to consider. And I really -- you know, I'm terrified to think of these enormous towers going up.

Let's see. What I would like to raise about that is, you know, if PG&E is not certain or not sure about the -- you know, the effects of electromagnetic fields, does PG&E want to deal with the litigation that's going to come down the road when the research is conclusive?

Look at what's happening with the tobacco companies now. You know, now that the research is in that smoking causes lung cancer, there are class action suits going after PG&E -- going after the tobacco companies. Does PG&E want to be in that position 10, 20 years from now?

And, you know, I know that, you know, trees and walls and other structures can mitigate some of the EMF direct exposure; but many of the trees in the Highlands, the larger trees, are these Monterey -- Monterey pines that are really overgrown right now. And whenever we get a major storm, five, six, seven or eight of them just come down. So these larger trees are now coming down and may not -- you know, may not exist in a few years. And then when you try to plant a new tree, it takes years for it to grow and be an effective block of EMFs.

So anyway, I would like to say, bury the lines in the Highlands if you have to have these line down here, but I really think it's an important thing to consider why this project is needed in the first place. If generating the energy closer to the source where it will be used is more efficient and more cost effective and more reliable, I don't understand why this project is happening in the first place. So that concludes my comments.

Thanks for listening.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

I'd like to say something, and then I'll ask one more time to see if there's anyone else who would like to speak today.

First, while comments have to be received by August 28th in order to be considered as the Environmental Impact Report folks complete the final Environmental Impact Report,

PPH1-31

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

the record will remain open as we proceed with the evidentiary portion of the proceeding. So letters that come in after that will still be read and considered and circulated to the Commissioners' offices, and I will read them.

So don't feel like that's an absolute cutoff. If you haven't figured out what you want to say, go ahead and send in your comments after that date. Don't be surprised if you are not reflected in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

Second, I know this is a very difficult situation. I had a site visit with Billie and Chris a couple of weeks ago. We traversed a good bit of the proposed route, and it made me very aware of the complexities and the difficulties that are being faced here.

So I would -- I would urge you, to draw a bad analogy right now, to -- as you send your comments in and participate in these hearings, to treat it kind of like a recall vote that we are about to all face where you let us know not just -- it's not just should this project be built or not, but also, if it is to be built, what do you see as the best route among the possible alternatives, preferably not just from your own very localized point of view, but keeping in mind the Environmental Impact Report impacts along the entire route.

I will be very interested to hear the public's views on that issue.

MS. BLANCHARD: I just wanted to mention one thing as far as the August 28th deadline. We, of course, would like to receive people's comments by that deadline. However, CEQA does allow that for, you know, reasonable justification, the lead agency can extend the time for people to send in comments. And I have mentioned this to several individuals who just got the EIR.

So I can extend for people with comments if absolutely necessary. It just helps us to keep on schedule, though; but if there is a real good reason why a group can't get their comments in by 28, then I can give some extension time, you know. So anyway -- but we would like to see it by the 28th just so we can start going on responding because I'm sure we have a lot to respond to, but there is that way of -- I'm sorry. If you need to, we can go beyond that, but you would have to call me before that 28 time.

ALJ TERKEURST: And if any of you are still having problems getting access to the documents, Billie can either get you the documents today or get them to you if you will let her know after this hearing concludes.

I know there are some copies on CD-ROMs that can be passed out today and some summaries, but we will certainly make the full document available to anyone who still needs access to it.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak today?

Yes.

STATEMENT OF MS. KING

MS. KING: Thank you for the time for you guys.

My name is MaryJean King. I live in Hillsborough.

I heard a lot of people talking about everything here. The only thing I don't understand is our environmental report, how come we don't have anything, research? Are we human being? Our environment belong in environment? How come we don't have any research report on what's this project effect on all the human beings living in this area? I would like to hear that part of the report. Because I heard a lot of people talking about environmental effect on animals, plants, even grass. How come we don't have anything talking about the people living in the area? I think that's the main thing. Are we

PPH1-32

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

environmental, too? If we are not environmental, then we don't need to talk about all the environmental things because I think that's the main thing. We are people. We are human being. We live in the area. We are environmental, too.

PPH1-32

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. Could you spell your last name, please.

MS. KING: Last name King.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

MS. BLANCHARD: The document that we did, we looked at it from the standpoint of CEQA under a number of topics. And the impacts that we look at are both towards biological, animals, but also we do look at the effect upon the human population in that area.

I know it is a fairly large document to review, but we do cover a lot of issues that relate to effect upon the community people living in that area. So it is not that we do not do that in these documents.

I just wanted to say that. But we need to take a real read of the whole thing, and you will see the amount of attention we actually do give to the effect upon the people living there.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. Next.

STATEMENT OF CLIFF DUNNELY

MR. DUNNELY: My name is Cliff Dunnely. I am the president of the Highlands Community Association, but I am not speaking for the association right now because we still are studying this matter, although personally I would like to say I certainly support almost everything I have heard people say here.

I just would like to make an observation. Here we are on the Tuesday afternoon and we really appreciate the opportunity to speak, but it is not an easy thing for people to get here. I want it noted how many people have appeared here from the Highlands and how concerned they are. And this is just the tip of the iceberg as far as the concern in our community. I just wanted that to be noted. Thank you very much.

PPH1-33

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

There's another hearing tonight at 7 o'clock. I don't know if everyone is aware of that. Obviously you're here, so you don't need to come tonight. But if you know people who may not be aware of the hearing this evening, we will be here again this evening.

Next.

STATEMENT OF MR. KASTEN

MR. KASTEN: Good afternoon. My name is Tom Kasten. I am a member of the city council of the Town of Hillsborough.

First, I would like to add my thanks to those that have already expressed theirs for your willingness to come down to our community and hold these meetings and not just to hold one, but a series of them. We appreciate the opportunity.

As somebody who represents the residents of Hillsborough, and frankly I have heard many comments from other residents in our county, I would like to express that our main concern is the health of our residents and our citizens. It is of paramount concern.

PPH1-34

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

We also have environmental concerns. We also have aesthetic concerns and value concerns. But health has to be foremost in our minds in terms of our citizens and their families.

PPH1-34

We do oppose the original PG&E proposal with respect to the bigger, wider, taller towers and the higher voltage that would be running from those towers. We feel that the lines must be kept as far as possible away from citizens and away from their homes to ensure their health.

We feel that their original proposal poses dangers detrimental to their health, to the visual aesthetics of our community as well as to the property values of those communities. Some people have already eloquently spoken about that.

As several people have pointed out, it is interesting that Peninsula residents are being asked to bear the brunt of the environmental impacts, though most of the benefits accrue to the City of San Francisco.

PPH1-35

I found it kind of ironic as I read the articles recently that appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle about some of the plants that were being considered for San Francisco, either retrofitting or building new ones, that the residents of San Francisco had significant concerns and opposition toward that for generation that would benefit them. And yet we on the Peninsula where we get basically no benefit from that we are being asked to bear the entire impact of this proposal.

It is also interesting to note that there are lots of concerns about EMF and that the record is not altogether clear yet, at least in this country. However, it is also interesting to note, if we go back far enough, somebody referenced tobacco, but also exposure to the sun, for example, as another potential health hazard. We as individuals have the ability to decide whether we want to smoke or not. We have the ability to decide whether we want to go out in the sun with or without sunscreen, with or without protection. If these lines are built overhead over our residents, they do not have that same ability to protect themselves.

PPH1-36

So again, we feel that they should be removed far away from any homes or any of our residents.

The other thing I would like to point out is in the executive summary on pages ES-8 and ES-9, the town of Hillsborough did provide comments, and yet we are not listed as one of the agencies or organizations that provided comments. So I want to be sure that somehow our comments did not get lost in the mail because we will again be providing feedback prior to August 28th.

PPH1-37

Thank you very much for this opportunity. I appreciate it.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Anyone else?

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: Do you have anything further?

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you all for coming. This has been very informative. As I mentioned, we will be here again this evening at 7:00. We will be down in San Bruno on Thursday for two hearings down there. I hope that anyone who wishes to make their views known will make it to one of those hearings or at least write us and let us know what your views are.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

With that, this public participation hearing is adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 4:15 p.m. a recess was
taken until 7:00 p.m.)

EVENING SESSION - 7:00 P.M.

* * * * *

ALJ TERKEURST: This is the time and place for a second public participation hearing before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California. This is in Application No. 02-09-043, which is the application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessary authorizing construction of the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV transmission project.

My name is Charlotte TerKeurst. I am the Administrative Law Judge assigned to this proceeding.

I really thank you all for coming. I know this is a project of some great interest to the communities, and I appreciate your taking the time to come out this evening and give us your opinions.

With me today to my left is Billie Blanchard. She is the Commission's project manager of the environmental review that is being undertaken of the proposed project.

And to her left is Chris Keller, who is with the Aspen Environmental Group, the consulting group that we have retained to undertake the environmental study.

They will be giving a brief overview of the project very shortly, and then we will turn to comment from the audience.

Also here this evening is Judy Cooper. She is out in the hallway helping people sign up. She is with the Commission's Public Advisor's office. She could also give you information, if you want, about other things that are pending before the Commission or just any kind of general assistance that you would like.

We have some representatives from PG&E here as well, Alain Billot. Is he here this evening?

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: If not, could someone from PG&E stand up and identify yourself so that anyone who has questions will know you.

MR. OSAKA (phonetic): Bob Osaka, PG&E.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

We also have at least one other active party in the proceeding. Ed O'Neill is here with the 280 Concerned Citizens Group. And he can speak with you outside if you want to talk with him at some point this evening.

Let me take just a moment to explain the basic procedures that the Commission uses in processing an application like this. We undertake essentially a two-pronged process. The first step is the detailed environmental review that is undertaken consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA.

The draft Environmental Impact Report has been issued. We're in the public comment period for that document. And final environmental impact report will be issued later this fall. Billie will give more details about that.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

Building on that, but to some extent separate from it, there will be a separate evidentiary phase of the proceeding this fall. The parties that are participating in that formal proceeding will be presenting prepared testimony during evidentiary hearings that will be held the first week in December. The anticipated decision date is approximately May of 2004. So we're about halfway through the process. And that gives you some rough idea of the time frame that we're looking at.

There are two sign-up sheets out front. One is just for general people who are here this evening. Another one is a separate sign-up sheet for people who want to speak.

Once we hear from people who are on that list, I will ask if there are any additional people who want to speak. So if you haven't signed up and you decide you want to, you will still have that opportunity.

The comments are informal. You won't be under oath. But we will have your comments recorded by the transcribers. So with that in mind you will facilitate it if you speak clearly and fairly slowly, state your name for the record when you begin.

Given the full house that we have this evening, I would ask that people limit your comments to three minutes, five at the most, but preferably three.

If someone else has essentially said the same thing that you had in mind, you can certainly just reference their comments without reiterating things that have already been said.

In the hearing this afternoon, after listening to some people, I commented that I am very interested in hearing people's views of the alternatives that have been developed first by PG&E and then the additional alternatives that the environmental consultants have developed. And I would like the public, you, to give us your opinion on the various alternatives. I likened it to the recall process that we're all facing where while some of you may have the opinion or be concerned about whether the project is needed at all, I would like it, to the extent you have an opinion, to also address if the project is built, which of the alternatives do you find either most distasteful or least distasteful, I guess, if you question the need for the project. That would help us as we evaluate the many alternatives that have been developed.

Another detail, before I turn it over to Billie and Chris, they will explain to you that the deadline, the approximate deadline, for giving comments to be considered in the final environmental impact report is August 28th. The remaining phases of the proceeding will be open, though, as I indicate, will be in December. Even if you don't get comments in in time for them to consider them in their development of the environmental impact report, they will be considered, I will read them, they will be circulated to the Commission. So don't feel like even after the final environmental impact report is out that your opportunities to provide input to the Commission are over.

With that, I will ask Billie and Chris to give their opening.

We will go off the record for this. We had transcribed their presentation this afternoon. There is no need to transcribe it again. But we will go on the record once their presentation is finished. Thank you.

(Off the record)

ALJ TERKEURST: Back on the record.

I want to mark the slide presentation as Reference Item 1 so that we will have it in our record.

(Reference Item No. 1 was marked for identification.)

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

ALJ TERKEURST: Chris mentioned the additional public participation hearings. We do have two scheduled on Thursday in San Bruno. We have two additional ones scheduled on November 18th, one here and one in San Bruno.

I do want to just point out that given the state budget crisis, there is a chance that the November hearing will be canceled. I hope not, but if so, we will advertise that to let you know. Unless you hear otherwise, you can assume that they will go forward as planned.

I believe we are ready to proceed with public statements.

The first person on the sign up list is Paul Greek. Mr. Grech.

STATEMENT OF MR. GRECH

MR. GRECH: Hello. My comments will only take a couple of minutes.

My name is Paul Greek. I own the home at 1315 Skyview Drive in Burlingame. I am one of the homeowners that would be most adversely affected by the proposed PG&E project, since the existing towers and lines are currently directly behind my house.

I am here this evening to ask you to not approve the route that PG&E has proposed for new power lines and towers through Burlingame which would significantly increase the size of the towers directly behind our homes nor a route the draft EIR suggests as a possible alternative option which would put the lines under Skyline and Trousdale Drive, resulting in many Burlingame residents finding themselves in the following situation: They would have the existing 60 kV lines and towers behind their houses and the new 230 kV line underground not far from the front of their houses.

Instead, I along with all of my neighbors, support what is referred to in the draft EIR as the partial underground alternative route, which would place the towers and lines to the west of Highway 280 and away from our homes in Burlingame.

This alternative would have the added benefit of removing the existing towers and 60 kV line from behind our houses since this line would be combined with the proposed 230 kV line.

This is clearly a once in a lifetime opportunity to remove these towers from our neighborhood.

PG&E's proposed route would mean, on the other hand, massive, unsightly towers directly behind our homes and a subsequent degradation of the character of our neighborhood, much higher EMF exposure to residents, which we are all very concerned about, and an obvious detrimental impact on our property values.

The partial underground alternative route, which is also the route the City of Burlingame supports, would eliminate all of those concerns.

The towers and lines would be built on the other side of Highway 280 in a nonresidential area away from our homes and families. I respectfully request that the CPUC Commissioners approve the partial underground alternative route through Burlingame.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: The record will show that there seems to be widespread support in this room for Mr. Grech's position.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: The next speaker is Tim Kobe.

PPH1-38

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

STATEMENT OF MR. KOBE

MR. KOBE: Hello. My name is Tim Kobe. I am a Highlands resident. And on behalf of my wife and my three children, we would like to respectfully oppose the modified 230 kV transmission line proposal, primarily based on the health risks that we feel are as of yet undetermined, completely undetermined and pose an enormous risk to both the families and neighbor associated with the Highlands area.

PPH1-39

In addition, I believe that the quality of life in our neighborhood would be severely impacted by the increased towers. And this is a great opportunity to remove them completely.

I guess there will be aspects of negative impact with respect to land values and other real estate issues. But fundamentally, given PG&E's track record of decision making, I do not trust a bankrupt utility to make the correct decision of health and safety when it comes to that or money.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: There is also a lot of support for Mr. Kobe's position.

Next person on the list is Dr. Lillo.

If I mispronounce someone's name I apologize.

STATEMENT OF DR. LILLO

DR. LILLO: Thank you. Apologies are not necessary.

I would like to submit an article which I thought was very timely, was in this week's San Jose Mercury News. And the article was titled "The Key to Buying Homes."

PPH1-40

It listed the fact that location was the main thing. And it said -- it lists several features of location that were important, but then it goes on to state: "Also crucial to a good location is the lack of negatives. Real estate agents say these factors cause many buyers to think twice: One, noise; two, high prime rate, three, empty lots, and four, flood zone, and five, large power lines."

So it is of concern. This is an apropos. It is a current and it is expert opinion. It is not a mere local whim.

I won't elaborate on the first speaker because I agree with him. I think that if the watershed is there and it can be moved away from people, you don't have to draw the line directly along the houses. There is a broad area beyond the freeway that is wide open that could be used for the power lines.

Thank you very much. And I will give you the article.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: The next speaker is Lila Lynn Humphrey.

STATEMENT OF MS. HUMPHREY

MS. HUMPHREY: Hi. Good evening.

My name is Lila Lynn Humphrey. I'm a Highland resident for 33 years, and I agree with the first two speakers totally. I feel that in this day and age, building new power stations and power lines is obsolete. This should not be done.

PPH1-41

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

What we should be doing is taking down the towers that are already there and undergrounding the existing wires.

What I object to primarily are the lowering of the property rates, the unsightliness, the change to the detriment of our way of life, but mainly the unknown effects these new power lines will have on the children, the unborn children who aren't with us yet, and to the people.

There are -- sometimes these electrical lines cause brain tumors in adults, and I'm concerned with the elderly people who live in the Highlands and in Burlingame, Millbrae, and the other towns that will be affected also.

So this is not a good idea. I'm speaking in very, very simple terms. This is not a good idea.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: The next speaker is James Goodman.

MR. GOODMAN: My sentiments have been expressed by a number of speakers already, so I would like to yield my time to somebody else.

ALJ TERKEURST: All right. Thank you.

The next speaker is Dan Anderson.

STATEMENT OF MR. ANDERSON

MR. ANDERSON: My name is Dan Anderson. I'm a resident of Burlingame. Though I don't live in the Highlands or up along Skyline Drive, I find that good urban planning in general in anything that you see being built today requires the undergrounding of all utilities. This includes the telephone, PG&E, and et cetera.

And why would we want to take this opportunity that we are now faced with with the ability to move those lines underground and exacerbate an already bad situation with the 60 kV towers. It would be an opportunity for PG&E to show good faith to the community, move those lines to the west side of I-280 and underground them for the full length of the project. I think that would be the most viable alternative.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

The next speaker is Katie Carlin.

STATEMENT OF MS. CARLIN

MS. CARLIN: Good evening. I'm Katie Carlin, a Highlands resident active in the 280 CCC. I'm speaking tonight on behalf of the 280 CCC and also as a private resident, a first-time homeowner, and a mother of two young sons.

I have been working with a core group of dedicated residents opposing what we see as the most controversial and detrimental aspects of this line.

We have spent countless hours educating our communities -- the Highlands, Burlingame, Hillsborough -- about this project. Hundreds of people have become involved, attending our meetings and making individual financial contributions of thousands of dollars.

PPH1-41

PPH1-42

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

After ten months of working to protect the health and safety of our residents, to preserve the beauty of the scenic gem that is the 280 corridor, and to protect our most valuable financial investments, our homes, it is extremely gratifying to see the CPUC provide this kind of exhaustive and thorough administrative process.

At every step of the way, the CPUC and the Aspen Group have been here for us. There's not been a question Susan Lee or Billie Blanchard has left unanswered. We are grateful to them for encouraging our participation in these hearings. And so I'd like to express how grateful we are to the Aspen Group for their exemplary job of drafting the Draft EIR and to the Commission that has taken so seriously its job to uphold the public trust.

The 280 CCC has been following a similar case in Boca Raton, Florida, where residents watched as crews constructed a 230 kilovolt line on public land behind their homes without any prior notification. Problems such as cancers and plummeting property values are now a part of these people's lives -- and there is no process or agency such as the CPUC to provide those residents a forum for voicing their concerns. Again, we are extremely grateful that you all are doing your jobs and taking our position seriously.

I cannot speak within a reasonable time frame tonight to the myriad of issues that are keeping the 280 CCC residents awake at night. Instead I will ask of you to listen for a moment to what is on my mind.

I am concerned by the recent research I've found regarding EMF radiation. Electric and magnetic fields in homes from nearby power lines produce very weak electric currents in the human body. Several expert panels convened by organizations concerned with public health have evaluated the public health risks of exposure to magnetic fields. These organizations include the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in the United States, the National Radiological Protection Board in the United Kingdom, and the International Agency for Research on Cancer, a branch of the World Health Organization.

These panels, and, more recently, a California Department of Health Services panel, concluded, based on epidemiologic studies, that exposure to magnetic fields of 3 to 4 milligauss or more may increase the risk of leukemia in children. Only about 5 percent of U.S. residences have magnetic fields this high. Epidemiologic studies indicate that magnetic fields of 3 to 4 milligauss or above are associated with leukemia in children. And these children may have roughly double the risk of unexposed children.

Many homes along this line will house EMF levels of 3 to 4 milligauss if PG&E is able to build on their preferred route.

The June 2002 EMF risk evaluation by the California Department of Health Services initiated, I understand, on behalf of the California Public Utilities Commission, had three scientists who work for the California Department of Health Services review the studies about possible health problems. To one degree or another, all three scientists are inclined to believe that EMFs can lead to some degree of increased childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage.

The trouble is, is that every time I do research on the dangers of EMF, I find more troubling information.

In last-minute research for this talk today, I stumbled across a March 15th, 2000 study by the Electric Power Research Institute of Palo Alto, California, in cooperation with several utility corporations, including Pacific Gas and Electric, that reports a doubled risk of suicide for line workers exposed to EMFs daily.

PPH1-43

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

These researchers theorized that one biologically plausible explanation is that EMFs depress production of melatonin, a hormone that's important for sleep and mood. Decreases in melatonin can lead to depression, which in turn can lead to suicide.

PPH1-43

The Electric Power Research Institute has also launched the Northern California Childhood Leukemia Study with 500 participants, including the control group of children with leukemia, to try and determine the role of magnetic field exposure in this disease.

While I applaud their efforts, I have to tell you, I don't want to be part of a study like that. Not now and not in ten years.

The great thing about this and all the concerns about this project, excepting need analysis and alternative energy development, which should not be discounted -- the great thing is that they can all be addressed with intelligent route planning. If this line can be run underground along a nonresidential route, many, many people will feel relieved.

We urge the Commission to reflect on this project and develop innovative, progressive, and thoughtful alternatives to Route 1A, which the Aspen Group has identified - - and here I'm only slightly paraphrasing -- as an unmitigable disaster.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

There has been widespread support for all the speakers so far.

And let's continue. The next speaker is Helga Hayes.

STATEMENT OF MS. HAYES

MS. HAYES: Good evening. I'm Helga Hayes, and I live up in the Highlands. And I concur with everything I have heard here tonight so I won't go over it again.

I was at this afternoon's meeting, and I realized that there was something that was bothering me that I couldn't fully articulate, and I needed a couple of hours to kind of mull it over. And I came here primarily tonight to give this to you.

This is a printout of the Precautionary Principle in Action. It's a handbook that was devised for a conference on biotechnology at Harvard in the year 2000. And basically it looks at the difference between risks analysis and precautionary principle, which is kind of the analogy to the medical version of at first do no harm.

PPH1-44

So here we have a situation where the movement towards where this is going in the future ought to be on having the person who is -- or the entity which is interested in taking action prove that this action will not cause any harm, rather than we the people upon who this action is being, quote, taken upon to prove that it will be harmful to us. So it's kind of the exact reverse of what's happening here.

And I just wanted to enter this into the record and say that the State of Massachusetts has adopted the Precautionary Principle as the first thing that they look at before they allow any environmental action to be taken on any, any aspect of construction in the State of Massachusetts or developing anything that hasn't met a rigorous investigation.

And so I just brought you a copy. I'm sorry I only have one, but I was in a hurry to print it out.

Thank you.

(Applause)

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Just as a note, materials that are provided to us during the public participation hearings will be marked and put in the file in this proceeding. Thank you.

The final person that I have written down to speak is Tony Lee.

STATEMENT OF MR. LEE

MR. LEE: Hi. My name is Tony Lee, and I live up in the Hillsborough area with my family.

Back in November of 2002, we submitted a protest letter. And our primary concern was over the health ramifications of the project. I'd just like to read something. It's additional written comments on this -- on the Jefferson-Martin Project and Draft Environmental Impact Report.

My family and I would like to submit this letter to refocus attention on the critical, vital health issues/hazards that are raised by the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV transmission project. Our family has reviewed a plethora of CPUC, PG&E and Aspen Environmental Group reports, filings and documents from the very first day PG&E submitted its request to build the project. However, to state respectfully, these issues have not been addressed thoroughly.

On the other end of the spectrum, we have also reviewed just a few protest letters from individuals and communities. Along with many of the traditional comments, health and safety of the residents through exposure to byproducts of the project were forefront and paramount. Frankly speaking, we fear that individuals or agencies can sometimes forget the most basics of rules -- through all the paperwork, years of discussion, rational arguments made, we are all here to protect one another. If commerce, business and costs are inadvertently placed at the forefront, such items ultimately exist to serve the welfare and health concerns of the public. We would like to request the Presiding Judge and CPUC's particular sympathy and attention to this matter.

For the purpose of addressing this major concern, we would like to emphasize the following point:

Though the health effects of EMFs are continuously being evaluated, scientists have clearly stipulated that EMFs cause physical changes in cells' reproduction, rhythms, communication, and growth. This is an excerpt taken directly from PG&E's own literature.

Also, as the California Department of Health Services and the California EMF Program themselves published -- and this is a quote: "EMFs can affect biological processes if the intensity is strong enough."

We remind the CPUC that our home as well as many other homes are just a few dozen feet away from PG&E's proposed path. Specifically, our home is less than 30 feet from the tower.

According to the Evaluation of the Possible Risks From Electric and Magnetic Fields from Power Lines, Internal Wiring, Electrical Occupations, and Appliances, Final Report, dated June 2002, published by the California EMF Program, we are in an exposure category that is significantly higher than even the highest categories in which studies have been performed.

An extensive study conducted by the California Department of Health on behalf of the CPUC recently reported, quote, degrees of certainty for policy analysis that EMFs increase risk to some extent. Degrees of certainty for increased disease risk were as high as

PPH1-45

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

94 percent in such categories as childhood leukemia, and above 50 percent in each of such categories as adult leukemia, adult brain cancer, miscarriage, and Lou Gehrig's Disease.

PPH1-45

What additional information will be uncovered five or ten years from now, and what real costs are we in fact saving now if the entire project needs to be moved later?

The 230 kilovolt line and tower PG&E will erect in our garden will generate at the line source 1,917 times the electric field of a regular home electric socket. The 230 kilovolt line from the tower will generate at the source 7,255 times the magnetic field of a small fluorescent bulb; 15,960 times the magnetic field of an electric shaver; 95,000 times the magnetic field of a digital cell phone; and 1,064 and 5,700 times the magnetic field of a computer monitor in the on and standby modes respectively.

These magnetic figures are derived from the projections prepared by PG&E of the amps the 230 kilovolt line will carry in 2006, but only in normal summer peak load conditions. Notably, this does not represent the maximum amps the 230 kilovolt line could carry at any one point or that it could consistently carry all the time. The maximum usage can be considerably higher and the amps carried through the line would be equivalently higher, further increasing the magnetic fields stipulated above.

Also, these magnetic fields are based on what PG&E currently believes will be the thickness of actual wiring in the line. If the thickness is increased, though the sizes of the wires cannot be infinitely increased due to physical and heating limitations, the maximum potential amps that can be carried in this line and the currents that are created will be even that much larger, increasing proportionately the magnetic field that is generated.

According to PG&E, the tower could even hold two lines. The above electric and magnetic statistics and exposure at the source would double and increase accordingly.

As reported by the California Department of Health Services and the Public Health Institute California Electric and Magnetic Fields Program in their Short Factsheet on EMFs, magnetic fields are down to background levels at three or four feet away from an appliance, but magnetic fields reach background levels 300 to 1,000 feet from a transmission line. To reemphasize, we are 30 feet from the tower.

As stated in the same report, though electric and magnetic fields dissipate with distance, the strength of both electric and magnetic fields decrease more quickly with distance from "point" sources like appliances than from most materials, and safeguards such as barriers generally do not provide protection against magnetic fields.

With potential exposure levels considerably higher than risk levels, the potential health risks for us are radically heightened. The tower PG&E proposes to place in our very garden will always be on and could continuously produce thousands of times both the electric and magnetic fields one can or should reasonably be exposed to.

Upon receipt of the Notice of Application, we briefly excavated the areas between the general route the project will take place and our residences. A vast amount of open space exists in this area.

This is a place of home, just as yours, for a family, where our children and even grandchildren visit, sleep, live and spend an immense amount of time.

Just a couple of quick last comments.

We read over the Draft Environmental Impact Report, and we learned in the meeting held a couple of weeks ago that the effects of EMFs were not really included in the report because there was not conclusive evidence.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

We asked her if she had read over the most recent report created by the Department of Health stipulating specifically some of the things that I was listing out, and she said that information was not included.

PPH1-45

And again, that information explicitly states that there is more than a probable likelihood of increased cancers and there are thousands of different cancers.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak? I see a couple of hands. We will take this lady first.

STATEMENT OF MS. JUDALO (phonetic)

MS. JUDALO: My name is Carla Judalo. I live on Lexington Avenue.

There is a tower about one house down pretty close to my yard. I would like to thank everybody for listing out the medical concerns that they have. That is what I wanted to talk about.

PPH1-46

I won't go too far into that other than to say that risks which have yet to be proven I do not want to be proven on my own children because once they have been proven it is too late for me.

There are a few other factors which I would like to address which were discussed today about property values.

One, when I was reading over the DEIR, it mentioned, I might have the percentage off, but a 60 percent probability of a major quake hitting the area within the next 15 years. And it could have been 55 or 60 percent, but something very close to that measure. And it listed in the EIR that the idea of having these very large towers so close to the homes could be really catastrophic if an event should occur, which it is more than likely to occur.

PPH1-47

In addition to that, simply from a comfort and home perspective, those of us who are anywhere near the towers now know that on any foggy night you hear a buzzing, a snapping, a crackling which is so loud that you do not want to sleep with your window open because it keeps you awake. It is worse with evenings of condensation.

PPH1-48

Try to imagine this sound being so loud with the larger towers. Even the neighbors across the street, who have no idea that this might exist, will feel this descending upon them without even knowing what happened by the time it is too late.

In one of the previous meetings we had a Ham operator who spoke saying it is very difficult to get some of his equipment to function since he moved to a home with the tower behind it.

PPH1-49

This is the computer age. A lot of people are working from home. We continue on electronic equipment. There is absolutely no idea what could happen within our homes with this type of interference as another factor which is not being addressed.

So I wanted to point those out. Most of all, my husband and I saved for over seven years to buy our home. I am very involved in the community. I volunteered at the local school for well over a year. My children have their friends there. This is where I want to build my life. My main question, it is frustrating for those of us here with a year and a half process, we want to fix our homes, we don't know what to do. We feel out of control.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

In a way I feel like a sitting duck. What if we raise all the money we can, we attend all the meetings, we send all the e-mails we can and this happens anyhow? What are we supposed to do? Are we -- because I, for one, as a mother of two young children and a family physician am very concerned about the possible cancer risks. Are we supposed to just pick up and move? Who is going to move into our houses? Where will our neighborhood go? What will become of us?

Again, I really thank you for giving us the opportunity to state our concerns. I am sorry for being so emotional, but I am a good neighbor in a good neighborhood and I want to stay that way. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Yes.

STATEMENT OF MR. MANKY (phonetic)

MR. MANKY: My name is William Manky. I have lived within 60 feet of the one tower for 46 years. I am a licensed radio operator. I can tell you you have got radiation. I have got hundreds of dollars worth of equipment to just keep it out of my radios.

PPH1-50

And the lady that just addressed you said you can hear it with your doors shut on the salt-laden lines which are poorly taken care of now.

I don't know how they are going to take care of the ones they are going to put up. But right now the resistors that hold the lines, insulators, are fissured from probably over 50 years of use. And nobody has done a damn thing about it.

I have requested them to fix them, take care of them, wash them. They don't do it. I have had them up to the house within the last three or four months to fix the power lines around my house. They were leaking so bad that the electricity, voltage, whatever you want to call it, runs down through the poles and you touch the poles and you can be shocked. You can stand out underneath the power lines in the field now with a fluorescent bulb and light it up. It will glow in the dark.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MS. NADLE (phonetic)

MS. NADLE: Hi. My name is Terry Nadle. I have lived in Burlingame for 25 years. And I personally witnessed the emotion and the anguish that this decision is bringing to the residents of Burlingame.

I want you to please reflect, if you will, on who benefits from this decision. It is obvious that PG&E will benefit. They want more power lines. It is obvious that San Francisco will benefit. But the best information I have received is that the Peninsula really won't benefit from this transmission line except perhaps in emergency situations we might be transferred part of our power to different lines.

PPH1-51

So in reflecting on the decision of where to put the lines, I would ask you to bend over backwards to please make this more palatable to the people that live near it.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

You have heard about how they are concerned not only about their health, but also about their property values. In many cases the house that people own is the biggest investment of their life. There is a lot riding on that.

PPH1-52

You also have plenty of documentation from the many intervenors that have come before the Commission through the years on the effects of the EMFs. One thing that has not been mentioned tonight is also the fact that many studies have shown, both in the states and internationally, that undergrounding lines can be as cost effective as overground lines over the long term of the lines. So please take that into consideration as well.

PPH1-53

And when you make the decision on where to place the lines, please consider these residents who pay some of the highest rates in the nation for their power service and they also are about to be saddled with additional surcharges for ten years under the current CPUC PG&E plan to pay back the \$8 billion overcharging that occurred during the recent energy crisis. They deserve a break. Please support them in your quest to keep the lines as far away from people as possible, underground them where you can and please also try to keep those unsightly towers away from people's homes.

PPH1-54

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MS. THOMAS

MS. THOMAS: My name is Dianne Thomas. And I am a Highlands resident. And I would just like to reiterate the precautionary principle, how important that is. Back in the late '40s, early '50s, my mother lived in a small town in southern Utah, during which time they held nuclear bomb testing. They said don't worry about it, it is not going to affect you or your community. This is a safe procedure. We have got it under control.

PPH1-55

Since then, as you probably all know, the little communities in southern Utah close to the bomb testing have had a disproportionately high rate of cancers and leukemias, as well as my mother has had throughout her life. She came down with Leukemia years later. And she has had a very difficult life. She has had poor health, and it has had a very negative impact of course on our family.

So I just know that when there is a possible risk, and it certainly seems as though there really is a possible risk here, we have to err on the side of being conservative about our health.

And it is my understanding that in Sweden they have adopted the precautionary principle. Even though it is not a hundred percent certain that EMFs cause problems with people's health, they are going to take the conservative route and do what they can to keep EMFs away from people, populations, and I think they are burying all their lines.

I think we need to follow their example. We have seen what happens if we just try to ignore health, possible health risks. And I agree with the mother that said I just really don't want to find out later that these EMFs have had a negative impact on our children and our community because then it's too late. We need to proceed on the conservative side.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

STATEMENT OF MR. MINGLE (phonetic)

MR. MINGLE: Your Honor, I didn't come here to speak tonight. I came to listen. After listening, I decided to make a few comments.

My name is Jack Mingle. I live on Black Mountain Road in Hillsborough.

I have a tower directly in front of my house. It was there when I bought the house. And I figured that at that time I could live with that.

But this proposal, I can't. I see this as good news, bad news. The bad news is the City and County of San Francisco needs additional power. The other part of the bad news is they want to run it through and over the backs of the residents of San Mateo County.

The good news is there's ample land and room to move those lines either across the 280 freeway on the west side or underground on the west side which the City and County owns that land.

This is a good opportunity to remove the existing power lines, one of which is in front of my home. This is a no-brainer. And we're talking about, everybody eloquently said, that we have medical concerns, property value concerns. This is a no-brainer because what we are really talking is how much this is going to cost PG&E to install it.

Well, the good news is there are so many alternatives and the alternatives make so much more sense than to just build a bigger structure and put bigger lines on existing towers because it is cost effective. So I urge you to hear what these people have said and vote accordingly and support some of these alternative measures that make sense.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Is there anyone else. Yes, at the back.

STATEMENT OF MR. NACHLIS

MR. NACHLIS: Hello. My name is Mark Nachlis. I am a Highlands resident. I purchased my house on July 20th of last year. I think 2-1/2 or three months later this project came as knowledge to most of the neighborhood except me because I think I am outside the 50 or 60-foot range or yard range of a tower because it is a hundred yards from my home.

If I knew that this project was going to exist, I would never have purchased my home, not only for the medical reasons, but the aesthetics and property values. At the same time, there are certain things I can control in my life, not many these days, like after being in a start-up company for five years and losing my job and losing that job about a week after I purchased my home or many other things within the area or the economy. But by being able to voice my opinion in organizations like the 280 CCC in open hearings like this, I feel that at least one thing I can try to control is putting my opinion out there to try to keep my property values where they are, keep my family safe and try to keep the right path or the partially submersed lines opinion to get publicly said. And for my family and my two children I would like to get my opinion on record.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

PPH1-56

PPH1-57

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

STATEMENT OF MS. SURE (phonetic)

MS. SURE: Hi. My name is Sally Sure. I am 11 years old. I lived in Highlands all my life since I was about 9 months old or something like that. And it is, as other people said, it is a really nice town right now. And I don't really care about San Francisco getting their electricity. I just personally am scared of getting Leukemia myself or anything like that. And I have a little sister over there. I am sure she is scared of it, too.

PPH1-58

So I just want it not on land so I can see it. I just don't want to be able to look at it, and it might do something bad to me.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Anyone else?

STATEMENT OF MR. CANNING (phonetic)

MR. CANNING: Hi. My name is Larry Canning. I live at 1860 Lexington Avenue in the Highlands.

I need to get up and speak because I have a tower in the back of my house. The proposed addition of a 230 kV line in addition to two 60 kV lines I think is presenting a great danger to all the residents along that corridor.

PPH1-59

I would like to bring one point home about the EMF. I have two small children at home. And they have learned how to use the microwave oven. They love to watch the thing spin around while cooking some of the spaghetti or something. I always tell them to get away from the microwave because there is radiation coming out of it. We actually have a meter at home. I measured it at three feet away we are measuring about five milligauss. I heard the numbers tonight that the 230 kV line would be producing 3 to 4 milligauss throughout our houses 24 hours a day, seven days a week. That is very shocking to me. I would like those lines to be as far away from our house, if there is even the need for this project to go forward. Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. CUAN

MR. CUAN: Your Honor, my name is Jose Cuan. I live at 1249 Laurel Hill for almost 13 years. I don't like to talk in public, but I feel like this time I have to.

PPH1-60

Maybe it's a little bit late for me. We lived there for 13 years. My wife has just been diagnosed with lung cancer last December. She doesn't smoke. She doesn't work with smokers or live near smokers. So we don't know how she got lung cancer, okay. I'm not saying that I have proof that the kV -- the 60 kV line caused it or that the electro-magnetic field caused it, but it's suspicious, you know. It makes you feel not safe.

So what I think we should do, not only stop the 230 kV line being built on the same 60 kV line, but I would really like to see that 60 kV line moved away from where it is now because I don't think it's good for people's health.

Thank you.

(Applause)

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. GOODMAN

MR. GOODMAN: Hi. My name is James Goodman. I live in the Highlands, not too close to the towers, but I think there is something that -- some knowledge that I have because I did my master's thesis on biological effects of microwave radiation a number of years ago.

But one of the things I found out that was very interesting was that you can have an ambient field of microwave radiation, but inside a human body or an animal, you can have a higher level than actually exists in ambient -- in the atmosphere. I think this is -- could be very significant if you were in a field that the previous speaker was talking about, constantly, and then you have possibly increased levels inside your body, long term, all the time. Even if you didn't have an increased level in your body, just having -- if you can imagine kind of the old water torture concept where you have one drop on your head. It's nothing if you do it for five minutes, but if you do that for five years, it will kill you.

So I don't think when you're talking about stresses that electromagnetic radiation can possibly do, and it's known certainly that at higher levels it's absolutely known, since that's what cooks food.

Also, it's interesting to note that the Soviet Union standard for microwave radiation is a thousand times less than the United States standard. And there has been an on-going debate between -- it was kind of a Cold War thing between what's safe and what isn't safe. So I think it's very important to take these things seriously.

And I want to thank the 280 CCC for all the work that they have done. Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MS. LIGHTHOUSE

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: Hi. My name is Lara Lighthouse. And I spoke this afternoon, so I hope you will indulge my second term.

I live in Burlingame, and I have been listening tonight, and that was my intention. And I keep hearing people saying that they are worried about being exposed to 3 and 4 milligauss of EMFs in their homes, and then they mention that their homes are 50 feet away or 60 feet away or 30 feet away. And I have a table of EMF exposure from PG&E that has different information. And I think that it's the same table that is in the back of the EIR. It's with their EMF management plan.

And I just want the people in this room to know that if the 230 kilovolt overhead transmission line is 50 feet away from their house, they will be exposed, according to this -- the base case exposure will be 51 milligauss of EMFs.

And if they do optimal phasing and raise the conductors by 20 feet, at 50 feet away you will still be exposed to 17.3 milligauss of EMFs. And I think that is far, far, far above what we consider to be safe.

I think the Swedish studies say that they recommend 2 milligauss or less. And I think that's what Judy Chen said this morning, and that goes along with what I have read.

I'll just read some more numbers so people can compare to how far away they are from the towers.

PPH1-61

PPH1-62

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

At 30 feet away, the base case would be 79.4 milligauss, and the optimal phasing and raising the conductors would be 23.6.

And someone earlier today who operates a radio spoke and said that the lines in his opinion were not clean and were not maintained. And the optimal phasing really only works if -- and the EMF reduction only works if the lines are maintained. And if the 60 kilovolt lines are not maintained, I'm not sure that I have faith that the 230 kilovolt lines will be maintained either.

I'm going to read some more numbers for the people in the audience.

At 70 feet away, base case would be 32.6, and optimal phasing and raising the conductors would be 11. And at 100 feet away, base case would be 18.2, and raising the conductors would be 6.8.

So if the lines anywhere go above ground, I would like them to be 300 feet away or more so that we are exposed to a safe level of EMFs, if the lines are over ground.

Now, for underground --

ALJ TERKEURST: Ms. Lighthouse, we don't need all those numbers read into the record. We have that information.

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: Okay. Can I just ask for underground, just quickly?

ALJ TERKEURST: Make it brief.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We'd like to hear.

MS. LIGHTHOUSE: For the underground levels, we'd also like to be exposed to 2 milligauss or less. And in order to be exposed to 2 milligauss or less, you would need to bury the lines 45 feet away or more from our homes.

And thank you very much. That's it.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Anyone else?

Yes.

STATEMENT OF MR. MASTERS-GUTIERREZ

MR. MASTERS-GUTIERREZ: Hello. I'm Neil Masters-Gutierrez. And I've been listening to all this stuff, and I've been thinking about it and putting some of it in perspective. If you think about -- they brought up points of noise factor.

I have been taking the bus to go to school since middle school. On a foggy morning, you can hear this thing buzzing. We're talking not just next to the lines. We're talking good three, four hundred feet away across the street and down the block. You can hear these things buzzing, and these are only 60 kilovolt lines. You increase them to 230, the buzzing is going to get much noisier. If you have those transfer stations, there's going to be buzzing noises there.

And also, you listen to your AM dial. If you ever notice whenever you drive under power lines, the signal goes out. We had an older cordless phone in our house. Anytime the microwave went on, it stopped working. If we have larger lines, we can see that those of us closer could see significant electronic devices in the house will stop functioning properly as the manufacturer intended it. We can see that these extra magnetic fields will cause significant distortions in our computer monitors, our sound systems, our radios. We might next be finding ourselves that nothing works very well anymore.

PPH1-62

PPH1-63

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

We've -- as Mr. Kang brought up, microwave puts off about 3 milligauss, 4 milligauss. If these things are putting off 70 or higher, or anywhere in that range, we can literally find we're effectively living in microwaves now. Our house is now a microwave, and we're going to be waking up and finding people baked in their beds. So that wouldn't be good.

PPH1-64

So moving the lines away as soon as we can to get better levels of electromagnetic fields would be in the best interests, not just from our personal comfort levels, but also in our health efforts.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Anyone else?

STATEMENT OF MS. NEMSCHOFF

MS. NEMSCHOFF: Yes. I'm Michelle Nemschoff, and I live in Lexington. And I spoke at length this afternoon, and I am not going to repeat all those statements. I just wanted to add one quick thing, and I apologize for reappearing because I forgot something this afternoon.

PPH1-65

Most people talked tonight, and I spoke, mostly about where to put the 230s. And, yes, the 60 kV lines were at our homes when we bought our homes because those lines were put up in 1950s preceding all our homes.

As I said, I was comfortable with the milligauss and the level when I purchased my home, but I think this is a perfect opportunity because over time the need's going to increase and the current is going to increase and the EMFs are going to increase on the 60 kV lines.

And again, the effects and the risks -- the health effects and the risks are unknown to our children. We don't want to be the guinea pigs, or in ten years, like they did with smoking and the sun, that they find it's bad.

And I think this project where it's going basically along the same route, whether it's west of 280 or in the city streets or behind our homes, is a perfect opportunity to take the 60 kV lines and move them further away from residences so they are at least 300 feet from our houses.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. THOM

MR. THOM: Thank you. My name is Dennis Thom, and I live in Hillsborough, and I do concur with all the speakers this evening and I appreciate everybody's comments.

PPH1-66

I do want to make note that there is a power company in California called Sierra Pacific Electric that has a program to work with communities to actually underground power lines that are already existing and that is to benefit the environment. So maybe please take a look at that program and see if there is any way that we can make use of the ideas from that program to underground these power lines that are proposed.

Thank you.

(Applause)

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

ALJ TERKEURST: If I could respond just to the extent of my knowledge regarding that.

I believe PG&E has a similar program but the programs are aimed at undergrounding distribution lines. They generally are not applied to the transmission lines such as we are considering here. And PG&E can confirm whether that's correct. Thank you.

Anyone else?

STATEMENT OF MS. WILLIAMS

MS. WILLIAMS: I am Jackie Williams. I am a South San Francisco resident.

The main reason I'm here is as far as the no-project item, because I am really interested in knowing whether there is really a need for this project. And I know that is not considered under the EIR.

But someone mentioned to me that the no-project alternative that was put up was meaning that we did have to consider a no project alternative. I don't know if this is true or not. This is one of the things I have been told.

The other thing is as far as putting in the turbines, when I read the EIR, I have been going to the ISO meetings and a lot of meetings, but nowhere in my conversations with people or what was brought up came up the fact in the last couple of weeks that there was going to be turbines put in at the airport. And now I have read in the Guardian that maybe there are going to be two turbines at the airport which is going to affect the San Bruno community. And they are unaware of this happening right now.

And I am wondering where this came from, because I get the Airport Commission and I see nothing about -- I know there was at one time going to be a 15 megawatt -- El Paso was going to put in a 15 megawatt plant, but we have had no notification anywhere in the public of them using these Williams turbines at the airport.

So what I would like to know from you, if it is possible, is there going to be one? Is there going to be two? And has this been looked into?

I know that the no-need is going to be looked at. We brought that up at the meeting, at the CPUC, that it is going to be parallel. But I am wondering who is going to look into the fact of whether we need to have this transmission line? Is ORA going to do it? Is the City of San Francisco going to do it?

Is there any money allocated to look into the fact of do we need this project? Because the 540 Potrero megawatt plant of Potrero might not be put in by Mirant but it could be put in -- the CC could license it and it could be put in by somebody. So I would like the 200 megawatts of the turbines to be looked at and the 540 megawatt of the Potrero plant being considered in the EIR.

I would like -- basically, I would like more information because I have been doing my best to keep abreast of this and this came out of left field for me, these turbines, because the last I heard they were going to go in the Bayview Hunters Point and downtown. That was from people recently that told me that. So I would like to know where the EIR got this information.

ALJ TERKEURST: Maybe we will take this opportunity to respond to that to the extent we can.

If you will explain first how you assess need in the EIR process, the extent to which you do, and then I will explain the evidentiary hearings in December will be looking at need.

PPH1-67

PPH1-68

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

Maybe I will go ahead and explain that first since I've started.

In the scoping memo for this proceeding that we prepared and that was issued by the assigned Commissioner, we required PG&E to prepare additional information on need. PG&E is supposed to submit that testimony on October 10th. And then the other parties can respond to that in their own direct testimony. There will then be rebuttal testimony.

This is all written and submitted and circulated among the parties. And then the hearings in December will address, along with the environmental issues, the need for the project and the cost of the project and perhaps some other issues. But those are definitely the big three issues.

So that is how we will handle -- that is how it will be treated in the evidentiary phase.

My understanding, the environmental work kind of assumes to some extent that there is need for the project.

Billie, can you elaborate.

MS. BLANCHARD: Basically, under CEQA, you analyze the impacts of the proposed project. And we do not make -- CEQA does not make the decision on the need. We look at alternatives based upon the project objectives. Although in this document, we tried to disclose all the information that we knew surrounding the issue of need.

But the CEQA document doesn't make any conclusions about need for the project. It merely looks at alternatives that would meet some or all of the project objectives or most of the project objectives. The need issue is really going to be handled in the proceeding.

ALJ TERKEURST: Did that respond to your question?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. I just want people to be aware that that is not an issue of the EIR, that there is another phase that we have to deal with as far as the need issue. I wanted it in the record.

But the other thing is does the EIR have anything to do with the constraints that we are involved in here? Because when the transmission line is put in, there are going to be constraints at the Martin -- with getting the power into San Francisco as far as there being blockages at Ravenswood and further up. So you might put in the transmission line but because of the constraints and the fact other projects haven't gone ahead, you have a problem getting the power into San Francisco because of constraints.

So I was wondering if you are looking very thoroughly at that or if that is someone else's job to look into the constraints of the project with PG&E and getting the megawatts actually into the city.

It is fine putting the line in, but you are going to have 350 megawatts, but are you going to be able to get that power into San Francisco as they need? Or is there going to be blockages that might mean you might have the transmission line but you can't get the power into San Francisco and do what the job is unless you do other jobs ahead of it, you know, or other projects. I am wondering who is looking into that, too?

MS. BLANCHARD: Our main task, responsibility, as far as the environmental team is evaluating the impacts of the proposed project and looking at options and alternatives to that proposed project.

If there are other things that need to be done up towards San Francisco, upgrades and modifications, everything like that, then those would have to be considered by PG&E at

PPH1-69

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

some point. And that is not something that we have really looked at as far as we are concerned in this document.

MS. WILLIAMS: Will it come up under the need issue? I know at Cal ISO and PG&E where we have the stakeholders meetings, that is part of the issues where they address that. But I am wondering if there is somebody that gets all the information together as a whole package?

I know this is maybe not the right place to bring it up because it is the EIR, but this is one section. And I know the need is one. But I am wondering who is it that gets the whole ball of wax together and looks at all the issues as a whole?

MR. O'NEILL: Your Honor, I might be able to help out a little bit.

ALJ TERKEURST: Let me respond first.

You have already referenced that you are involved in the California -- and for the rest of the people in the audience, it is called the Independent System Operator, which is a nonprofit group that runs the transmission system in California. And they do a lot of the planning that you're talking about.

MS. WILLIAMS: With PG&E.

ALJ TERKEURST: Yes, and the other stakeholders. This is not the place, I can't give you a definitive accurate run down of how that works. I am learning it kind of as we go in this proceeding and in another transmission proceeding that I'm handling as well.

But we really can't give you a precise answer to your question this evening.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

ALJ TERKEURST: Anyone else?

STATEMENT OF MR. COLE

MR. COLE: I am Richard Cole. I spoke to you this afternoon. And I focused on what I considered to be the draft EIR's inadequacy with respect to its evaluation of the no-project and related alternatives.

I have to say to this audience that this afternoon we were a very sedate group. There was no applause. More power to you.

I want to discuss only one thing. It is something I included in my letter to you in February. It concerns your whole procedure from decision to writing an EIR to your evidentiary hearings and decisions which you now say will take place in December.

I think the CPUC's process puts the cart before the horse. You complete an EIR. You will be taking these comments, responding to them, issuing a final EIR, and that will be an information document for the use of decision makers later on.

After that you will have the evidentiary hearings and a decision by somebody in the CPUC, I believe it is about the need for the project.

What I mean by saying you are putting the cart before the horse is I think that you should establish the need for the project before you even start the EIR. If you are studying the need for the project, that means there's a chance, it may be small, but a chance that you will find no need for the project. And if you find no need for the project, then you don't have to go through all of this, you don't have to scare the community. You could make a decision on the basis of no need and stop things right there. And that's two ways I think things ought to go.

PPH1-70

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

Thank you.

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MS. OSKAMP

MS. OSKAMP: My name is Mary Oskamp. I live at 485 (inaudible) Way, Hillsborough. I am an immigrant to the United States eight years ago. So it takes me a lot of encouragement to speak in public in English.

PPH1-71

So tonight I think I have to do it. About two years ago, after a divorce, I was looking around the best place to raise my two young girls in the best place in a nice house, nice school. So finally I decide to move to Hillsborough. I sold my house in Foster City and one investment apartment in Cupertino. I put together all the equity to live into Hillsborough. This electric line about hundred feet behind my house. So I think if this proposal passes, where I can move to? Because I really am concerned.

As a mother I want to provide a -- I work so hard to pay the property tax, to pay the mortgage and let my two kids live in the best area in Hillsborough. And I don't quite understand if San Francisco residents need the power supplies and PG&E sell the power to San Francisco, I don't think you will build that huge electric tower in San Francisco downtown. Why you build that in Hillsborough? Why they got the power supply and we have to suffer it?

This is take -- where is the justice? Is that fair to residents that live around these power lines? How many people, how many decision makers in PG&E live same as everybody here, close to this power line? Would they have the same feeling as us?

And when I am aware of this proposal and I drive along 280 to my work, I find this power line sometimes in the east side of 280, sometimes in the west side of 280. I was wondering was that some special people live in that area? That is why the power line goes this way and this way and come back? I don't understand.

PPH1-72

So that means that this power line is possible to build in west of 280, right? So if you make that decision, why we have to go through this? Just build the other power line in west side of 280. Nobody lives there. We don't need to argue. And tonight I think we can be special if we hold our hands together to protect our home, protect our children, protect our value, we can be a special people, too, to let them build this power line to east side of 280, right?

(Applause)

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. LEE

MR. LEE: Hi. I apologize for having to come up again and take up some more time, but I understand that one option is to go underground. A second option is to move everything to the west -- yeah, to the west of 280.

PPH1-73

I heard, though -- and I'm wondering if you could confirm this -- if the 230 kV line was placed west of 280, if that was chosen by the CPUC as the best option, that the 60 volt line would have to still stay, though. That the 230 volt -- you know, they'd hire the cranes. They'd put up the towers and everything. They'd spend, you know, how many millions of dollars to do that, and they can't spend extra -- a couple of hundred dollars to take the 60 volt and put it on those towers as well.

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

And I heard that they can't do that because there

some type of a precedent or a law that prohibits -- that states that if that does happen, they are considered two completely different projects, and they can't be combined. I'm wondering if that's the case. I do need clarification. I don't know if you know it or not.

MS. BLANCHARD: Okay. You are referring to if they do the Alternative 1B --

MR. LEE: Right. If they choose the --

MS. BLANCHARD: They are proposing a 230 line. And if you do Alternative 1B and you put it in Canada Road, Skyline, and go down Trousdale, that it has no connection to the existing 60 kV line.

MR. LEE: Right.

MS. BLANCHARD: And so we -- if you read in our Section C in the appendix there is a legal discussion about the lack of nexus in that case to be able to do -- move the 60 over. But partial underground, you know, we have various proposals there for undergrounding the 60 and the 230 in the existing corridor area.

MR. LEE: Okay. Because I think it's most people's understanding that -- and that's why they are proposing -- they are pushing so hard to move the entire system to the west, is because they think that that's going to get rid of their current 60 volt also if it's, for instance, in their backyard; but that is not necessarily -- that's not the case apparently.

MS. BLANCHARD: No. But -- and I would highly recommend reading our -- at least the Section C discussion and also look at Appendix 1 to read that legal discussion regarding that, just so that you get a little bit more of an understanding of why that is.

MR. LEE: Well, I understand why, but it just doesn't seem to make sense to me. If you are going to be spending 90 -- if you are going to be spending, let's say, two -- you know, 200 million to build the project over there, you spend an extra, you know, 4 percent, or whatever it might be -- I have absolutely no idea -- to move the 60 volt also. But just because of a law that exists, that's not going to happen. I have read that, and that's -- I just want to point that out to some of the people here, that it's not necessarily a complete solution. It doesn't make us any worse off. It's not going to be 230 volts in our backyard, but it's not going to get rid of our 60 volts either.

That's the only comment I wanted to make.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: And I thank you for pointing that out.

I had mentioned earlier that I am very interested in people expressing opinions about -- of the alternatives that the Commission may -- and I will emphasize this -- I didn't say it earlier -- that we may legally consider the ones that you view as having the least unacceptable or the most acceptable, depending on your point of view, trade-offs.

He has just explained -- and I'm still learning some of these details myself -- some of the limitations on what the Commission may require as mitigation measures.

So I do urge you to spend the time -- I know it's complicated -- to understand the alternatives, understand what the Commission is -- the constraints that the Commission is operating under, and then make your views known about the various alternatives that are before the Commission.

Anyone else?

PPH1-73

Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo 8/12/03, cont.

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: All right. I think everyone has spoken who is interested in speaking this evening. I do appreciate your coming out. This has been very helpful.

To reiterate, there are two additional public participation hearings this week on Thursday in San Bruno. Hopefully, we will be back in November after the Final Environmental Impact Report is out for any additional comments that you wish to present to us.

Is there anything else this evening?

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: Hearing none, this public participation hearing is adjourned.

Thank you very much. (Whereupon, at the hour of 9:15 p.m., this matter having been continued to 2:00 p.m., August 14, 2003, at San Bruno, California, the Commission then adjourned.)

* * * * *

Responses to Comments Made at the Public Participation Hearing, San Mateo, 8/12/03

Ms. Chen

PPH1-1 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF and to Responses to Comment Set 25.

Mr. Cole

PPH1-2 Please see Responses to Comment Set 42, in which the written comments of this commenter are answered.

PPH1-3 Please see Response to Comment Set 42.

Mr. McFarland

PPH1-4 Please see Response to Comment Set 9, in which the written comments of this commenter are answered.

PPH1-5 Please see Response to Comment Set 9.

PPH1-6 Please see Response to Comment Set 9.

PPH1-7 Please see Response to Comment Set 9.

PPH1-8 Please see Response to Comment Set 9.

Mr. Treonor

PPH1-9 The San Andreas Fault is a strike-slip fault that moves north on one side and south on the other side. Therefore, any feature crossing the fault at a right angle would likely be severely damaged if fault movement is extensive. An underground structure parallel to the fault would also be likely to suffer severe damage in a major earthquake due to ground shaking, but it may not rupture if it does not cross the trace of the fault on which the earthquake occurs.

PPH1-10 The commenter suggests that a route be selected that is entirely west of I-280. Two alternatives are fully considered in the EIR in which portions of the transmission line would be installed underground west of I-280: the PG&E Route Option 1B Alternative (which would be west of I-280 from Jefferson Substation to Hayne Road), and the Partial Underground Alternative (which would be west of I-280 from just north of Hayne Road to San Bruno). Appendix 1 to the Draft EIR evaluates the "West of Reservoirs" Alternative (Section 4.2.6) but finds that this route would create greater impacts than the Proposed Project and would have regulatory feasibility challenges. Additional routes west of I-280 were not considered for the following reasons:

- CEQA requires that an EIR consider a “reasonable range” of alternatives, and the Draft EIR, along with modifications to the Final EIR, clearly meets this requirement.
- The suggested new alignment, if overhead, would create a new utility corridor, in conflict with the Watershed Plan which restricts creation of new corridors on SFPUC Watershed Lands.
- If overhead or underground (assuming the underground route would be outside of a roadway), such routes would create new biological impacts due to the requirement to clear new ground for tower footings and access roads.
- Visual and recreation impacts could be significant, due to the additional views of towers in the scenic corridor between Jefferson Substation and San Bruno Avenue.

PPH1-11 The suggested route of installing the 230 kV line underground along the existing 60 kV corridor west of Loma Vista Drive was investigated in response to this and similar comments. The existing right-of-way is west of private homes at the north and south ends of this segment. As a result, the 230 kV line could not be installed underground from Skyline Boulevard without passing through private property and in close proximity to residences. Therefore, this potential alternative was not pursued for EIR analysis. This evaluation is presented in Appendix 1, Section 4.2.2. Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF.

Mr. Pinney

PPH1-12 The CPUC was not aware that this library was closed, and no notification was sent to the CPUC after the Draft EIR was mailed to the current (invalid) address. However, several other libraries in the project area were also provided with copies of the Draft EIR, as documented in EIR Section H.

PPH1-13 Transmission towers historically perform very well in earthquakes, as they are designed to withstand high winds, which put more stress on towers than do most earthquakes. EIR Section D.8.7.2 addresses earthquake hazards; see also Impact PS-4 in Section D.8.8.2.

Ms. Kemper

PPH1-14 The commenter’s opposition to the Proposed Project is noted.

PPH1-15 The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is briefly discussed in Section A.2 of the Draft EIR, but it is not an issue addressed under CEQA. The need for this project is not addressed or decided within this EIR (see Response to Comment CC8-1). The CPUC Administrative Law Judge would evaluate project need during the General Proceeding at a later date based on information presented by PG&E, Cal ISO, and other parties.

PPH1-16 Please see General Responses GR-1, GR-2, and GR-3 for a discussion of EMF, property values, and the benefits and burdens of the Proposed Project, respectively. Regarding notification of the release of the Draft EIR, please see General Response GR-4.

Mr. Friedman

PPH1-17 The scenic quality of the project area is acknowledged in EIR Sections D.2 (Land Use), D.3 (Visual Resources), and D.9 (Recreation). Each individual issue area discusses potential impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives and classifies each potential impact based

on significance criteria. Mitigation measures are recommended to reduce the effects of the project to a level that is less than significant. If the CPUC approves a route with significant, unmitigable (Class I) impacts, a Statement of Overriding Consideration must be issued (per CEQA) by the CPUC as a part of project approval.

Ms. Friedman

PPH1-18 Please see General Response GR-1 for a discussion of EMF. The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is briefly discussed in Section A.2, but it is not an issue addressed under CEQA. The need for this project is not addressed or decided within this EIR (see Response to Comment CC8-1). The CPUC Administrative Law Judge would evaluate project need during the General Proceeding at a later date based on information presented by PG&E, Cal ISO, and other parties. The commenter's preference for undergrounding the transmission lines is noted.

Ms. Nemschoff

PPH1-19 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF and Responses to Comment Set 40. The commenter's opposition to the Proposed Project and EMF levels above 1 mG is noted.

PPH1-20 EIR Section D.3 (Visual Resources) presents a detailed analysis of visual impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives, including identification of significant visual impacts along Lexington Avenue.

PPH1-21 Please see General Response GR-2 regarding property values.

PPH1-22 Please see General Response GR-3 for a discussion of benefits and burdens of the Proposed Project.

PPH1-23 Please see General Response GR-3 for a discussion of benefits and burdens of the Proposed Project. The closure of Hunters Point Power Plant (HPPP) Unit 4, the Williams' Turbines, and Potrero Unit 7 are discussed in Section C.6.1 of the Draft EIR under the No Project Alternative. The CPUC is required, independent of HPPP closure, proposed new generation, and energy conservation measures in place, to consider the effects of the Proposed Project. The CPUC does not have the authority to require construction of generating facilities. Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is briefly discussed in Section A.2, but it is not an issue included under CEQA. The need for this project is not addressed or decided within this EIR (see Response to Comment CC8-1). The CPUC Administrative Law Judge evaluates need during the General Proceeding with information presented by PG&E, Cal ISO, and other parties.

PPH1-24 Impact A-3 (Construction Activity Could Encounter Naturally Occurring Asbestos) in EIR Section D.10.3.3 (Air Quality) discusses the potential impact in serpentinite soils, however, implementation of Mitigation Measure A-3a (Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan) would reduce this impact to less than significant levels. The CPUC only has authority over the Proposed Project and is not familiar with the construction practices and policies of the local developers or of the SFPUC during the firebreak diking. The commenter's preference for the lines to be routed at a sufficient distance from houses as not to increase EMF is noted. This EIR cannot address concerns related to construction of other projects or residences in areas with serpentine soils.

Ms. Lighthouse

PPH1-25 Please refer to General Response GR-1 for a discussion regarding EMF and to Responses to Comment Set 40. The commenter's opposition to Route Option 1A and EMF levels above 1 mG is noted. Also, please see Response to Comment 40-29 regarding EMF thresholds.

PPH1-26 Please see General Response GR-3 for a discussion of the benefits and burdens of the Proposed Project. Please see Response to Comment PPH1-24 for a discussion of serpentine soils, asbestos, and disking for the firebreaks.

Consideration of installing the underground 230 kV line in the existing 60 kV corridor west of Loma Vista has been added to Appendix 1 (Alternatives Screening Report) of this Final EIR in the discussion of Route Option 1B (Section 4.2.1). This option was found to be infeasible due to the lack of access to the transmission corridor from Skyline Boulevard – at both the south and north ends of this corridor segment, private property would have to be crossed to allow installation of the 230 kV line in that area.

PPH1-27 The commenter's support for the Partial Underground Alternative north of Carolands Substation is noted. As described in the Response to PPH1-26, while the land disked for the firebreak is no longer sensitive habitat, there are feasibility concerns at the northern and southern ends of the segment west of the homes on Loma Vista and Skyview Drives that would make it difficult to bring the line to the area underground.

PPH1-28 Please see General Response GR-4 regarding notification.

PPH1-29 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF and the text addition in Section D.8.7.4 of this Final EIR, which presents magnetic field data for the area west of Skyline Boulevard in Burlingame under PG&E Route Option 1B. With the 230 kV line installed in Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard, there are essentially no cumulative impacts of the 230 and 60 kV lines. See Response to Comment 40-15 regarding potential cumulative EMF impacts along Skyline Boulevard between Hayne Road and Trousdale Avenue.

PPH1-30 The commenter's concerns regarding EMF are noted. Please see General Response GR-1 for a discussion of EMF.

Ms. Prentiss

PPH1-31 Please see General Response GR-1 for a discussion of EMF.

Ms. King

PPH1-32 Please see General Response GR-1 for a discussion of EMF. The purpose of the EIR is to objectively state the environmental effects of the Proposed Project in regards to the established CEQA significance criteria. The CPUC commissioner may take into consideration "community values" when making a decision. Most of the issue areas address impacts to the human environment, including Land Use (Section D.2), Visual Resources (Section D.3), Socioeconomics (Section D.13), Public Services and Utilities (Section D.14), Public Health and Safety (Section D.8), Recreation (Section D.9), Geology, Soils, and Paleontology (Section D.6), Air Quality (Section D.10), Noise and Vibration (D.11), and Transportation and Traffic (Section D.12).

PPH1-33 The size of the turnout of the Public Participation Hearing is noted.

Mr. Kasten

- PPH1-34 EIR Section D.3 (Visual Resources) presents a detailed analysis of visual impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives. Also, please see General Responses GR-1 and GR-2 for a discussion of EMF and property values, respectively.
- PPH1-35 Please see Response to Comment PPH1-23.
- PPH1-36 The commenter's concerns regarding EMF and preference for the lines to be located far from residences are noted. Please see General Response GR-1 for a discussion of EMF.
- PPH1-37 The Town of Hillsborough did not submit formal written comments during the scoping period (from January 21 to February 27, 2003). However, comments and concerns from the Town of Hillsborough were incorporated based on notes taken during an Agency Consultation between Billie Blanchard (CPUC Project Manager) and Susan Lee (EIR Team Project Manager) with the Town of Hillsborough on January 22, 2003. Please see Appendix B-5 of the Public Scoping Report, dated April 2003, for a summary of the meeting notes.

Mr. Grech

- PPH1-38 The commenter's support for the Partial Underground Alternative is noted. Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF and the text addition in Section D.8.7.4 of this Final EIR for magnetic field information on the various segments of the PG&E Route Option 1B. With the 230 kV line installed in Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard, there are essentially no cumulative impacts of the 230 and 60 kV lines. Please see Response to Comment 40-15 regarding potential cumulative EMF impacts along Skyline Boulevard between Hayne Road and Trousdale Avenue. Also, please see General Response GR-2 for a discussion of property values.

Mr. Kobe

- PPH1-39 Please see General Responses GR-1 and GR-2 for a discussion of EMF and property values, respectively. Sections D.2.1 and D.2.3 (Land Use), D.3.1 and D.3.3 (Visual Resources), D.4.1 and D.4.3 (Biological Resources), and D.9.1 and D.9.3 (Recreation) in the Draft EIR, discuss the ecological and/or scenic qualities of the environmental setting of the I-280 corridor and the SFPUC Watershed, and how the Proposed Project would affect each individual issue area (both construction and operational phases).

Dr. Lillo

- PPH1-40 Please see General Response GR-2 regarding property values, and Response to Comment PPH1-10 for a discussion of alternatives west of I-280.

Ms. Humphrey

- PPH1-41 While substantial research is ongoing about new sources of power and distributed generation, power lines are not yet obsolete. They remain the only method available to transmit large quantities of electricity from where it is generated to areas the power is used. The commenter's preference for underground lines is noted. EIR Section D.3 (Visual Resources)

presents a detailed analysis of visual impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives. Please also refer to General Responses GR-1 and GR-2 for a discussion of EMF and property values, respectively.

Mr. Anderson

PPH1-42 The commenter's support for the undergrounding of lines is noted. Please note that PG&E Route Option 1B, chosen in this EIR as the Environmentally Superior Alternative, is an all-underground route. Please see Response to Comment PPH1-40 for a discussion of alternatives west of I-280.

Ms. Carlin

PPH1-43 The commenter's preference for an all-underground route along non-residential roads is noted. Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF.

Ms. Hayes

PPH1-44 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF.

Mr. (Tony) Lee

PPH1-45 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF, and Section D.8.7 of the Final EIR, which explain the approach to EMF analysis under CEQA and the CPUC's policy.

With respect to the transition tower that would be installed at Tower 7/39 under the Partial Underground Alternative, it is acknowledged that existing Tower 7/39 is located within the commenter's fenced yard. Under the Proposed Project and the Partial Underground Alternative as originally defined, this transition tower would be relocated to be west of the residential property line so it would be on SFPUC land. Substantial analysis was carried out to see whether there were feasible options for moving the Partial Underground Alternative transition tower to the south or to the north, or to utilize a route modification that would allow a different crossing of San Mateo Creek. These efforts are documented in Appendix 1, Section 4.2.3 (Partial Underground Alternative), and the conclusion is reached that moving the tower to the south or effecting a different crossing of San Mateo Creek would not be technically and legally feasible, respectively. Therefore, the EIR recommends in Mitigation Measure V-24a (Visual Resources Section D.3.4.2) that this tower would be relocated to the north 100 feet, and at least 100 feet from the property line of any residence.

Modeling of the magnetic field for individual transition towers with aerial wires on one side and underground cables routed down the structure, while possible, is relatively complex. In actuality the magnetic field in the vicinity of transition towers would be predominated on one side by the overhead circuits as they approach or on the other by the underground circuits as they depart. Therefore, the magnetic field from a transition tower (as is proposed for Tower 7/39 in the Partial Underground Alternative) would be similar to that of both an overhead and an underground transmission line. At a distance of 100 feet from the transition tower, the magnetic field would be stronger from the overhead portion of the line at 5 mG (as shown in EIR Figure D.8-1b) than the underground portion (see values in Figure D.8-2). This compares with the existing situation where the 60 kV double circuit line has an estimated magnetic field of 16 mG near the tower, and an estimate of about 26

mG at the property line for the Proposed Project Tower 7/39 (as documented in Table D.8-16 and Figure D.8-1b).

Ms. Jadalo

- PPH1-46 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF.
- PPH1-47 Please see Responses to Comments PPH1-13 and 4-4.
- PPH1-48 Corona noise is addressed in Sections D.11.3 (Noise and Vibration) under Impact N-3, Corona Noise from the Operation of the Overhead Transmission Line. Also, please see Response to Comment G-4.
- PPH1-49 Please refer to Sections D.8.7.2 and D.8.8.2, Public Health and Safety, for a discussion of effects on radio and television interference (Impact PS-1). Mitigation Measures PS-1b addresses the documentation and response to impacts to television interference. Individual sources of adverse radio/television interference can be located and corrected on the power lines. Also, please see Responses During the Comment Period 1.2.16 (Email from Mark Trail).

Mr. Manky

- PPH1-50 Please see Responses to Comments PPH1-48, PPH1-49, and G-4. PG&E states that it is unaware of any maintenance requests or problems in the project area.

Ms. Nadle

- PPH1-51 Please see General Response GR-3 for a discussion of the benefits and burdens of the Proposed Project.
- PPH1-52 Please see General Response GR-1 and GR-2 for a discussion of EMF and property values, respectively.
- PPH1-53 CEQA and this Draft EIR do not consider cost in the evaluation of alternatives. Cost of the project and alternatives is addressed by the CPUC Administrative Law Judge during the general proceeding on the project.
- PPH1-54 The commenter's support for lines as far from people and residences, as well as underground lines is noted.

Ms. Thomas

- PPH1-55 Please see Response to Comment Set 26.
- PPH1-56 Please see Response to Comment PPH1-40 for a discussion of alternatives west of I-280. Please see Response to Comment N-4 and Section 2.3.2.1 in Appendix 1 of this Final EIR for a discussion of the CEQA legal issues regarding line collocation. Please see General Response GR-1 and GR-2 for a discussion of EMF and property values, respectively. The EIR does not address cost in the evaluation of alternatives. Cost of the project and alternatives is addressed by the CPUC Administrative Law Judge during the general proceeding on the project. The commenter's support for alternative measures is noted.

Mr. Nachlis

PPH1-57 EIR Section D.3 (Visual Resources) presents a detailed analysis of visual impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives. Also, please see General Responses GR-1 and GR-2 for a discussion of EMF and property values, respectively.

Ms. Sure

PPH1-58 EIR Section D.3 (Visual Resources) presents a detailed analysis of visual impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives. Also, please see General Responses GR-1 and GR-3 for a discussion of EMF and benefits and burdens of the Proposed Project, respectively.

Mr. Canning

PPH1-59 The commenter's preference for lines far from the residences on Lexington Avenue is noted. Please see General Response GR-1 for a discussion of EMF. Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project is briefly discussed in Section A.2, but it is not an issue included under CEQA. The need for this project is not addressed or decided within this EIR (see Response to Comment CC8-1). The CPUC Administrative Law Judge evaluates need during the General Proceeding with information presented by PG&E, Cal ISO, and other parties.

Mr. Cuan

PPH1-60 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF.

The purpose of the EIR is to objectively state the environmental effects of the Proposed Project in regards to the established CEQA significance criteria. Under CEQA law, the removal of the 60 kV lines cannot be required separate from the Proposed Project. Please see Response to Comment N-4 and Section 2.3.2.1 in Appendix 1 of this Final EIR for a discussion of the CEQA legal issues regarding line collocation. It should be noted that under the Partial Underground Alternative, portions of the alternative route include moving or undergrounding the 60 kV line. In Section C.6 under No Project Alternative in the Draft EIR, the scenario and impacts should the project not be installed are considered.

Mr. Goodman

PPH1-61 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF. As indicated in Section D.8.7 of the Draft EIR, the electric power lines in the United States and Europe operate between 50 to 60 Hertz (Hz), which is considered an extremely low frequency. Electric power lines do not generate microwave radiation. Standards established for microwave radiation, which occurs at a frequency of 1,000,000,000 to 30,000,000,000 Hz, would not be relevant to EMF from electric power lines.

Ms. Lighthouse

PPH1-62 Please see General Response GR-1 for a discussion regarding EMF and Responses to Comment Set 40. The commenter's opposition to EMF levels above 2 mG is noted. Also, please see Response to Comment 40-29 regarding EMF thresholds.

Mr. Masters-Gutierrez

PPH1-63 Please see Responses to Comments PPH1-48 and PPH1-49.

PPH1-64 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF.

Ms. Nemschoff

PPH1-65 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF. The purpose of the EIR is to objectively state the environmental effects of the Proposed Project in regards to the established CEQA significance criteria. Under CEQA law, the removal of the 60 kV lines cannot be required; see discussion in Appendix 1, Section 2.3.1 of this Final EIR. Please see Responses to Comments N-4 and Section 2.3.2.1 in Appendix 1 for a discussion of the CEQA legal issues regarding line collocation. Should PG&E or any applicant desire to upgrade the existing transmission lines in the future, a separate and similar application and environmental review process would be required.

Mr. Thom

PPH1-66 As ALJ TerKeurst stated during the Public Participation Hearing, “PG&E has a similar program, but programs are aimed at undergrounding distribution lines. They generally are not applied to the transmission lines such as we are considering here.”

Ms. Williams

PPH1-67 Please see Response to Comment Set 42. Regarding potential new generation at the San Francisco Airport, airport sites have been considered in California Energy Commission (CEC) proceedings in the past as alternative sites for other proposed plants, and a previous 50 MW plant was approved but not built. No applications are currently pending with the CEC for generation at the airport.

PPH1-68 The closure of Hunters Point Power Plant (HPPP) Unit 4, the Williams’ Turbines, and Potrero Unit 7 are discussed in Section C.6.1 of the Draft EIR under the No Project Alternative.

In addition, as ALJ TerKeurst stated during the Public Participation Hearing, “in the scoping memo for this proceeding that [the CPUC] prepared and that was issued by the assigned Commissioner, [the CPUC] required PG&E to prepare additional information on need. PG&E is supposed to submit that testimony on October 10, 2003. And then the other parties can respond to that in their own direct testimony. There will then be rebuttal testimony. This is all written and submitted and circulated among parties. And then the hearings in December will address, along with the environmental issues, the need for the project and the cost of the project and perhaps some other issues.”

PPH1-69 The commenter’s concerns regarding need are acknowledged. Other deficiencies in the region’s transmission system are being studied in regional Stakeholder process managed by the California ISO. The purpose of the EIR is to objectively state the environmental effects of the Proposed Project and alternatives in regards to the established significance criteria per CEQA.

Mr. Cole

PPH1-70 Please see Responses to Comment Set 42.

Ms. Oskamp

PPH1-71 While the Jefferson-Martin project would not create new power generation, it would increase the reliability of the electric transmission system for the San Francisco Peninsula. The CPUC does not have the authority to require construction of generating facilities. Please see General Response GR-3 regarding the benefits and burdens of the Proposed Project.

PPH1-72 The commenter's support for alternatives west of I-280 is noted. Please see Response to Comment PPH1-40 regarding alternatives west of I-280. Also, please see General Responses GR-1 and GR-2 for a discussion of EMF and property values, respectively.

Mr. (Tony) Lee

PPH1-73 The commenter is correct that if the 230 kV line were installed west of I-280, the 60 kV lines would remain as they are. Because the 60 kV lines currently serve the Ralston, Watershed, Hillsdale Junction, Crystal Springs, and Carolands Substations, these lines cannot be moved further west without installation of new connections to each of these substations. Please see the clarified legal discussion included in Appendix 1, Section 2.3.1 of this Final EIR for explanation of the cases in which the 60 kV line can legally be moved and when it cannot.

Please see Response to Comment PPH1-40 for a discussion of alternatives west of I-280. Please see Response to Comment N-4 and Section 2.3.2.1 in Appendix 1 of this Final EIR for a discussion of the CEQA legal issues regarding line collocation.