

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno, 8/14/03

SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA, AUGUST 14, 2003 - 2:00 P.M. and 7:00 P.M.

* * * * *

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE TERKEURST: I think we're about ready to start. We're here today for a public-participation hearing before the Public Utilities Commission of the state of California. This hearing is in the matter of Application 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 proceeding. I have an extra (indicating); I'm prepared. And I thank you all for coming.

The purpose of today's hearing is to hear from the members of the public regarding the proposed project, and the alternatives that have been identified for the Commission's consideration. It's very important that we hear how the people who would be affected by this project view it, and which of the alternatives you find least or most problematic. I'd likened it to the recall situation that we're in. I would be interested in hearing not only views about whether the project should be built, but if it is to be built, which routes you would find most acceptable, realizing that there are trade-offs on many of the routes.

The issue of need for the project will be considered more thoroughly than it has been to date. And there will be some evidentiary hearings in the fall that would focus on more on need than the environmental impact study has to date. And the people who are here to explain the environmental impact study to you can address how they have handled that issue so far.

And let me introduce -- to my right here to, my immediate right, is Billie Blanchard. She's the Commission's project manager who has overseen the environmental analysis.

And then to her right is Chris Keller, who is one of the consultants with the environmental -- the Aspen Environmental Group, which performed this study.

They will give a brief presentation explaining the project and the alternatives that they have identified.

Also present, by the door, is Harriet Burt. She's the Commission's public advisor. And she will be happy to have you sign up. She has a sign-up list of people who want to speak. I'll also ask as we proceed if anyone else would like to speak. You don't -- don't feel obligated to sign up ahead of time. You can decide as you hear what we have to say.

I'm not sure if anyone from PG&E is here yet. Is there? Could you -- yes. Alain Billot, who was here at the hearing on Tuesday. Good afternoon. So if you have questions for PG&E, you can ask him either outside or after the hearing.

Billie and Chris will explain the process that they've used in preparing the environmental impact report subject to the California Environmental Quality Act. I won't go into that.

We had two public-participation hearings on Tuesday in San Mateo, and have the two here today, at 2:00 and 7:00. We planned an additional set of public-participation hearings on November 18th -- one in San Mateo, and one here -- but I do caution, given the State's budget situation, there is some chance that we won't be able to hold those. Regardless, we would want to hear from you, whether we're able to come here and hear from you in person or not. Feel free to contact the senior by letter or e-mail. Your views would be circulated. And I will read them all, even if I can't hear them in person.

Billie will explain there's a deadline for comments to be considered as they prepare their final environmental impact report, but the record will remain open, beyond that. We will, as I mentioned, have evidentiary hearings that will look at the results of that report and other issues, including need, as I have discussed, and also the costs of the project, in December. So the record will remain open throughout that period. The expectation is there will be a Commission order in about mid 2004 on the application.

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

The comments today are informal. People are not being put under oath, but we do have court reporters here who are making a transcript of the proceedings, so I would ask you to keep that in mind when you speak. So please speak clearly and slowly enough so that they can catch what you're saying.

I have one matter. Let me go ahead and get it out of the way before we get into the substance of the hearing. I'm going to take advantage of being on the record to deal with a petition to intervene that the City of Daly City had filed in this case in May.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company had filed a response to their petition, and had some concerns about some of the issues that they felt Daly City was raising, perhaps inappropriately.

I will grant the petition to intervene. Obviously, they have a very strong interest in this case. There's no question about whether they should be granted intervenor status. The issue of the substance of their position will be dealt with when the time is right. I don't think that that needs to be addressed today.

And with that, I believe I'm ready to turn the proceeding over to Billie and Chris. We'll go off the record for this. We had transcribed their presentation on Tuesday in San Mateo, and we're not going to do that every time, so we'll be off the record now.

(Off the record)

ALJ TERKEURST: All right. We'll go back on the record now.

I probably should mention, too, if you want to send in comments after the environmental report comment period is over, you can send them in addition or instead of to the address that is in these handouts. You can send them directly to the Commission. You could send them to the public advisor's office at the Commission. The address is 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, 94102. And they'll be routed appropriately when we get them.

I think we're ready now to hear from you. The first name -- first person who's requested to speak is Christine Giannini. Is that correct? Yes. So we have a podium set up over here.

STATEMENT OF MS. GIANNINI

MS. GIANNINI: Good afternoon. I'd like to thank you for coming here. It's been important to the residents of San Bruno to feel that their voices are being heard.

I live on Glenview Drive. My home is in view of the proposed site, and I have many concerns, one of which is health.

Recently -- as a matter of fact, 13 days ago -- I had major surgery. I chose to have the surgery to improve my health. I have concerns about the substation being located on my street due to health, not just for myself, but for the increasing numbers of children that are coming into our neighborhood.

I also have concerns about the appearance of the substation that will be planted at the entrance of my community. We have been trying for the last ten years to improve the San Bruno Glenview area. We just jumped up and down one or two weeks ago over the joy of having the demolition of a gas station that -- we have been fighting for its removal for ten years, so that we could improve the appearance of our neighborhood. We have a developer who would like to put in a nice piece of property there. It's my understanding that it's condominiums. And it would add to the appearance of our neighborhood.

PPH2-1

PPH2-2

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

We are looking at a reverend of a local church who has a desire to put in a soccer field for children next door to the adjacent lot. It is the adjacent lot to the proposed substation site. I don't think I want children playing soccer next door to that substation.

PPH2-2

I don't wish to exit 280 and see a 70-foot tower standing there. I don't think that 15-foot trees are going to conceal it.

My biggest issue here is a health concern.

PPH2-3

Also, how is it going -- if we are going to have a substation -- and I truly feel that PG&E has already decided we're going to have one -- we need to come up with a resolve. How is it going to happen? And how much is it going to cost us?

I don't really like any of the alternatives. However, I do have a preference, and that would be to go underground all the way. I know that Millbrae, Hillsborough, and Burlingame are striving for this. I support them in it. We live in a beautiful area that is panoramic to many. And I think increasing the existing towers is ludicrous.

PPH2-4

And I don't care to hear the increased voltage every time I go walking by. I can hear it now.

PPH2-5

There is a canyon in San Bruno. I see some residents in here that live directly on the canyon edge, just as my home does. And I don't want that disturbed. It's a wildlife reserve. It may be small in respect to others that exist, but I want to know that that wildlife reserve is going remain intact, untouched.

As far as where to route, I understand that Daly City is petitioning. They have some questions regarding us going down Westborough. In my eye, I think Westborough might be a good alternative. And I'm saying this because I can see two cities sharing the expenditure of the outline.

Thanks for hearing me.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

The next speaker is Kemper Dudley.

STATEMENT OF MR. DUDLEY

MR. DUDLEY: Good afternoon. Hello. My name is Kemper Dudley. And I am the general manager of the Residence Inn by Marriott that is at 1350 Veterans Boulevard. And we also have Courtyard by Marriott right next door. And we are concerned about the modified underground alternative, because the modified alternative goes literally through our front yard.

PPH2-6

Veterans Way -- Veterans Boulevard goes from Oyster Point Boulevard to our hotel. It's at the end of the road. And so we're concerned about access for our guests, concerned about the duration of -- if there's limited access, what the duration might be.

ALJ TERKEURST: Mr. Dudley, I'm sorry. Some people are having trouble hearing you. If you could -- I'm not sure --

MR. DUDLEY: Closer and louder?

ALJ TERKEURST: That's good. Yes.

MR. DUDLEY: Right, okay.

We're concerned about the effect that this might have on the guests of our hotel. We have 350 hotel rooms there, and the proposed alternative route goes right through the front of the hotel. It's where we drive in and drive up. And there's a small space between that and

PPH2-6

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

where the railroad tracks are. And so it's routed through there after it goes through a gateway down through our area, Veterans Boulevard.

PPH2-6

And we're concerned about the extent of construction that would be necessary, the duration, how it would affect access for our guests, the safety of our guests and our employees as well.

We're also a little bit concerned about digging in that area, because I'm not fully aware of the history of that area. I have been there since the hotel has opened in March of '01, but I do know that there were some environmental clean-up issues in that area from before, and I'm not sure that it's good to -- might not get into some problems potentially digging up that area as well. And so I just wanted to put in our comments. And our concern, as always, is to take good care of our guests. And we want to make sure that we have access for them and for those businesses.

Can you hear me?

Okay. Thank you very much.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you, Mr. Dudley.

The next speaker is Nancy Anding.

STATEMENT OF MS. ANDING

MS. ANDING: Hi. My name is Nancy Anding and I work with the San Francisco Community Power Cooperative, and our cooperative has over 1100 members who live directly and only in Bay View Hunters Point and Potrero Hill.

PPH2-7

Our members are very concerned about the power plants that we have now and we, you know, of course, give our support for that upgrade of the transmission lines. We think that it will really clean up the energy. Our program teaches people how to use energy more efficiently. We have many community outreach programs to do that.

Right now, our neighborhoods have huge, huge cases of asthma and cancer, greater than anyone else here in the city and I believe in the state.

So I know that there are many different points of view and everyone has a very legitimate point of view, but I feel like this decision to upgrade the transmission lines could affect thousands and thousands of households. So it's a human point of view, and it just happens to coincide with a an environment point of view. And I hope a lot of people will support it in one form or another. Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. The next speaker is Patricia Pilster.

STATEMENT OF MS. PILSTER

MS. PILSTER: Hello. My name is Patricia Pilster. I'm a resident of San Bruno, like the lady that spoke here who lives on Glenview. I live just a few blocks away from that, couple of blocks, in fact. I've lived there for 39 years.

The corner of Glenview or where they plan to put the substation has always been an eyesore for the 39 years that I have lived there. She mentioned also -- I'm sorry; I forgot her name -- the gas station. And it is an entrance into San Bruno that I feel should look good. And a power -- a 70-foot tower is not going to look good. Not only that, I am worried about the environmental impact, about the danger, I feel, from the electrical tower to our community, our children. I raised all my children there, but now I have grandchildren that come. I'm concerned about them.

PPH2-8

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

I also sell real estate in the area for the last 32 years. I do think it's going to have an impact on the values in the neighborhood having those ugly towers.

PPH2-8

If there has to be something, I would want the lines underground. And that's mostly my concern, and I just wanted to voice it. Thank you very much.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. The next speaker is Sharon-Ann Baum.

STATEMENT OF MS. BAUM

MS. BAUM: My name is Sharon Baum. I'm a 35-year resident of San Bruno. And I, too, feel like Ms. Pilster; we hopefully have something that is going to improve the corner of Glenview and San Bruno Avenue. I was looking forward to seeing a parking lot up there for people to use the reservoir trail. I don't think I'd want to park my car there if there's a transmission tower.

PPH2-9

One thing that no one has mentioned is directly across the street from where this project may end up is a church with a preschool program. And there are many children there, five days a week, from early in the morning until dinner time until their parents pick them up. And they do try to get these children outside.

My biggest concern is health. My next concern is the eyesore. Please put it underground.

I'm also concerned about you're so close -- it's so close to the San Andreas Fault. And I'm not sure this is a good thing to do. Thank you.

PPH2-10

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. The next speaker is Chuck Zelnik.

STATEMENT OF MR. ZELNIK

MR. ZELNIK: Thank you for having this meeting and giving us an opportunity.

I'd like to speak first and foremost of the issue -- I'm currently board president of San Bruno Park School District. Even though our board has not taken a formal action on this matter, the concern I have as a trustee of this district is that along the corridor near -- going north on Highway 35 to San Bruno Avenue, we have a school known as John Muir. About 375 kids are in that school. It's a K-6 school. When you're out on the playground, you constantly hear the voltage sounds from the towers that are currently there. What type of impacts may these voltages have to humans, we don't know, or there's nothing that I've heard that relates that. But for myself as a member of that board, it is a concern that going up higher with these towers, having these towers exposed, creates a potential issue with the student population at that school.

PPH2-11

On that note, there was an issue relating to that site just as a visual blight is something that is a concern. At this point, I'd like to just speak as a resident of San Bruno and say that when you did your presentation, you talked about the power lines being above ground and then going below ground and coming back above ground. Wouldn't that require more of those transition stations in that process? So now instead of having one transition station you've got multiples, which would seem to be an additional cost to the whole potential project.

PPH2-12

The project may be needed. But I think from my perspective, the best course is to put it underground completely. And the reason is that I realize the hotel might be inconvenienced with its patrons of getting in and out. But you know, the cities of San Bruno, Millbrae, South San Francisco have lived through BART constructions for many years, and we put up with that. A small inconvenience of digging the trench, putting in a voltage line. However long it might take, once it's in the ground, it's done, it's over with, and we get that

PPH2-13

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

clear view out of our windows of our homes that face that direction or when we're driving on the 280 corridor.

PPH2-13

So I prefer that -- the alternative for undergrounding down Trousdale Boulevard, up the El Camino and over seems to make the most logical sense. We all as ratepayers are going to pay for this project, so why not give us what we want, which is bury it in the ground and we don't have to look at it.

The other thing that I'm opposed to putting it on the Glenview site is for two other reasons. The county has put in a beautiful walking trail that has a starting point right at that location. The gate has been locked for probably three, four months because there's no place to park. And the local church group that was going to put a parking lot there is up in the air now about doing that, and therefore the gate stays locked to a wonderful walking trail that us taxpayers paid for. We can't use it from that point because there is no parking near that.

PPH2-14

The issue of moving the transmission transition right at the nearest point of the San Andreas Fault makes no sense. If I mean, if you're going to put this transition station somewhere, move it to where it's on the same side of the fault on the bay side, not the ocean side of the fault and then have to cross it because you never know how severe an earthquake can happen. And I don't care how well it's engineered, a failure, a breakage could be detrimental to everybody that's in that general vicinity.

PPH2-15

So I think the appropriate -- and my support goes to undergrounding it completely. I as a tax ratepayer don't mind the increase to that to put it underground because out of sight, out of mind; we'll have a beautiful environment to look at again. Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. The next speaker is Hanns Lee.

STATEMENT OF MR. LEE

MR. LEE: Good afternoon. My name is Hanns Lee. I want to thank you for having multiple hearings in multiple locations. I think it's important to get as many point of views as possible. I work for a real estate investment and management firm. My particular office owns and manages property and land in San Mateo County, including South San Francisco.

PPH2-16

I am here this afternoon representing the management of two organizations: First, the common interest development association that is comprised of four distinct property owners in the redevelopment area of South San Francisco commonly referred to as Bay West Cove; second and specifically, the landowner of the undeveloped portion of Bay West Cove.

My comments are directed particularly towards the description and evaluation of the project alternative for the northern segments referred to as the modified underground 230 kilovolt collocation alternative and South San Francisco segment; and more specifically, at the segment from the intersection of Gateway Boulevard and Oyster Point Boulevard to the railroad right-of-way in South San Francisco. This particular segment would go through the lands and properties of the organization I am here on behalf of.

To my knowledge, neither the management nor the ownership entities for the four members of our common interest development received the notice of preparation or the notice of availability for the project. I was able to track down information about the project and received a copy of the draft EIR earlier this week. It appears that it's possible that some land and property owners along the northern segment alternative did not receive timely notification of the available public documents. So I ask the lead agency if it intends to endorse the northern segment alternative that it should consider recirculation of notices and additional hearings to ensure that all land and property owners along the northern segments are properly informed and thus minimize any chance for legal challenges and significant project delay.

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

I would like to ask that the sponsors and lead agency consider the following concerns for each of the following identified issue areas.

Under Land Use, the draft EIR identifies South San Francisco industrial use as a reason for favoring the northern segment alternative. While the area east of Highway 101 in South San Francisco has traditionally in the past supported industrial uses, that use has changed over the last ten years. Gateway Boulevard, which is part of the route of the northern segment alternative, has been redeveloped exclusively into Class A office buildings. Among the many industries represented along Gateway Boulevard are pharmaceutical, biotechnology, information technology, software, to name a few. All these companies will be impacted by major construction along the main access route and to their offices.

PPH2-17

I would request that the sponsor note that the transition from industrial use to commercial use is occurring and will continue and that the land use issue area be readdressed to consider this fact.

Furthermore, the segment from the intersection of Gateway Boulevard and Oyster Point Boulevard to the railroad right-of-way in South San Francisco is the only point of ingress and egress for two hotels in South San Francisco. You heard about it a little earlier.

PPH2-18

These hotels have hundreds of patrons every day, and provide vital business support to business travelers and guests coming to South San Francisco. The hotels' business is also a critical component of the city's revenue vis-a-vis the transit occupation tax.

With regard to public health, the segment of the intersection of Gateway Boulevard and Oyster Point Boulevard to the railroad right-of-way in South San Francisco possess significant amounts of hazardous material, as it was originally occupied by U.S. Steel as a mill. Under the direction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, this area has been substantially remediated and capped. Much of the contaminants were, in fact, sealed in lead cells that are currently located underground.

PPH2-19

Previous and current landowners have taken painstaking measures to ensure compliance with the environmental covenants in place. And, in my opinion, the draft EIR does not adequately address how the northern segment alternative would address the significant risks, which would include release of these existing hazardous materials into the groundwater, and possibly into San Francisco Bay.

Additionally, the draft EIR did not articulate clearly how the CPUC preemptive jurisdiction would address Regional Water Quality Control Board's oversight of the Bay West Cove area.

PPH2-20

With regard to geology, the segment of the intersection of Gateway Boulevard and Oyster Point Boulevard to the railroad right-of-way in South San Francisco possesses many unforeseen underground conditions. I know for a fact that portions of a large GSA facility were demolished and buried in place. Contractors who have done underground work in the vicinity can assure you that there's great underground risk. And as far as expenses are concerned, contractor pricing will reflect as much.

PPH2-21

Finally, the undeveloped portion of Bay West Cove is scheduled for development at the end of this year, and will be constructed in phases throughout 2006. The development plan calls for Class A office park that will serve as the Gateway to South San Francisco. Although the site is currently undeveloped, it is clear that the Bay West Cove project will be well under way at the same time that the proposed northern segment alternative will be in construction. The owner has finalized a complex yet effective construction phasing plan that will be significantly disrupted by introducing the proposed northern segment alternative.

PPH2-22

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

Thank you very much. I look forward to submitting my comments in writing as well.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you, Mr. Lee.

The next speaker is Carolyn Wilson.

STATEMENT OF MS. WILSON

MS. WILSON: Thank you. I live on Fairmont Drive, which is about three blocks away from the proposed site. This is the primary entrance into our neighborhood, and the only way we can walk to the elementary school for my children.

Last spring I took my children to explore this open land, and we discovered tadpoles and frogs there. It was a wonderful experience for the kids. A tower here would destroy the beauty of the entrance into our neighborhood, and destroy an area of natural exploration for my children. And it would be a great safety concern to my children, who'll be walking past this area to get to school and the grocery store.

I strongly disagree with a tower here, and I would urge you strongly to consider completely undergrounding this system. In fact, right before coming up here, my daughter said to me, "And, Mom, don't forget to tell them about the insects and birds living there, too." I think she says it all. She's six years old.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. The last person who signed up is Tom Sparks.

STATEMENT OF MR. SPARKS

MR. SPARKS: Good afternoon. I'm Tom Sparks. I'm chief planner for the City of South San Francisco. The City expects to be submitting formal written comments before the deadline.

I have some brief technical comments regarding the reputedly environmentally superior alternative that's identified in the draft EIR. We feel that there are some major technical issues involved with that. Mr. Lee went into rather more detail than I'm planning to in this presentation, but I just wanted to raise a few points.

Among the lesser issues, the route would disrupt Produce Avenue, which is the main southbound on ramp to Highway 101 and South San Francisco. We run something in excess of 16,000 average daily trips on that segment.

Further, that segment is the sole access to the Golden Gate Produce Terminal, which has no other way in and out. And that is the largest produce terminal in the Bay Area. It cannot be disrupted for even a day without having a major impact on fresh produce availability in the entire Bay Area.

There are some other traffic issues, since it would be on surface streets in South San Francisco, but I'll focus on Gateway Boulevard, particularly the area from Grand Avenue north.

Gateway, as Mr. Lee noted, has undergone significant transition. It is no longer what we would normally call "industrial" -- meaning trucking or manufacturing. It is dominated by hotels, generally pretty nice hotels, Class A office space, you know, some biotech, that sort of thing.

We also have under Gateway, because of past industrial use there, unknown toxic contamination, but every time anybody tries to dig up the street, we have to be very careful. We characterize as we go, because we simply don't know what's there.

PPH2-23

PPH2-24

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

As we go further north toward Oyster Point Boulevard, there's no question that we have toxics. And once across Oyster Point Boulevard, which, by the way, carries in excess of 20,000 average daily trips going to and from the east area in South San Francisco, then we know we have severe toxics problems. I think Mr. Lee summarized that better than I'm planning on going into today, but going through the cap and getting into the heavy metals and other things that we know are gathered there, although we don't know exactly where, is going to be a major issue.

PPH2-24

Further, there is, almost directly at the intersection of Oyster Point Boulevard and Gateway, a 300-position childcare center that is now in operation.

Further, about a half mile down Gateway, the City has broken ground on a new 100-position childcare facility. And that will be in operation by the time this project is under way.

So there are a number of technical issues. It appears at least at this point in our analysis that the project description route is probably environmentally superior. There are far fewer impacts with regard to toxics, with regard to our most sensitive receptors -- young children -- with traffic disruption, and a variety of other issues.

So, as I said, we will be submitting formal comments. Thank you for the opportunity.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you, Mr. Sparks.

Yes.

STATEMENT OF MS. WILLIAMS

THE WITNESS: I'm Jackie Williams, and I live in South San Francisco. And I would like to put on the record that I'm for the no-project alternative, and to find out if we really need this project, period.

PPH2-25

The four turbines that Williams is installing give us 180 megawatts. The Potrero plant gives us 540 megawatts, and is still an issue. Even though Mirant is going bankrupt -- it could be taken over -- the CEC could still approve this project.

And my concern --

And there are also upgrades, lots of upgrades, that have been done on different lines.

And there still seems some dispute as far as how many megawatts is actually available. And it seems like we're not going to --

The four turbine units that Williams has have to be sited by the end of the year, lest we lose them. The siting of those projects has still not been determined, even though we don't know whether there's going to be one turbine at the airport or two, which is going to affect San Bruno; and they're completely unaware this is going on.

We also need to -- I guess basically it seems like there's a lot of if's.

And I think the need issue -- there's not enough people looking into the need issue. San Francisco is obviously looking to the need issue. And a lot of the environmental groups in the Bayview, because they don't want the project in their backyard, they want to move it to someone else's backyard. And what I don't want to see is -- they're very involved. All the meetings I go to, San Francisco is very, very involved. And there's no participation from any of the counties -- any of the cities in San Mateo. They're not participating. Even though now we've got Daly City who's going to be an intervenor, and we also have San Bruno as an intervenor, there are people here today from South San Francisco for the first time who just

PPH2-26

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

found out about the project, that found out one of the alternatives might go through their backyard.

And so there's still, I feel, a lot of information that we don't have available to us as far as how many megawatts we actually need in the Peninsula and in San Francisco, and if we really need this project.

And I'd like to know if the CPUC has somebody who can be helping us as far as a no-project alternative, as far as looking into the megawatt need, because I can't do it. And there has to be somebody, because the only two people that are going to be at the table when we do the need issue is going to be San Francisco City and County, and there's going to be ORA maybe; they're not sure. Even though they said at the prehearing they were going to get involved, they still haven't done any work on it.

I'm wondering who is going to protect the people to know if we really just need this project, or if it's just a way of getting us to put in a transmission line and loads of power plants where the power is going to go out of our state. And I'm wondering if the CPUC has any kind of money available, which is probably not there, but I'm going to ask anyway if, under the no-project alternative, there's somebody you can get, other than PG&E, who is looking after their interests, other than the City and County of San Francisco, who is looking after their interests. Who's looking after the people's interests in San Mateo County and the Peninsula? Because all the meetings I go to, San Francisco is at the table, but there's nobody in San Mateo that's at the table that I can -- that I've seen.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Well, let me respond to that just briefly.

Ms. Williams referred to ORA. It's the Office of Ratepayer Advocates, a branch of the Commission that is assigned the task or given the task of representing the interests of ratepayers in proceedings before the Commission. We do expect them to be involved. I don't know to what extent. I'm not in charge of that, so I can't speak for them.

We do provide the possibility of intervenor funding. There's a group called the 280 Concerned Citizens Coalition, I believe, that has applied for and has been granted intervenor status. If they make a substantial contribution, they may be eligible for compensation, but they're the only consumer group that has applied for potential compensation in this case.

MS. WILSON: I have spoken to them, but I don't know if they're going to follow through. They don't have -- they are trying to save money, too, and are not spending too much money, so I don't think they're going to go to the full extent that needs to be done on this process.

ALJ TERKEURST: I can't speak for them either, so I don't know.

Would anyone else -- yes. I would ask people to state their names for the record.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you saying something to me?

ALJ TERKEURST: Yes. I was calling you, asking you if you want to speak.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, please.

STATEMENT OF MS. LEAVENGOOD

MS. LEAVENGOOD: Carol Leavengood. I live on Cheryl Drive here in San Bruno.

I used to have a lot of respect for PG&E. I had even hoped at one time my son would work for them, but with the recent fiascoes and bankruptcies and personal experiences with PG&E, including coming home last night and finding my power out for the umpteenth

PPH2-26

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

time -- I am not in a too happy mood about it, especially when you've got to go around the house and reset 50 million things.

I don't want to be redundant. I am concerned very much about health.

I'm concerned about cost, especially what's going on in California lately. I am wondering how much more a lot of us can handle. I feel like my back's being broken from the way that some costs and rate increases that are coming right and left, not just on PG&E, but 50 million other things.

PPH2-27

And in the past, if my memory serves me right -- as you mature in life, sometimes your memory isn't as good, because there's a lot to put in there. I remember them talking about Crestmoor Garden Center that used to sit on the corner, which would be adjacent to where the power tower would be. And I used to -- one of the reasons that left was because they were concerned about earthquakes in the area. And yet since then, I've seen houses along there. Everybody suddenly seems to want to come in, in the very area that they said they didn't want people in. So I am very much concerned about earthquakes.

PPH2-28

I am particularly -- I probably feel almost as strongly on aesthetics as I do health, because, as many people commented here, San Bruno's been battling, trying to get itself improved in appearance over the years. And it seems like every time we go forward, we get knocked back two steps, and I can't stomach that.

PPH2-29

I also want to mention that the last time I appeared at one of these hearings that you had here in San Bruno, somebody mentioned about -- well, why don't we put it west of Skyline?

PPH2-30

Well, as a west-of-Skyline resident, let me tell you I don't like the idea of: what we don't want in our yard, let's put it over in somebody else's.

West of Skyline and east of railroad area have had tremendous impacts from BART, from the jail, from housing coming in. I don't think it should be shoved to somebody else.

I think undergrounding is probably the best answer, although I worry about costs. I worry about the safety of earthquakes for that, but if it's the least of the poisons, I guess I'd take undergrounding.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

Anyone else? Going once.

Okay. Well, I thank you all for coming. We will be back this evening at 7:00. If you know of anyone who might be interested, please remind them of that. And I thank you all very much.

This public-participation hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 3:10 p.m., a recess was taken until 7:00 p.m.)

* * * * *

EVENING SESSION - 7:10 P.M.

* * * * *

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE TERKEURST: I believe we're about ready to get started here.

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

This is the time and place for the fourth public participation hearing in Application 02-09-043 before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California. This case is the application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity authorizing the construction of the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV transmission project.

My name is Charlotte TerKeurst. I'm the administrative law judge assigned to this case. And I thank you all for coming.

The purpose of the public participation hearings as they are named is to hear from the public. Whether they're projects like this or proceedings like this before the Commission, we're very interested in getting your opinions about the project, about the alternatives that have been identified. So we schedule these in the area that will be affected by the proposed project if it's built.

With me this evening to my right are Billie Blanchard. She's the project manager for the Commission's environmental review of the proposed projects. To her right is Kris Keller. She's with the Aspen Environmental Group, which is the environmental consultant that we hired to prepare the Environmental Impact Reports for us, consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA.

Billie and Kris will be giving about a 15-minute overview of the project and the alternatives that have been identified very shortly. We will go off the record while they do that because they're doing this at every one of these hearings, and we really don't need to have a transcript of it every time. Just to let you know why the court reporter will not be taking down what they say. And then we'll go back on the record for the comments from the public.

Also present this evening is Harriet Burt, back there. She's our Public Advisor. She's here to assist in getting the sign-up list and can provide you lots of information about the Commission and our proceedings if you'd like to talk with her about anything like that.

Is there someone from PG&E here?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Indicating)

ALJ TERKEURST: Yes. Could you identify yourself.

MR. MASUOKA: Bob Masuoka, PG&E.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. He will be available if you have questions of PG&E as well.

Billie and Kris will describe the timelines and the procedures for the environmental review. Right now we're in the comment period, the draft EIR has been published. We plan to come back again in November, November 18, after the final EIR has been published.

I've been cautioning people, though, because of the state budget crisis there's a chance that we won't be able to have that public hearing, unfortunately. But if it is canceled, we will still want to hear from you through letters or calls or emails. So don't feel like we've gone away if you are not able to come back.

The proceeding before the Commission is, I guess you could call it a two-phase proceeding. We're doing the full environmental review subject to CEQA; and then after that we will have a more formal evidentiary process. The parties that are involved in that will file prepared written testimony and rebuttal testimony, and then there will be hearings before me the first week in December, and then briefs and reply briefs. And we're anticipating a Commission decision on the project about the middle of 2004.

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

The record will remain open if -- as someone mentioned earlier, even after the environmental impact review is complete, if you send letters or emails or whatever after that, they will still be routed. I will read them. They will be routed to the commissioners' offices. So don't feel like the record is closed once the final Environmental Impact Report comes out.

The hearings this evening are very informal. You won't be under oath. We do take a transcript, so your comments are available to the commissioners as they review the record.

I ask, in general, if you can limit your comments to three to five minutes. That will help us. If you need longer, then you can take longer. But generally, it's three to five minutes.

In deference to the reporters, I ask that you state your name when you come up to speak, speak clearly, don't speak too fast so that the reporter can take down what you are saying. We will take speakers first who have signed up with Harriet at the back, but then there will be plenty of time for anyone else who decides that they have something to say after they hear. Don't feel like you have to decide right now whether you want to speak.

I believe that's about it. I'll turn the proceeding over to Billie and Kris right now. And we'll go off the record right now. Thank you.

(Off the record)

ALJ TERKEURST: Let's go back on the record.

Kris just gave the information about how to get comments on the EIR to the environmental team. If you send comments after their work is done, you can send them directly to the Public Utilities Commission to the Public Advisor, and the address there is 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, 94102. I don't know the email address.

Harriet, do you?

MS. BURT: Very well. public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov. I've got cards on the table.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. One thing I forgot to mention when I was describing what we'd like the rest of the evening to be: When you speak, if you have opinions, not just about whether the project should be built but of the alternatives, we'd like to hear not only which ones you don't like but which ones you find least objectionable. I assume you're here because you have concerns. But if there are routes that you think are reasonable routes, then we'd like to hear them as well as we try to understand where the areas of concern are and where there may be some routes that you find acceptable.

With that, the first person who has signed up to speak is Larry Franzella. Good evening.

STATEMENT OF MR. FRANZELLA

MR. FRANZELLA: Good evening. I'm Larry Franzella. I'm the mayor of the City of San Bruno, and I'm here representing this evening a unanimous city council, which is not always my pleasure, but this evening I am representing a unanimous city council.

As you can imagine, this issue is of great concern to the citizenry of this community, especially the 70-foot transition tower that's proposed at the entrance to a residential community and to our gateway to the west coming on San Bruno Avenue.

We do appreciate you holding the hearings here and we appreciate the work that we've done to this date with the CPUC, and we know that they've listened and heard our comments as the Draft Environmental Impact Report shows.

PPH2-31

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

The City is in complete support of Alternative 1B, the all-underground method. This is the only alternative that addresses and reduces all of the impacts -- visual, recreational land use -- to anything less than a significant degree. It is the best choice for everyone.

As to partial underground, we understand that our neighbors to the south in the City of Burlingame are supporting the partial underground and they want to continue along through there. And we told the PUC previously and we've told PG&E before that if there needs to be a transition station, it needs to be west of Skyline Boulevard. It needs to be where the current station is or at some location near Sneath Lane. That's not our most preferable, but that's something we can work with.

The Glenview and San Bruno Avenue design is absolutely not acceptable. It comes nowhere close to anything that this community should have to live with. It is the ugliest thing. It's beyond my comprehension that anyone in designing this could even come up with it.

I'm sure you've had an opportunity to take a look at the Draft Environmental Impact Report that shows what the current site looks like, which is right in the middle of our redevelopment area where we've just, after years of agonizing effort, been successful in removing a blighted gas station that was vacant and abandoned. We've been working with the developer possibly to build townhouses. And now you want to build something that, to me, is only reminiscent of possibly Chernobyl. This is absolutely horrible to even consider in a residential neighborhood. Anyone looking at the pictures could see that.

The Draft Environment Impact Report agrees that it's impossible to mitigate impacts at the San Bruno Avenue and Glenview site. You've got that massive amount of height and concrete that the 15-gallon trees that PG&E plans on planting will never cover. They're not going to grow above 70 feet.

I'd just like to leave you with saying: Please, not at San Bruno and Glenview Drive. It's not an acceptable area. If there has to be a transition station, it has to be some place that can work for all the citizenry of this community. The Sneath Lane Station has an existing PG&E facility and it could work in that location if we must have a transition station, but definitely not at San Bruno and Glenview.

I'd like to ask you to please make sure that you keep the city informed. And we appreciate the hearing process as its gone along. Thank you very much.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you, Mr. Franzella.

The next speaker is Norma Bureau Elias.

STATEMENT OF MS. ELIAS

MS. ELIAS: Yes. Thank you. My name is Norma Bureau Elias and I live at 3231 Crestmoor Drive. I would like to commend the mayor on presenting it so well --

ALJ TERKEURST: Can you use the mic? I'm sorry.

MS. ELIAS: -- as to how the area of San Bruno feels about it. I'm sure the whole city feels the same way as he expressed tonight. But I also would like to question the PG&E gentleman that's here representing PG&E.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear.

ALJ TERKEURST: I'm sorry. I think you can take that off.

PPH2-31

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

MS. ELIAS: I would like to question the PG&E gentleman, if I could. If he would please stand up. Will he please stand up, the man that represents PG&E.

ALJ TERKEURST: Let me hear what your question is. The purpose of the public participation hearing is not to have PG&E testify. So let's hear what your questions are.

MS. ELIAS: I see. Well, the question is very simple. I was cleaning out my file and I came across this (holding document). It must be five or six years old. And it says how harmful the EMF magnetic fields are and the electric fields are. Will we get -- in this transition station, would we get anything from that transition? What happens there with these fields? Do they come out into the area?

PPH2-32

ALJ TERKEURST: Let me refer that to our consultants. I'd rather not --

MS. ELIAS: I think that's of major interest to our community. I mean, we're worried about what it looks like; and we should, but this is really what's important to us. So when you look at this, you're not even supposed to be standing near a microwave oven without a certain distance.

I can't believe what they're trying to do to our city. That's what I'm trying to say. This is completely wrong. And that is the gateway to our city. And it looks so much better, as our mayor said, without that miserable old gas station that was there for years and years and years. And I wish it could stay just open space there. It looks beautiful.

PPH2-33

That's my thinking, but I would really request that this gets answered for the people of our community, because we have schools in that area, and we have a church, and we have a shopping mall, a gas station. And we would be getting it 24 hours a day. The people should be up in arms about this. PG&E should have a right to answer that question.

ALJ TERKEURST: They will, but not at the public-participation hearing. There will be formal hearings where they will have their experts under oath to answer questions like that.

MS. ELIAS: I understand.

ALJ TERKEURST: But I'll ask Billie to describe briefly the work that the Commission has done in that area.

MS. BLANCHARD: We have a section in the draft EIR that discusses the EMF issues, but what I would like to do for you is to get your name and address, so that I can make sure that we get an answer to that question. So I don't have my EMF specialist here tonight.

MS. ELIAS: I don't want the answer. I want the mayor to get the answer for the people of San Bruno. I would like to hear it from him.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: All right. Thank you.

The next person on the list is Tom Roberts, if I'm reading that correctly; if not, I apologize.

STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERTS

MR. ROBERTS: My name is Tom, and I'm a citizen and resident of San Francisco, so I represent the group that will benefit from this line. I'm an environmental activist with a major organization, but I can't give the name yet until we have had a chance to vote on this.

PPH2-34

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

In general, we would be opposed to such a large project bringing power into the city, since we believe more in conservation and efficiency of resources in meeting the city's energy needs, but what we look at in the city is the alternative to this line not being built, or what it can accomplish. Primarily, it's shutting down plants that are 20-plus years old that are causing high rates of respiratory illness in residents of the least-expensive -- excuse me -- the poorest area of San Francisco. If those -- to close those plants, we need new capacity, either in the city or imported.

PPH2-34

One option being considered by the CEC is a natural gas plant that's approximately the same amount of capacity that this line would bring in, but if that is passed, we now have a plant in the city that's going to be there for decades that's running on a limited resource, which Alan Greenspan has said is going to be causing problems here shortly.

So we look at the alternatives to this line. And the City has looked at it very closely, and said that in combination with increased conservation, increased efficiency measures, and trying very hard to develop renewable energy, those -- my group will be working for those things, but it's not going to be enough in the short term to close these dirty plants down. So we are for the plan. And so I'd like to add some support to the plan.

I haven't yet looked at the options between above-ground and below-ground, but the comment I'd like to make to the people in this room that might be opposed: I understand San Francisco will gain by this project, and you will be impacted. There will be long-term impacts, too; possible habitat loss. If it's above ground, it will be visual degradation. There might be EMF issues. In the short term you'll be inconvenienced, but what will be gained could actually be people's lives in San Francisco, because these plants have been proven to cause high rates of asthma and respiratory illness for some of the poorest citizens in the city. And I hope you keep that in mind as you're considering this project.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

The next speaker is Scott Buschman.

STATEMENT OF MR. BUSCHMAN

MR. BUSCHMAN: Scott Buschman. I'm a 16-year resident of the city of San Bruno.

PPH2-35

I'm here tonight to endorse what the draft EIR concludes is the environmentally superior alternative, which is Option 1B for the southern segment, and the modified underground collocation alternative for the northern segment.

I am glad that through the process of developing the draft, that you have found the plan that eliminates basically all the significant Class 1 impacts. Granted, with this plan there will be some temporary impacts associated with the construction of the project, but once completed, this route will have very little impact on our county, while the other options will continue to impact -- would continue to impact our county forever.

I live in San Bruno, and I was quite upset when I saw PG&E's original proposal for this project. One of the key problems, as the mayor stated, was the transition -- the proposed transition station at the corner of San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive. Placing a 10-by-13-foot concrete transition station with a 50- to 75-foot tower surrounded by a 100-foot fence at that location is a terrible idea.

Not only is this an area -- not only is this area a gateway to the city; it is a Gateway to a neighborhood. We were all concerned with the visual blight this tower and structure would create in our neighborhood, not to mention the effect on our property values, with the industrial rather than residential look that it would bring. Homes sit within a couple hundred

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

feet of this -- of this proposed site, and new homes are being planned to be on the lot directly across the street. **PPH2-35**

Locating a transition station adjacent to an active earthquake fault and having the line cross the fault line also seemed poorly thought out, especially since one of the purposes of this project is to provide reliable service from one end of the county to the other. What would happen to the service if there were a major earthquake? No one could guarantee that that service would be uninterrupted. **PPH2-36**

So any alternative that includes a transition station in San Bruno is unacceptable. And again, your own document states that there is no way to mitigate those impacts to less than significant.

I also agree with the draft that the northern segment alternative, like in the modified underground collocation alternative, is better, because it's shorter, and it doesn't -- excuse me -- doesn't disturb residential areas as much.

I was quite dismayed when I first heard of the project on March 11th at a city council meeting, mainly because it was after the scoping process was completed. It appeared that PG&E was trying to sneak their plan through without notifying all those that should be notified. And though they may have followed the law with their method of public notification, I think the CEQA and the PUC rules do not go far enough in notifying stakeholders in a city. When you're proposing a project of this size and scope, I would like to see these rules rewritten to enlarge the geographic area of those that must be notified, as well as increasing -- increase the number of ways that you are required to notify the public, so that more people can be a part of this process from the very beginning. **PPH2-37**

I am very thankful that our mayor and our city councilmen -- members in San Bruno went further than the PG&E and the PUC did, and they notified many more residents through direct mail, through notification on our cable TV system. And they notified us about the PG&E proposal. And they held an emergency city council meeting on March 20th. I think about 200 residents attended this meeting. And they all spoke out against the proposed plan.

So again, any transition station in San Bruno is unacceptable. We believe it would severely and significantly impact our city forever. And that's, again, why we are in favor of Option 1B.

Thank you.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you.

We also have a request to speak from Tony Lee. Mr. Lee.

STATEMENT OF MR. LEE

MR. LEE: Hi. How are you doing? My name is Tony Lee, and we reside at 1435 Lakeview Drive in Hillsborough.

Two days ago, I attended the meeting held at the city hall over in the San Mateo area. And at that time -- I actually walked in here a little bit late, so I don't know what was already discussed. There were -- when I counted, over 200 people that attended that meeting. And basically, I attended that meeting because I had immense concerns over EMFs. **PPH2-38**

I submitted a protest letter back on October 29th, 2002, attended the scoping meetings, attended that informational meeting two nights ago, and it was somewhat of a relief to see how many other people shared my views as far as their concerns with EMFs.

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

The reason I was thinking there may not be a lot of support is because if you look at the EIR, there's one -- half a page addressed to EMF exposure. And in a nutshell, basically their explanation for that was that there's not necessarily any proof.

PPH2-38

I'm not going to go through what I said last time, but for -- there's a lot of recent evidence showing that they're very -- there is a lot of evidence.

In any case, so today, the reason I'm here again is because clearly this is a major issue for everyone. And the Aspen Group was engaged to figure out exactly what is the best scenario. And considering everything that was stated, it seems that the Aspen Group is acknowledging that there are some real fears and some real health concerns. So that was a relief to me.

Apparently there's a couple of different alternatives. So after that meeting two nights ago, I was somewhat relieved. Particularly under one plan, which is the partial underground plan.

Yesterday, after going to sleep, waking up, I looked at that plan a little more thoroughly, and I looked at my specific home. So today I'm appearing here specifically -- it may be a one-household situation. I'm not sure. But I would imagine it affects at least a couple of different households. Under that plan, we would -- our tower would not only potentially remain -- and I want to emphasize this tower is less than 30 feet away from the master bedroom of our house -- it would actually potentially become bigger.

PPH2-39

I think right now it's just a regular tower. And the idea is to turn it into a transition station. So the problem I have with that is there is some acknowledgment that this is a real concern and certain designs have been produced to address that, and that's good. But how is it that that's acknowledged for the mass and then it's not acknowledged for a select group of individuals? That's what I don't understand.

You know, you could have -- if this were something as simple as saying this group gets 12 eggs and this group doesn't because some people have to sacrifice or whatnot, you know, that's a different thing. Here we're talking about people's lives. And when you deal -- you don't have the FDA, you don't have the -- you don't have various agencies saying well, they might cure 2,000 people of cancers, but in the process 20 people will die and 20 people will have to sacrifice. There is no such thing as a sacrifice when it comes to people's lives.

There has -- you know. What's the options? There's plenty of space around our area. There's a creek right before, and I was -- what was explained to me is that the creek does not allow the line to go underneath. I don't know. I mean, but what I would like to eventually -- the information that I would eventually like to receive is not just that this can't be done. I'd like to understand why it can't, for instance, be put underneath the creek or put through the creek with a shell or whatnot?

I'd also like to know why the tower cannot be placed, you know, much more remote from our house because there is plenty of space.

I've submitted -- I've e-mailed a letter basically outlining all of this and -- so, you know, I'm sure it will get addressed. But -- so as time goes on, you know, I'm sure that that will be addressed.

But there's just one other item that I wanted to talk about. Besides the partial route - - partial underground alternative, there's the total underground alternative. I guess this is my question: If under a partial underground alternative situation we can place both the 60 kV and 2 kV [sic] volt underground, why, under a total underground, will we not be able to do the same?

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

PPH2-39

I understand under the partial underground -- or, I'm sorry, under the total underground you have certain -- maybe certain laws have been put into place, there are certain bureaucratic things that are occurring. But if we could somehow do it under -- the underground, partial underground situation, then I'm not sure why these two situations would be so dramatically different where we wouldn't be able to do that. I'm sure that there's some explanation.

But my request is that we don't simply accept -- if the explanation is simply "it's law," "it's historical," things constantly change. Things have to change. The laws have to change with it. If we don't do it now, when are we going to do it.

Just from my own experience, there are not necessarily loopholes, but there's ways of interpreting laws. And if it can be done under one scenario, then it can be done under another.

So on behalf of my family and several other families that this might affect, you know, particularly -- I say my household because I don't know any other household that has a tower as close to their home as ours. I'm sure that there might be one or two others. But 30 feet. That's -- I can't even believe that something that -- you know, something like that was allowed.

I spoke to Billie Blanchard briefly and she stated that she will investigate this. I don't want to misrepresent our conversation. But I think that you were somewhat taken aback. Also, you were kind of surprised. And you stated that possibly there may be a mistake with Figure D.3-20A. That's in the large -- big EIR. So I'm hoping to God that is a mistake and I'm here, you know, without me necessarily having to be here. And if that's the case, you know, great. If it's not, all the questions that I posed before, please, you know, can we take this very seriously? Thank you.

MS. BLANCHARD: We will. That map was produced and had to go out with the draft EIR at the last minute. I didn't have an opportunity to, quite frankly, edit and review. And so we've got to take a second look at that area and reconsider the design of that area. We didn't -- there was no thought and intention of having a transition station in your backyard.

MR. LEE: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. I wanted to say a few things in response to not just what Mr. Lee has said but what some other speakers have said this evening and in the prior public participation hearings this week.

As the judge, I am not in control of what parties bring before me when the hearings occur. And obviously, different parties will have different perspectives. So to some extent I'm saying if there are issues that you feel like are not being adequately addressed in the environmental impact report, let us know.

There is one consumer group called the 280 Concerned Citizens Coalition that I think most of its members are further south along the line, along the 60 kV corridor, and they have expressed on Tuesday and in previous correspondence with us a lot of concerns about the EMF issue and other environmental issues related to the above-ground alternatives. I don't know if any of you would be interested in hooking up with them if you haven't already or if you would do it in the future.

They have filed to become certified as an Intervenor in the evidentiary hearings, and I've granted that request. If they make a substantial contribution to the Commission's order, they will be eligible for intervenor compensation.

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

So there are avenues for citizen groups to get information into the formal evidentiary proceedings. And I'm always in favor of a full record. So I look forward to what they have to say in the formal proceeding this fall.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak this evening? Yes.

Good evening.

STATEMENT OF MS. LOUTZENHEISER

MS. LOUTZENHEISER: Good evening. My name is Dale Loutzenheiser. I'm a Burlingame resident, part of the Burlingame-Hillsborough-Skyline area, also part of the 280 CCC which the Judge just mentioned. And though I and my family and my neighbors do appreciate the draft EIR and the efforts that went into that and some of the proponents here tonight on the Alternative 1B, I would like to state tonight that in the area that I come from and the many other neighbors that I have, 1B would surround our neighborhood with towers on the 280 side on our property and lines, though underground, lines they will be; right down Skyline for quite a ways. This would be more of an impact on the families of this entire area, the health concerns and issues that are keeping some of us awake at night; you know, our homes, our property values. I keep thinking about the transportation issues of tearing up Skyline to put these lines underground.

PPH2-40

So I'm here tonight to encourage the interest in at least the partial underground route. This would put the line in that area either underground. And the free space area on the other side of 280, we have a reserve back there that the towers are sitting on anyway. And they mow it down to keep it for a fire issue. So obviously the soil and plant life and wildlife are affected yearly.

And so, again, I'm here tonight to please encourage the partial underground, if not, as Mr. Lee said, a complete underground. Thank you very much.

ALJ TERKEURST: Thank you. Anyone else? All right. Oh. I'm sorry.

STATEMENT OF MR. RICCI

MR. RICCI: Good evening. I'm Tom Ricci. 3340 Crestmoor Drive. I support Mayor Larry Franzella and our council in undergrounding the entire line. And I know that you can look at it from the standpoint of each city pursuing their own needs. But I think that every city says it should be a hundred percent underground.

PPH2-41

It looks like to me that this line is benefiting San Francisco. San Francisco has Hetch Hetchy property. It's wide open. Why can't it be put in there? Why should we have to worry about it impacting our cities, our home, our lives?

I read in the newspaper recently that the City of San Francisco is trying to get rid of Hunters Point and Potrero power plant. And they're trying to get the city residents to accept building five alternative plants, small, but they don't want them. So while they're trying to decide what they want to do in their own city, we're being asked to be impacted on our ends. I don't think that we should be impacted by these transmission towers.

PPH2-42

The towers right now are high enough. I don't know -- no one likes them, but people aren't saying anything about them. But now they're going for them to be extended higher. That's going to be a blight on our community. So I think without any alternative other than the super alternative underground hundred percent.

And I think that the city of San Bruno should also pursue being an Intervenor in the hearings so that we are present at all times. Thank you.

Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno 8/14/03, cont.

ALJ TERKEURST: And I should have mentioned that. The City of San Bruno is an Intervenor, Daly City is an Intervenor. The City of Hillsborough. So at least three cities have intervened in the formal proceedings as well.

Anyone else?

(No response)

ALJ TERKEURST: All right. Well, since there are no other speakers, we will conclude the public participation hearing. Thank you very much. I really appreciated your turning out tonight and listening and participating. Good evening.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 8:05 p.m., this matter having been continued to 2:00 p.m., November 18, 2003 at San Francisco, California, the Commission then adjourned.)

Responses to Comments Made at the Public Participation Hearing, San Bruno, 8/14/03

Ms. Giannini

- PPH2-1 Please see Response to Comment GR-1 for a discussion regarding EMF.
- PPH2-2 The land use and neighborhood concerns stated in this comment are consistent with those described in Draft EIR Section D.2.3.4 (Land Use) in which the proposed transition station is identified as a significant and unmitigable impact. Two alternative transition stations are studied in the EIR, as well as the PG&E Underground 1B Alternative, all of which would not require a transition station at San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive. Also, three additional transition station alternatives are considered in the Final EIR: the Glenview Drive Transition Tower Alternative, Trousdale Drive Transition Station Alternative, and Golf Course Drive Transition Station Alternative (see Appendix 1, Section 4.3.1). The commenter's concerns regarding the proposed transition station are noted.
- PPH2-3 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF. The Proposed Project does not include construction of a new substation, but modification of several existing stations would be required.
- PPH2-4 The commenter's preference for underground lines is noted.
- PPH2-5 The commenter's support of the Westborough Boulevard Alternative is noted. There are several alternative routes, including the proposed route that would avoid the canyon in San Bruno. Sections D.4.3 and D.4.4 (Biological Resources) discuss impacts of the Proposed Project and alternative routes and proposed mitigation measures that would reduce potential impacts to the Northern Segment of the project to less than significant levels.

Mr. Dudley

- PPH2-6 Please see Response to Comment CC10-1. Based on Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b, construction timing could be scheduled around off-peak hours and the duration of construction would vary between locations. Section B.3.3.3 of the Draft EIR, details the duration and workforce of underground construction along any single road segment. The entire 13-mile underground segment of the Proposed Project is estimated to take approximately 12 months and individual road segments are estimated to take from 5 to 11 months. The alternative routes are expected to follow a similar timeline. Please see Responses to Comment Set H (City of South San Francisco), and specifically Responses to Comments H-1 and H-14 for a discussion of hazardous materials and conditions and Response to Comment H-2 for a discussion of alternative route option segments for the Modified Underground Existing 230 kV Collocation Alternative.

Ms. Anding

- PPH2-7 The concerns regarding power plants and support for the project by the San Francisco Community Power Cooperative are noted. Also, please see Response to Comment CC2-1 (San Francisco Community Power Cooperative).

PPH2-8 The commenter's opposition to the proposed transition station location and preference for underground lines are noted. Please see General Responses GR-1 and GR-2 regarding EMF and property values, respectively.

Ms. Baum

PPH2-9 The commenter's opposition to the proposed transition station location and preference for underground lines are noted. The land use and neighborhood concerns stated in this comment are consistent with those described in EIR Section D.2.3.4 (Land Use) in which the proposed transition station is identified as a significant and unmitigable impact. Two alternative transition stations are studied in the EIR, as well as the PG&E Underground 1B Alternative, all of which would not require a transition station at San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive. Additional transition station alternatives are considered in the Final EIR (see Appendix 1, Section 4.3.1). Also, please see Responses to Comment Set B (City of San Bruno).

Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF. As discussed in Section D.8.7.4, Consideration of Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF), no-cost/low-cost mitigation is proposed by PG&E with priority given to schools and daycare centers.

PPH2-10 Please refer to Section D.6.3.4 (Geology, Soils, and Paleontology) for a discussion of potential seismic impacts at the proposed transition station location. New information from the Geomatrix (2003) report has been incorporated into this Final EIR to indicate that fault rupture hazard impacts at the proposed transition station site are mitigable to less than significant levels, and to update the discussion of the arrangement of the main fault trace and secondary traces.

Mr. Zelnik

PPH2-11 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF. As discussed in Section D.8.7.4, Consideration of Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF), no-cost/low-cost EMF mitigation is proposed by PG&E, with priority for mitigation given to schools and daycare centers.

PPH2-12 Please refer to Response to Comment PPH2-9 for a discussion of land use and visual concerns at the proposed transition station location. Also, please see Responses to Comment Set B (City of San Bruno).

The Partial Underground Alternative and the overhead crossing around Crystal Springs Dam under PG&E Route Option 1B Alternative both would require additional transition stations/towers. The potential impacts of the transition structures are considered in the alternatives section of each issue area. However, CEQA and this Draft EIR do not consider cost in the evaluation of alternatives. Cost of the project and alternatives would be addressed by the CPUC Administrative Law Judge during the general proceeding on the project.

PPH2-13 The commenter's preference for underground lines and the Environmentally Superior Alternative route is noted.

PPH2-14 Please see Response to Comment PPH2-9 and Responses to Comment Set B (City of San Bruno).

PPH2-15 Please see Response to Comment 2-10.

Mr. (Hanns) Lee

- PPH2-16 Regarding notification of the release of the Draft EIR, please see General Response GR-4. Also, please see Responses to Comment Set CC15 (Oyster Point Owners Association).
- PPH2-17 Please see Responses to Comment Set CC15, and specifically Response to Comment CC15-1 regarding land use designations.
- PPH2-18 Please see Responses to Comment Set CC15, and specifically Response to Comment CC15-2 regarding hotel business. Also, please see Response to Comment CC9-1 regarding mitigation measures that would reduce disruption to businesses.
- PPH2-19 Please see Responses to Comment Sets CC15 (Oyster Point Owners Association) and Comment Set H (City of South San Francisco), and specifically Responses to Comments H-1 and H-14 for a discussion of hazardous materials and conditions.
- PPH2-20 Table A-3, Permits Required for the Jefferson-Martin Project, in Section A of the Draft EIR, lists the agencies, including the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and necessary permits. The CPUC's approval authority for the project does not preempt the jurisdiction of the RWQCB to oversee cleanup of contaminated sites.
- PPH2-21 Please see Response to Comment CC15-4.

Ms. Wilson

- PPH2-22 The text in Table F-1, Cumulative Scenario – Approved and Pending Projects, has been revised in this Final EIR to include the Bay West Cove Project. In addition, Figure F-1b, Cumulative Project Locations – Northern Segment, has been revised to incorporate the addition to the table.

Mr. Sparks

- PPH2-23 The commenter's opposition to the proposed transition station location and preference for undergrounding the entire route of the project are noted. Please see Response to Comment PPH2-9 and Responses to Comment Set B (City of San Bruno).

Section D.4.3.4 (Biological Resources) discusses the biological setting and impacts of the proposed transition station location at Glenview Drive and San Bruno Avenue. The Draft EIR found that there would be no impacts to biological resources because the proposed transition station site is in a developed urban area on a highly disturbed unvegetated dirt and gravel parking lot (previously used as a gas station).

- PPH2-24 Please see Responses to Comment Sets H (City of South San Francisco), CC10 (South San Francisco Chamber of Commerce), and CC16 (Golden Gate Produce Terminal). The commenter's support for the proposed route over the Modified Underground Existing 230 kV Alternative is noted. As a result of comments on the Draft EIR and additional analysis included in this Final EIR, the EIR finds that the Proposed Project and the Modified Underground Existing Alternative are both environmentally superior to other northern segment alternatives.

Ms. Williams

PPH2-25 The commenter's support for the No Project Alternative is noted. Please see Responses to Comments PPH1-67, PPH1-68, and PPH1-69.

PPH2-26 Please see Responses to Comments PPH1-67, PPH1-68, and PPH1-69.

Ms. Leavengood

PPH2-27 If the Jefferson-Martin Project is approved by the CPUC, all California electricity consumers would pay for the project as part of their electricity rates. CEQA and this EIR do not consider cost in their evaluation of alternatives. Cost of the project and alternatives would be addressed by the CPUC Administrative Law Judge during the general proceeding on the project.

PPH2-28 Please see Response to Comment 2-10.

PPH2-29 Please see Response to Comment PPH2-9. Also, please see Response to Comment Set B (City of San Bruno).

PPH2-30 The commenter's preference for undergrounding and opposition to the West of Skyline Transition Station Alternative are noted.

Mr. Franzella

PPH2-31 Please see Responses to Comment Set B (City of San Bruno). The commenter's opposition to the proposed transition station and preference for an all-underground alternative or the Sneath Lane transition station location (if need be) are noted.

Mr. Elias

PPH2-32 EMF emissions are addressed in Section D.8.7.4 of the EIR, in which graphs are presented that illustrate the magnetic field at varying distances from project facilities. Magnetic field levels are a function of distance and so as the lines would run from overhead to underground on or in the transition structure, they would, therefore, be located closer to people and residences on the ground than lines running only overhead on the towers. Figure D.8-2 illustrates the magnetic field of an underground 230 kV line; at the point where the line would cross the sidewalk and enter the Glenview Road right-of-way. The magnetic field immediately above the line would be about 70 mG. Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF.

PPH2-33 Please see Response to Comment PPH2-9 for a discussion of land uses at the proposed transition station site and to General Response GR-1 regarding EMF. Also, please see Response to Comment Set B (City of San Bruno).

Mr. Roberts

PPH2-34 The commenter's concerns regarding power plants and support for the project are noted. Please see Responses to Comment Set CC8 (For Future Generations).

Mr. Buschman

- PPH2-35 The commenter's support for the Environmentally Superior Alternative and opposition to the proposed transition station location are noted. Please see Response to Comment PPH2-9 for a discussion of land uses at the proposed transition station site, and General Response GR-2 regarding property values. Also, please see Response to Comment Set B (City of San Bruno).
- PPH2-36 Please see Section D.6.3.4 (Geology, Soils, and Paleontology) for a discussion of potential seismic impacts at the proposed transition station location. New information from the Geomatrix (2003) report has been incorporated into this Final EIR to indicate fault rupture hazard impacts at the proposed transition station site are mitigable to less than significant levels, and to update the discussion of the arrangement of the main fault trace and secondary traces. Mitigation measures for Impact G-5 (Strong Groundshaking from Local and Regional Sources), G-6 (Seismically Induced Ground Failures Including Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading, Seismic Slope Instability, and Ground Cracking), and G-8 (Surface Fault Rupture at Crossings of Active and Potentially Active Fault Traces) would reduce the level of seismic impacts, however, in the event of a major earthquake, electricity service on a larger scale throughout the region would likely be affected.
- PPH2-37 Regarding notification of the release of the Draft EIR, please see General Response GR-4 and refer to "Emails During the Comment Period" from Scott Buschman in Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, and 1.2.8.

Mr. (Tony) Lee

- PPH2-38 Please see General Response GR-1 discussing EMF. Also, please see Response to Comment PPH1-45.
- PPH2-39 Please see Response to Comment PPH1-45 and the added analysis in Appendix 1, Section 4.2.3, for a discussion regarding the location of transition tower 7/39 under the Partial Underground Alternative.

Ms. Loutzenheiser

- PPH2-40 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF and the text addition in Section D.8.7.4 of this Final EIR regarding the EMF analysis and the "sandwich" issue in the Burlingame area 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 because of the distance between the two 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 regarding property values.

Please see Responses to Comments 13-6 and 13-7 regarding roadway construction. Section D.12.3 and D.12.4.1 (PG&E Route Option 1B – Underground) discuss potential transportation impacts and mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels along the Proposed Project and PG&E Route Option 1B Alternative.

The commenter's support for the Partial Underground Alternative, if not a complete underground alternative, is noted.

Mr. Ricci

PPH2-41 The commenter's support for an all-underground alternative is noted. Please see General Response GR-3 for a discussion of the benefits and burdens of the Proposed Project. It should be noted that almost the entire length of the Southern Segment of the Proposed Project is located on SFPUC Peninsula Watershed land (the Hetch Hetchy property referenced by the commenter).

PPH2-42 The commenter's support for an all-underground alternative is noted. Please refer to General Response GR-3 for a discussion of the benefits and burdens of the Proposed Project. The closure of Hunters Point Power Plant (HPPP) Unit 4 and the Williams' turbines are discussed in Section C.6 in the Draft EIR under the No Project Alternative, as well as in Section 4.5.1.2, Non-Wires Alternatives, in Appendix 1. The ISO is the authority that would determine when HPPP can be closed in order that closure has no serious effects on the region's electric service. The CPUC is required, independent of HPPP closure and the status or constraints of the Williams' turbines, to consider the effects of the Proposed Project.

The City of San Bruno is already an intervenor in the formal proceedings, along with Daly City, the Town of Hillsborough, and the 280CCC.

