

Comment Set 1

April 14, 2003

California Public Utilities Commission
Docket Office
505 Van Ness Ave. Room 2001
San Francisco, Ca. 94102

Re: Jefferson-Martin 230kV
Transmission Project
App.# A-02-09-043

Gentlemen:

We are sending our objection to the transfer station of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company which is proposed to be located in San Bruno. The area proposed for the transfer station is on San Bruno Ave. near Glenview Dr. and Skyline Blvd. This AREA is unacceptable.

This area is at the western entrance to our City where we do not want a tall tower to obstruct the landscape and entrance to our City.

We object because it is located near a day care center at Peace Lutheran Church at 850 Glenview Dr. where children play outdoors and the consequences from the transfer station could be harmful to their health.

The site is in a residential neighborhood which is no place to build the transfer station because it could affect the health of the residents.

San Bruno is a good healthy place to live and raise your family and enjoy a good life. We do not need interference from the PG&E when there is other open space that would accommodate this transfer station.

Please reconsider other options available. The one you have chosen is NOT AVAILABLE. The residents of San Bruno say "NO WAY".

Yours truly,



William and Dorothy Goff
591 Maple Ave.
San Bruno, Ca. 94066

REC'D
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM.
STATE OF CALIF.
03 APR 21 AM 12: 02

1-1

1-2

TOTAL P.02

Responses to Comment Set 1 – William and Dorothy Goff

- 1-1 The commenters' opposition to the proposed transition station is acknowledged.
- 1-2 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 having 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, including the Glenview Drive Transition Tower Alternative, Trousdale Drive Transition Tower Alternative, and Golf Course Drive Transition Station Alternative (see Appendix 1, Section 4.3.1), all of which were carried forward to full consideration in the Final EIR for each issue area in Section D.

Comment Set 2

July 3, 2003

Irving Stern
Karen Olson Stern
15 Loma Vista Lane
Burlingame, CA 94010
(650) 348-5639

CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94104

Dear Sirs and Madams:

We are unable to attend the meeting of the Burlingame City Council on Monday evening, July 7, but would like to express our concern and opposition to PG&E's proposed project, known as the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project.

2-1

Our first concern is one of safety. Although the long term effects of exposure to electric and magnetic fields are not conclusive, scientists from the California Department of Health Services are inclined to believe that there are increased health risks, namely some degree of increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease, and miscarriage. In light of these probable risks, we do not believe that larger, higher voltage transmission lines should be added to the existing 60 kV lines. We, especially, do not wish the children and expectant mothers of our neighborhood to be exposed to these risks.

Views of the open space and hills would be affected if the new 230kV towers should be built. And, because the new towers could be placed in different locations than the existing towers, trees that currently block residents' views of the towers may not be enough to screen the new towers. Our living room bay window faces the watershed property. A 230kV tower would become the focus of our view, should the tower be placed North of the existing tower.

2-2

Another concern is that PG&E has a transmission gas pipeline buried in the same right-of-way as the current lines. Concern of a break in the gas line due to an earthquake would be heightened, should the higher voltage transmission lines proposed be installed.

2-3

Our final concern, but certainly not the least, is how the proposed 230kV towers would impact our property's value, because of safety concerns as well as the possibility of our view of the watershed property being obstructed by an unsightly power tower.


2-4


Please consider the potential alternate routes that will be presented at the Council meeting. we also wonder why the residents along the Highway 280 corridor from Woodside to San Bruno should be subjected to the possibility of increased safety concerns and decreased property values and aesthetics in order to increase the electricity available to serve San Francisco. We understand that, according to PG&E, reliability is one of the main goals of this project. Having local generation (within San Francisco) is much more reliable than transmission line electricity. Retrofitting Hunter's Point may be an option.

2-5

Thanking you in advance for your consideration of this matter, we remain

Sincerely,


Irving Stern


Karen Olson Stern

Responses to Comment Set 2 – Irving and Karen Olson Stern

- 2-1 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF concerns.
- 2-2 EIR Section D.3 presents a detailed analysis of visual impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives, including identification of significant visual impacts in Burlingame in Section D.3.3 (Impact V-13, Carolands Substation to Transition Station).
- 2-3 The installation of a higher voltage transmission line would have no effect on the likelihood of an accident for the existing natural gas pipeline. The presence of a transmission line of any voltage does not change the likelihood of an accident on the gas pipeline system. The most likely gas pipeline accident in this area would result from an earthquake that ruptures the pipeline. Ignition sources for escaping gas could occur from a fallen distribution line, a transmission line (of any voltage), or even a spark created as the gas leaves the pipeline itself.
- 2-4 Please see General Response GR-2 regarding property values.
- 2-5 The Watershed Restoration Alternative suggested by the 280 Citizens is considered in Response to Comment 40-18 (below). Also, regarding the need for additional electrical reliability in San Francisco, improvements in both transmission and generation are recommended by the California ISO.

Comment Set 3

August 4, 2003

TO:
Billie Blanchard, CPUC
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
Fax: (650) 240-1720

FROM:
Karen Olson Stern
15 Loma Vista Lane
Burlingame, CA
Fax: (650) 348-4175

One page

Dear Billie,

Thank you so much for the time that you spent with my husband and I at the Informal Workshop on the Draft EIR on July 31st. We appreciate your answering our numerous questions with patience and clarity.

Tonight is the Public Hearing for the city of Burlingame and I have one other area that I would like to understand before attending the hearing. I doubt that tonight would be the appropriate time to present the following, but I would appreciate hearing your comments:

I am urging the selection of the Partial Underground Alternative. I wonder if it is possible, in order to avoid the San Andreas crossing near San Bruno Avenue (after the Partial Underground Alternative joins the Proposed Project), to take the lines underground from tower 11/71 to the north end of Trousdale. From that point the lines could continue underground below the 280 overpass and across Skyline Blvd. They could then go down Trousdale along the route for PG& E Underground Option 1B Alternative to El Camino and San Bruno Avenue, and thus avoid the high exposure to the San Andreas Fault.

I would think that this alternative would have been considered for evaluation, but have not been able to find it. Am I missing it? If not, is it too late to consider? I, actually, am not sure that I would want the disruption of construction down Trousdale, but I think that this alternative should be on the table, if possible.

I have another question:

Upon reading the Draft EIR, Vol. 2, I have come upon a confusing area, perhaps an error. On page Ap.1-53, paragraph 2, line 3: *Where the Proposed Project would cross I-280 to the east (proposed towers 10/63 through 10/68 would be east of the freeway), this alternative would remain west of the interstate until it would rejoin the proposed route between towers 10/68 and 10/69 and continue north to the Proposed Transition Station at San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive..... North of tower 10/69, this alternative would rejoin the Proposed Project.* On Figure Ap.1-3b, it appears that it rejoins the Proposed Project at tower 11/71. Am I missing something?

Thank you for your continued assistance.

Sincerely,


Karen Olson Stern

3-1

3-2

Responses to Comment Set 3 – Karen Olson Stern

- 3-1 The commenter's support for the Partial Underground Alternative is acknowledged. Appendix 1, Alternative Screening Report, in Section 4.3.1.4, now describes the alternative transition station suggested in this comment (see also Figure Ap.1-9b). Consideration of an alternative transition tower west of the intersection of Trousdale Avenue and I-280 has been added to each issue area's analysis in the Final EIR under discussion of transition station alternatives (e.g., in Section D.3.5.3 for Visual Resources).
- 3-2 The description in Appendix 1, Section 4.2.3, Partial Underground Alternative is incorrect and reflects an earlier version of the alternative developed during the screening process. The line reconnects with the proposed route as it is displayed in Figure Ap.1-3b at Tower 10/71. The text has been revised to incorporate this correction in the Final EIR.

Comment Set 4

Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project

From: KIOlson@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2003 10:05 AM
To: jeffmartin@aspeneq.com
Subject: DEIR, Jefferson-Martin 230kV Transmission Project

August 26, 2003

To: Billie Blanchard, California Public Utilities Commission
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
Fax: (650) 240-1720 E-mail: jeffmartin@aspeneq.com

From: Irving Stern and Karen Olson Stern
15 Loma Vista Lane, Burlingame, CA 94010
Fax: (650) 348-4175 kiolson@aol.com

Dear Ms. Blanchard:

Thank you for this opportunity to write regarding our concerns about the Proposed PG&E Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Project and the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Living in Burlingame, we will address the issues primarily of the Southern Segment. We will first address our objections to PG&E's Proposed Project. Secondly, we will express our first preference for a route. Thirdly, we will express our preference, among the routes evaluated by the CPUC, for the selection of the Partial Underground Alternative for the Southern Segment, with certain modifications. Lastly, we will address possible solutions to the DEIR's consideration that the Partial Underground Alternative is less desirable than PG&E's Option 1B.

Opposition to the Proposed PG&E Jefferson Martin 230 kV Transmission Project:

Our first concern is one of safety. Although the long term effects of exposure to electric and magnetic fields are not conclusive, scientists from the California Department of Health Services are inclined to believe that there are increased health risks, namely some degree of increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease, and miscarriage. In light of these probable risks, we do not believe that higher voltage transmission lines should be added to the existing 60 kV lines. We, especially, do not wish the children and expectant mothers of our neighborhood to be further exposed to these already existing risks. **Please, don't make these neighborhoods the test case for future generations to know what risks are associated with EMFs.**

4-1

Views of the open space and hills would be affected if the wider and 25 foot taller 230kV towers should be built along the Highway 280 Corridor. And, because the new towers would be placed in addition to the existing 60 kV towers, trees that currently block residents' views of the towers may not be enough to screen both towers. **In Volume 1 of the DEIR Visual Resources there is no analysis of the significant view impacts from residential properties in Burlingame.** The key viewpoints look instead at the proposed towers from northbound Hwy. 280. The view impacts from Hwy. 280 are considerably less significant than from the residences near the towers.

4-2

Mitigation Measure V-15a, Figure D.3-14c, Volume 1, which proposes to relocate the proposed Tower 10/68-69 span to the north would bring the transmission lines directly over the northwest corner of our property, as well as place a tower closer to Skyline Blvd. residents. Mitigation Measure V-13a, Figure D.3-12d, Volume 1, proposes reducing the number of towers along Skyview Drive and Loma Vista Drive, but the remaining towers would have to be taller to span the increased distance, and would have even a greater view impact on the residential properties along these streets.

4-3

Another concern is that PG&E has a transmission gas pipeline buried in the same right-of-way as the existing 60 kV lines. **The southwest corner of our property is approximately 25 feet from one of the existing 60 kV towers and our house is approximately 85 feet from the tower. A present concern is the possibility of a break in the gas pipeline during an earthquake. This concern would only be heightened, should the higher voltage transmission lines proposed be installed. Additional concern is that the tower and/or lines could fall on our house during an earthquake.**

4-4

Our final concern, but certainly not the least, is how the proposed 230kV towers would impact our property's value, because of safety concerns as well as the possibility of our view of the watershed property being obstructed by an unsightly power tower. We are very concerned that our largest investment will be at risk, if this project proceeds.

4-5

One of the primary reasons that we bought our property was the view of the Watershed Property west of Highway 280. Our living room bay window faces the watershed property. A 230kV tower could become the focus of our view. At best, our view will be

8/28/03

Comment Set 4, cont.

infringed upon, and far less appealing, by PG&E's proposed 230kV transmission project.

4-5

The proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Project is not acceptable. It is not a reasonable or safe option. Preference for a route west of Highway 280

We wonder why the residents along the Highway 280 corridor from Woodside to San Bruno should be subjected to increased safety concerns, decreased property values, and negative aesthetics in order to increase the electricity available primarily to serve San Francisco. Peninsula residents should not have to bear all of the negative impact, while San Francisco reaps almost all of the benefits! We therefore recommend that the route for this proposed project from the Jefferson Substation to the Sneath Lane Substation run along the west side of Hwy. 280 on SFPUC Watershed Lands. We also recommend that the existing 60kV towers and lines be removed and co-located with the proposed 230 kV lines. This is a reasonable request, especially because we believe that the 60kV lines are not being adequately maintained, indicated by the crackling in damp weather, contributing to even higher EMF levels and making it additionally unpleasant to be living near them. Neighbors have complained that PG&E has failed repeatedly to respond to their requests to perform routine maintenance.

4-6

4-7

Among the routes evaluated by the CPUC, preference for the selection of the Partial Underground Alternative for the Southern Segment, with certain modifications:

There are four primary reasons that we recommend the Partial Underground Alternative for the Southern Segment:

4-8

1. Should the Partial Underground Alternative for the Southern Segment be chosen, the existing 60 kV towers north of the Carolands Substation would be relocated to the west side of Highway 280, mitigating any existing safety concerns and improving aesthetics for neighborhoods along the 280 Corridor. Should the PG&E Underground Option 1B Alternative be chosen, it is our understanding that by law the removal of the 60 kV towers would not be permitted.
2. Should the Partial Underground Alternative for the Southern Segment be chosen, the 230 kV lines proposed to run through Burlingame and Hillsborough (north of the Caroland Substation) would be placed west of Highway 280, away from neighborhoods. Should the PG&E Underground Option 1B Alternative be chosen, the 230 kV lines would be placed under Skyline Blvd., Trousdale Blvd., and El Camino Real, between Trousdale Blvd. and San Bruno Ave. Skyline Blvd. is not very wide, and some residences would be closer than what is believed to be safe. Also, many residences would be sandwiched between the existing overground 60kV lines and the underground 230 kV lines, posing even a more significant health threat.
3. Should the Partial Underground Alternative for the Southern Segment be chosen, there would be less disruption to the communities of Hillsborough, Burlingame, Millbrae and San Bruno. Streets would not need to be excavated and repaved; traffic would not be further congested and not have to be rerouted. Residents along Trousdale Blvd. and Skyline Blvd. would not be inconvenienced because of construction on their streets, or the resulting dust, vibration, and noise pollution in their neighborhoods; nor would businesses along El Camino between Trousdale Blvd. and San Bruno Ave. Should the PG&E Underground Option 1B Alternative be chosen, all of the pre-stated disruption will occur.
4. As hikers and environmentalists we also recommend the Partial Underground Alternative between the Jefferson and Ralston substations because it would eliminate the existing and proposed transmission lines through Edgewood Park and the Pulgas Ridge Preserve, thus removing the visual impact of such towers and lines and providing a definite benefit to the environment. We understand that tower footings may need to remain to minimize disturbance of sensitive habitats.

Possible solutions to the DEIR's consideration that the Partial Underground Alternative is less desirable than PG&E's Option 1B (and the undesirability of the city of San Bruno for the proposed Transition Station at San Bruno Avenue):

Having attended the Public Participation meetings in San Bruno as well as San Mateo, we are aware of the genuine concerns of the people of San Bruno. Were we residents of the Glenview area, we would have the same concerns: health, disruption of environment, habitat, property values, aesthetics: a blight to the entrance to their city, and especially the adjacent neighborhoods, shopping center, schools.

4-9

A solution must be found that no neighborhoods are put at increased risk of health concerns, negative aesthetics or property values.

We believe that by adopting the Partial Underground Alternative for the Southern Segment would be acceptable to the city and residents of San Bruno, should the West of Skyline Transition Station or the Sneath Lane Transition Station be chosen, rather than the proposed San Bruno Avenue Transition Station. Both could be more easily landscaped and could be visually mitigated to a level that is less than significant, whereas it would remain significant even with landscaping at the proposed San Bruno Avenue site. It is our opinion that Sneath Lane would be the best choice, as it would be less visually intrusive and would not result in significant visual impacts because of its location within the existing Sneath Lane Substation with its established industrial character.

One of the reasons that the DEIR considers the Partial Underground Alternative as less desirable is because of significant unmitigable visual impacts at two transition structure locations and at the I-280 crossing south of the Carolands Substation.

4-10

To eliminate the above mentioned unmitigable visual impacts, please consider the following proposals: The proposed route of the Partial Underground Alternative south of the Carolands Substation is too close to residences of Hillsborough and San Mateo. The above-mentioned transition towers (to replace towers 6/37 and 7/39 to allow crossing of San Mateo Creek) are along this route. We propose an alternative route that co-locates the existing 60 kV line underground with the proposed 230kV line west of the existing 60kV right-of-way behind the San Mateo Highlands and Hillsborough residences. It also seems that tunneling under San

8/26/03

Comment Set 4, cont.

Mateo Creek should be feasible (although the DEIR says it is not), as tunnels of much more magnitude have been successfully placed under lakes and bays. This would eliminate the need for the transition stations.

4-10

We believe that the proposed transition station south of the Carolands Substation is the above-mentioned crossing that the DEIR considers undesirable. We are not experts in this field, but we ask that you consider the feasibility of the following proposal. In order to eliminate the need for the transition station near the Carolands Substation, we propose rerouting the 230kV and 60 kV lines back to the south from the Carolands Substation for a short distance under Skyline Blvd. Turn west under Golf Course Road, which passes under Hwy. 280 at the Black Mountain/Hayne Road exit. A transition station could be built at the corner of Golf Course Road, Golf Course Drive, and Skyline Blvd. (a continuation of Skyline Blvd. west of Hwy. 280), if the lines are to continue overland west of 280. If not, no transition station is necessary. There is presently a parking lot on the northeast corner, which we understand has been a problem with crime. The southeast corner is undeveloped. There are no nearby residences at this location or along our proposed stretch of Skyline Blvd., Golf Course Road, or Golf Course Drive. The buildings of the Crystal Springs Golf Course would be considerably further away from the transition station than would the residences be from the proposed transition station slightly south of the Carolands Substation. The visual impacts and safety of residents should be considered an urgent priority in contrast to the visual impact from the Hwy. 280 onramp or the Crystal Springs Golf Course. This proposal eliminates an overhead crossing of Hwy. 280.

4-11

The DEIR also considers the Partial Underground Alternative less desirable because of significant unmitigable visual impacts along Cañada Road near Edgewood Road. We consider this unfortunate; however, as far as we know, no residences or schools are impacted, which should be the first concern, and it is in our opinion the most environmentally friendly route. The impact is offset by the removal of the existing towers from Edgewood Park and Pulgas Ridge Open Space. Visual Mitigation Measures V-5a, V-6a, and V-8a should lessen the visual impact (Figure D.3-20a, Volume 1) on Cañada Road.

4-12

Conclusion:

The entire project from the Jefferson Substation to the Sneath Lane Substation should run west of Hwy. 280, underground or above ground, on SFPUC Watershed Lands, away from all neighborhoods, schools and businesses. If this is not feasible (and it should be feasible, at the least, above ground), please consider the following proposals:
An alternative route north of the Carolands Substation that co-locates the proposed 230 kV line with the existing 60 kV line, either over ground or underground, west of Hwy. 280 and away from Burlingame and Hillsborough residences and schools.
An alternative route south of the Carolands Substation, co-locating the existing 60 kV line underground with the proposed 230 kV line west of the existing 60 kV right-of-way behind residences in the San Mateo Highlands and Hillsborough.

4-13

Solutions must be found to make the proposed project desirable to all residents, businesses, and communities in general who are impacted by this project. The existing 60 kV lines must be co-located with the proposed 230 kV lines away from residences, even if new laws need to be written. In the twenty-first century, utilities should be underground. This is our opportunity to be progressive and rid our communities of these unsightly and possibly dangerous towers and lines. We are environmentalists. The health of our planet is ultimately important for the health of its people, but placing residents in harm's way does not make sense. Wherever the environment can be protected, do so; but, first, protect the inhabitants of the neighborhoods impacted by this project.

4-14

Thank you for this opportunity to voice our objections, concerns, and preferences.

Very Sincerely,

Karen Olson Stern Irving Stern

8/26/03

Responses to Comment Set 4 – Irving and Karen Olson Stern

- 4-1 Please see General Response GR-1 regarding EMF.
- 4-2 While a visual simulation was not prepared for the view from residences in this area, the simulation prepared for Key Viewpoint 8 (Lexington Avenue) presents a similar view of the Proposed Project from adjacent residences. EIR Section D.3.3, in Impact V-13, Carolands Substation to Transition Station, considers the visual impact to Burlingame residents and concludes that it would be significant (Class I).
- 4-3 Mitigation Measure V-15a (Reduce Views of Proposed Tower 10/69) has been revised. If the Proposed Project is approved, this mitigation measure would require PG&E to relocate Towers 10/63 to 11/70 to the west of the I-280 Freeway as illustrated in Figure Ap.1-3b (Partial Underground Alternative, Detail of West of I-280 Segment). Mitigation Measure V-15a in the Draft EIR required that PG&E obtain an easement across a parcel of residential private property (very near the residence) in order that the lines between Towers 10/68 and 10/69 could cross that parcel. Given that Tower 10/68 cannot be moved further north to allow implementation of this route without crossing the residential property (the tower is located at the edge of the Caltrans I-280 ROW), the remaining available mitigation that would reduce the high visibility of Tower 10/69 is implementation of the reroute defined for the Partial Underground Alternative in which this area west of Burlingame residences would be avoided entirely. This reroute is recommended in Mitigation Measure V-15a.

It is acknowledged that the elimination of structures would likely result in larger remaining structures. In some cases, this may cause the tower(s) to extend above a treeline depending on viewing location. However, even with increased structure heights and mass, the recommended structure removals would result in a net reduction of visible structural mass along a given route segment. Furthermore, the increased tower heights (even if above visible tree lines) are not expected to result in significant visual impacts when taken in conjunction with the reduced visible structural mass.

- 4-4 The installation of a higher voltage transmission line would have no effect on the likelihood of an accident for the existing natural gas pipeline (see Response to Comment 2-3). Transmission lines are a flexible system of wires and supports, and transmission line towers are designed for a number of different extreme loading conditions. Often seismic loadings result in less tower design load than other extreme loading cases, such as high wind. Towers are constructed of steel angle members that under high stress exhibit a “yielding” type failure not a catastrophic break. This is not to say that towers never fail but that this is extremely rare. When lattice towers are overloaded to failure the nature of the structure tends to result in buckling type failures where the tower appears to collapse as opposed to an entire tower tipping over intact. Regarding the concern that a tower could fall on the commenter’s house, the total height of Tower 10/68 is proposed to be 131.5 feet. The proposed tower would be approximately 50 feet west of the existing tower, therefore, your house would be approximately 135 feet from the tower uphill from the tower, likely out of reach of damage should the tower fall during an earthquake in the direction of your house. Also, please see Response to Comment 4-3 regarding Mitigation Measure V-15a.

- 4-5 Please see General Response GR-2 regarding property values. The Partial Underground Alternative would require installation of towers at a lower elevation in the Watershed Lands, not visible from the east side of I-280. Under the Proposed Project, if there is not currently a tower in the existing view towards the Watershed Lands, it is unlikely even with final engineering that a proposed tower would be visible because, in accordance with the CPCN project description, the proposed towers would be located very close to existing towers.
- 4-6 As endorsed by the commenter, the Partial Underground Alternative includes a segment west of I-280 in the Burlingame area, as defined in Figure Ap.1-3b. Please see Response to Comment PPH1-10, and a general discussion of the legal issues regarding line collocation presented in Section 2.3.2.1 in Appendix 1. Also, please see General Response GR-3 regarding the equity of impacts and benefits of the project.
- 4-7 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. PG&E states that it is unaware of any maintenance requests in the project area. Also, please see Response to Comment G-4.
- In general, maintenance practices would not affect EMF levels, because maintenance is targeted to the physical condition of the components of lines and substations, the determinants for electric and magnetic field levels is the system voltage and current flow, neither of which are affected by line maintenance. See also Response to Comment G-4.
- 4-8 The commenter's support for the Partial Underground Alternative and opposition to the PG&E Route Option 1B is acknowledged.
- 4-9 The support for the suggested combination of the Partial Underground Alternative with the Sneath Lane Alternative Transition Station is acknowledged. This combination is also supported by the Cities of Burlingame, San Bruno, and Millbrae.
- 4-10 Two alternatives in which the transmission line would be installed underground west of the existing ROW between the Ralston and Carolands Substations were considered in the Alternatives Screening Report, in Sections 4.2.5 (West of ROW, East of I-280 Alternative) and 4.2.6 (West of Reservoirs Alternative). While these alternatives might reduce visual impacts to adjacent residences, they would create greater visual impacts to a much larger number of viewers from I-280, as well as creating potentially significant biological impacts. Please refer to Response to Comment PPH1-10 regarding other alternatives west of I-280.
- Regarding the suggested "tunneling" under San Mateo Creek, the creek crossing itself would likely be feasible with traditional boring across the waterway, but the construction in bedrock on both sides of the very steep canyon would create biological impacts and severe engineering challenges, which would make it technically infeasible. Note that an additional overhead crossing of San Mateo Creek has been suggested by PG&E for the Route Option 1B Alternative over the Crystal Springs Dam; this is documented in Appendix 1, Section 4.2.1 and evaluated in each issue area in Section D.
- 4-11 The suggested alternative to eliminate a transition south of Carolands Substation and add a transition station west of I-280 has been added to the Final EIR with consideration in each issue area in Section D. The transition station is described in Appendix 1, Section 4.3.1.5. This alternative would not be feasible exactly as described by the commenter. In order for the 60 kV line to enter Carolands Substation and serve the surrounding communities, there would have

to be either an underground/overhead transition station at or south of Carolands, or an overhead crossing of I-280 from a transition station west of I-280. Given that the 60 kV line would be east of I-280 at Hayne Road, it makes most sense for that line to continue north to the substation, with a 60 kV transition tower at Tower 8/50. The 230 kV line would remain underground, turning west in Hayne Road, and transition to overhead north of the ParkNRide lot. Please see Figure Ap.1-9c. This alternative transition station is also considered in the EIR because it could allow a hybrid alternative with the Route Option 1B south of Hayne Road and the Partial Underground Alternative (or Proposed Project) north of the transition station.

- 4-12 The EIR in Section D.3.4.2 acknowledges that the significant visual impact in the Cañada Road area is still considered to be an improvement over the Proposed Project, which also would have significant visual impacts and in a more sensitive and visible area.
- 4-13 The commenter's preference for a route north of Carolands Substation that is entirely west of I-280 is consistent with the definition of the Partial Underground Alternative. Regarding the installation of the 60 and 230 kV lines underground west of the existing ROW, please see the Response to Comment 4-10. Also, please see Response to Comment PPH1-10 regarding possible routes west of I-280.
- 4-14 It is noted that the Draft EIR identified an environmentally superior route that would be entirely underground, incorporating the PG&E Route Option 1B and the Modified Underground Existing 230 kV Alternative.

Comment Set 5

Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project

From: Don Billings [dbillings803@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2003 2:27 PM
To: jeffmartin@aspeneq.com
Subject: Notice of Availability to San Bruno Property Owners / Comment

Dear Sirs,
Dear Billie Blanchard, CPUC

RE: Terrorist Proof the System & Aesthetics

I am in receipt of your notice regarding the PG & E proposal to improve / upgrade power transmission facilities in the area.

I have a brief comment.

It would seem that the best time to put the entire length of the system underground would be at the present due to the open space that exists along proposed routes. (rather than only part of the system being placed underground).

My thinking isn't radical. It simply seems that an underground placement would be more aesthetically pleasing to all concerned.

Perhaps more importantly, an underground placement would possibly safeguard the transmission system from future bombings / terrorist attacks (which will no doubt come and continue to come our way).

Protecting our infrastructure from terrorist attacks might in itself be worth the additional expense and the aesthetic improvement would merely be a side benefit.

Just my thoughts.

Best Regards,

Don Billings
Property Owner: San Bruno, CA

=====
Reply to: D.Billings@Bigfoot.com

Do you Yahoo!?
SBC Yahoo! DSL - Now only \$29.95 per month!
<http://sbc.yahoo.com>

5-1

5-2

Responses to Comment Set 5 – Don Billings

- 5-1 The EIR does consider a range of underground alternatives for the entire project route, as defined in EIR Section C and Appendix 1, Alternatives Screening Report. It is noted that the Draft EIR identified an environmentally superior route that would be entirely underground, incorporating the PG&E Route Option 1B and the Modified Underground Existing 230 kV Alternative.
- 5-2 Protection of the transmission line from terrorism is not an environmental issue that can be considered under CEQA. However, this issue can be considered in the CPUC's general proceeding.

Comment Set 6

RECEIVED

JUL 22 2003

Dr. & Mrs. John L. Graham
6105 Skyline Blvd.
Hillborough, CA 94010

Phone: 650-579-4543

7/17/03

Billie Blanchard
EIR Project Manager
c/o Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery St, Suite 935
San Francisco, CA 94104

Re: Jefferson-Martin
230 kV Transmission Line Project

Dear EIR Project Manager,

We believe the proposed 230kV line should be West of 280 on the watershed land where there are very few dwellings.

The line will be extremely unsightly + perhaps dangerous.

Sincerely,
Mariam + John Graham

6-1

Responses to Comment Set 6 – Dr. & Mrs. John L. Graham

- 6-1 The commenter's support for routes west of I-280 is acknowledged. It is noted that a significant portion of the Partial Underground Alternative would be west of I-280 (north of Hayne Road). In addition, please see Response to Comment PPH1-10 regarding the EIR's consideration of alternatives west of I-280.

Comment Set 7

Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project

From: Pokerized4@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2003 8:32 PM
To: jeffmartin@aspeneg.com
Subject: no towers

i would like the power underground.
thanks

7-1

8/28/03

Responses to Comment Set 7 – Pokerized4@aol.com

- 7-1 The commenter's support for underground routes is acknowledged. The EIR does consider a range of underground alternatives for the entire project route, as defined in EIR Section C and Appendix 1, Alternatives Screening Report. It is noted that the Draft EIR identified an environmentally superior route that would be entirely underground, incorporating the PG&E Route Option 1B and the Modified Underground Existing 230 kV Alternative.

Comment Set 8

Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project

From: DAVID KRAKOWER [dkcpa@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2003 1:33 PM
To: jeffmartin@aspeneq.com
Subject: Draft EIR

Dear Ms. Blanchard,

It was a pleasure meeting with you last night at the informational meeting held at the San Bruno Senior Center.

8-1

As I mentioned to you and Susan Lee last night, I support the Draft EIR's conclusion that the PG&E Route Option 1B Alternative is environmentally superior to all other alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR for the southern area.

Of particular interest to me and other San Mateo Highlands residents at the northern end of Lexington Avenue, Laurel Hill Drive, as well as Hillsborough residents living along San Mateo Creek Gorge, is the discussion in the Draft EIR Executive Summary on pages ES-21 and ES-33.

8-2

On page ES-21 in the paragraph headed "Underwater Cable Alternative Segments to PG&E Route Option 1B" the Draft EIR recommends the first option which would require about 3,000 feet of cable to allow Route Option 1B to cross the Crystal Springs Dam. Again on page ES-33 this option is discussed as a way "to bypass the dam and its population of CRLF". I can't emphasize enough my support for this option. It was disturbing to read on page ES-33 about a sixth option developed by CPUC staff which would result in an overhead transmission line segment across San Mateo Creek. That would be a horrible outcome for the residents in that area who already have the 60 kv lines to deal with, in addition to all of those people who visit the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir for recreational purposes.

Thank you for your consideration of this e-mail.

Sincerely,

David Krakower
1410 Lexington Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94402
(H) (650) 578-1328
(O) (415) 398-1100

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! SiteBuilder - Free, easy-to-use web site design software
<http://sitebuilder.yahoo.com>

Responses to Comment Set 8 – David Krakower

- 8-1 The commenter's support for the PG&E Route Option 1B is acknowledged.
- 8-2 The Draft EIR concluded that the underwater route around the dam would be environmentally preferred. The overhead crossing of Crystal Springs Dam, addressed in the Alternatives Screening Report (Appendix 1) Section 4.2.1, is acknowledged in the EIR Section D.3.4.1 to create significant visual impacts. A different overhead crossing is suggested by PG&E in its comment letter; see Figure Ap. 1-2c and analysis presented in each issue area in Section D.