

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



January 7, 2005

Mr. David Kraska
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
P.O. Box 7442
San Francisco, CA 94120

Re: Transmission EMF Management Plan for Jefferson-Martin Project

Dear Mr. Kraska:

On January 6, 2005 we received your Final Transmission EMF Management Plan dated January 6, 2005 for the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Project. This document has been revised in response to our letters dated November 23, 2004 and December 14, 2004, in which we provided specific comments based on our assessment of the Plan and its compliance with the requirements included in the CPUC Final Decision (D.04-08-046).

Our review of the Final EMF Management Plan dated January 6, 2005 indicates that PG&E has fulfilled all of the following requirements of the CPUC Final Decision:

- a) Definition of the cost of EMF mitigation with respect to the 4% benchmark;
- b) Use of a triangular configuration for the transmission line phases;
- c) Use of strategic line placement along the entire route where it can be accommodated at no or minimal cost; and
- d) Use of a 5-foot deeper trench near high priority land uses, including residential areas and schools, where this deeper burial would lower the magnetic fields by at least 15%.

Therefore, PG&E is required to construct the project in accordance with the Final EMF Management Plan dated January 6, 2005.

In addition to our findings above regarding the technical adequacy of the EMF Management Plan related to the Final Decision, we have requested that PG&E prepare documentation regarding implementation of the Final Plan that is more user-friendly to lay readers. To accomplish this, PG&E has been requested to provide the following by February 1, 2005:

1. The EMF tables on pages 10-11 of the EMF Management Plan shall be revised to include location information that will be useful to the public, using table columns as follows: Segment, Street, Specific Addresses or Locations, Segment Length, P&P Drawing. Additional columns shall define the EMF mitigation implemented at each location (deeper burial and/or strategic line placement). The table shall also include a row that

specifically calls out each school along the approved route and defines the EMF situation at the school.

2. Graphic illustration of the actions undertaken to manage EMF in compliance with the Decision shall be presented on aerial photography, similar to that presented in the series of maps entitled Figure B-3 of the EIR. We suggest using black and white aerial photos, illustrating the transmission line alignment in red, and then using different colors and symbols to denote areas where the line is less than 34 feet from buildings and areas where the duct bank will be placed in a 5-foot deeper trench, etc.

Along with this public information documentation, PG&E has indicated that it will submit its revised Plan and Profile drawings to the CPUC by January 17, 2005, and that these plans will be consistent with the Final EMF Field Management Plan dated January 6, 2005. If there are any questions on this letter, please contact Billie Blanchard at (415) 703-2068

Sincerely,



Paul Clanon
Director
Energy Division

Cc: Billie Blanchard, CPUC
Ken Lewis, CPUC
Pam Nataloni, CPUC
Bob Masuoka, PG&E
Susan Lee, Aspen Environmental Group
Vida Strong, Aspen Environmental Group