

## **APPENDIX B**

---

### Summary of Scoping Comments

- B-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies
- B-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies
- B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens
- B-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings
- B-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

## **APPENDIX B-1**

---

### Summary of Written Comments Received From Government Agencies

---

**Appendix B-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies**

---

Date	From	Comments
<b>FEDERAL AGENCIES</b>		
March 21, 2003	<b>National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area:</b> Mai-Liis Bartling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIR should disclose that the rights held by GGNRA under its easements impose a significant limitation on the types of projects that can occur on Watershed lands.</li> <li>• The proposed project presented in PG&amp;E's PEA unreasonably interferes with the purposes of the easements, and GGNRA would not concur that the project could be built.</li> <li>• The EIR should analyze a reasonable range of alternatives, including undergrounding the transmission lines along Canada Road.</li> <li>• The EIR should discuss the impacts of each alternative on the GGNRA's easements in the land use sections of the document.</li> <li>• Underground both the 60 kV and the 230 kV transmission lines in a new utility corridor under Cañada Road.</li> <li>• EIR should also include Alternative 1B, undergrounding only the 230 kV line along Cañada Road.</li> <li>• Does not support undergrounding the new 230 kV line in the existing corridor.</li> <li>• Include alternatives in the EIR that would not constitute an unreasonable interference with GGNRA's easements.</li> </ul>
<b>STATE AGENCIES</b>		
February 24, 2003 (rec'd March 10, 2003)	<b>State of California, Dept of Parks &amp; Recreation:</b> Ronald P. Schafer, District Supt, Bay Area District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project has the potential has the potential to directly impact San Bruno Mountain State and County Park.</li> <li>• The EIR should analyze impacts associated with installation, maintenance, and repair of new facilities on the resources and the recreational uses of the park.</li> </ul>
<b>COUNTIES</b>		
February 27, 2003	<b>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission:</b> Joanne Wilson, AICP, Land and Resources Planner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SFPUC manages the Peninsula Watershed lands and is interested in minimizing the impacts of the project to natural and cultural resources of the watershed.</li> <li>• Prefers alternatives that do not involve the placement of the transmission line underground through sensitive areas of the Watershed.</li> <li>• Placing the transmission line underground could require a realignment of the existing PG&amp;E utility easement and could necessitate additional access roads and further degrade natural values.</li> <li>• Placing the line underground could interfere with SFPUC operations and compromise existing infrastructure.</li> <li>• Concerned about the safety of work crews performing maintenance on water lines buried adjacent to a 230 kV line.</li> <li>• SFPUC must review any proposal to attach a transmission line to the Upper Crystal Springs Dam.</li> <li>• The disturbance from placing the line underground in Watershed areas adjacent to Hillsborough/Burlingame would be devastating to natural resources.</li> <li>• Soil disturbance would allow invasive exotic species to take hold in sensitive areas.</li> <li>• Watershed lands adjacent to Hillsborough/Burlingame contain zones of cultural resource sensitivity.</li> <li>• Prefer to see underground lines installed under existing and paved streets and highways. <i>(continued)</i></li> </ul>

---

---

**Appendix B-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies**

---

Date	From	Comments
February 27, 2003	<b>County of San Mateo:</b> Mary K. Raftery, Deputy County Counsel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal to remove existing transmission line in Edgewood Park and relocate the line west to SFPUC property would accomplish little in reducing visual impacts and would only create adverse impacts to natural and cultural resources.</li> <li>• Moving the line to the west side of I-280 is out of the question as the area, known as the Triangle, contains high-quality serpentine bunchgrass grassland and contains rare species of native plants, including state and federally listed endangered species.</li> <li>• To mitigate potential long-term impacts to existing trails, recommend that PG&amp;E develop additional public trails on SFPUC property to provide new recreational opportunities.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E's proposed Transition Station at San Bruno Avenue and Skyline Boulevard provides another opportunity for project mitigation by providing a parking area and improved trailhead at this location.</li> <li>• Interested in reviewing the tubular type tower to assess whether it could reduce visual impacts.</li> </ul> <p><b>Attachment:</b> Preliminary Peninsula Watershed Trail Concepts brochure</p>
April 3, 2003	<b>County of San Mateo:</b> Joe Napoliello, Real Property Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board of Supervisors for the County of San Mateo has not taken a position on the proposed project. County staff are still reviewing the proposal to determine effects on the County and County interest.</li> <li>• Staff needs additional information including more explicit mapping and details of the proposed route and feasible alternative routes.</li> <li>• The CPUC's environmental review will assist the County in reviewing potential impacts in the County.</li> <li>• The EIR should include an analysis of potential impacts to the County's proposed new Juvenile Justice Facilities at Tower Road.</li> <li>• Would like to see a discussion, including mitigation measures if appropriate, related to trenching for the underground route, particularly in the urbanized North County areas, where sites, including remediation programs for LUST, may be impacted.</li> <li>• Would appreciate a full and fair discussion of visual aesthetic impacts from the Project along Interstate 280, a designated Scenic Highway.</li> <li>• Will the County be able to rely on the certified Final EIR as a responsible agency under CEAQA in considering approval of encroachment permits?</li> </ul>
<b>CITIES</b>		
February 10, 2003	<b>City of Burlingame:</b> James Nantell, City Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over aesthetic and health effects of proposed transmission lines.</li> <li>• Proposed alternative to bring line down Trousdale Drive to El Camino Real would:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cause horrendous disruption to single-family residences along Trousdale Drive.</li> <li>○ Conflict with plans to rebuild Peninsula Hospital. <i>(continued)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Appendix B-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies**

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Immediately affect the new BART station in Millbrae.</li> <li>○ Intercept the central delivery main of the entire San Francisco water system.</li> <li>• Proposed 230 kV lines would interfere with electric appliances along corridor.</li> <li>• Route should be simplified along west side of I-280 to reduce costs.</li> <li>• Effects of proposed line on Harry Tracy Water Distribution Facility's chloramination facility.</li> <li>• Concern over reliability of local electrical service.</li> </ul> <p><b>Attachment:</b> Resolution of the City Council of the City of Burlingame Urging the Public Utilities Commission and Pacific Gas &amp; Electric to Study Alternatives to Locating New Electric Transmission Line in the Skyline Boulevard Corridor.</p>
February 21, 2003	<b>City of Redwood City:</b> Gary H. Bonte, Associate Planner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over visual impacts of larger towers to Edgewood Road/I-280 interchange.</li> <li>• Suggests using different tower designs that would create less of a visual impact than conventional steel lattice towers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Attachments:</b> Series of photos of Collierville-Bellota transmission line supported on tubular steel poles.</p>
February 24, 2003	<b>City of San Bruno:</b> Scott T. Munns, P.E., Public Works Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that statements attributed to the City of San Bruno in the PEA are inaccurate and do not correctly represent the views of the City of San Bruno.</li> <li>• City of San Bruno did not support use of the vacant Caltrans property for the transition station.</li> <li>• City of San Bruno did not recommend Route 2B and believes there are better alternatives.</li> <li>• Unwise to locate new lines in the already busy utility corridor of San Bruno Avenue.</li> <li>• City requests additional routing studies be performed through San Bruno and that the Transition Station be relocated.</li> <li>• Suggestion to site the station on the west side of Skyline Boulevard away from residential areas.</li> <li>• Three other possible routes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Beginning at a transition station on the west side of Skyline Boulevard, crossing Skyline underground and proceeding down San Bruno Avenue to open space west of MP 15, then traversing northeast through undeveloped land connecting into Sneath Lane near I-280, continuing east on Sneath to Huntington Avenue, then north along BART ROW as indicated in Segment 2B.</li> <li>○ Beginning at a transition station on the west side of Skyline Boulevard, crossing Skyline underground and proceeding down San Bruno Avenue to exit/entrance ramp of I-280, along the northbound ramp to Sneath Lane, continuing east to Huntington Avenue, then north along BART ROW as indicated in segment 2B.</li> <li>○ Beginning at a transition station on the west side of Skyline Boulevard, crossing Skyline underground and proceeding down San Bruno Avenue to Cherry Avenue, north on Cherry to Sneath Lane, continuing east on Sneath to Huntington Avenue, then north along BART ROW as indicated in segment 2B.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Request following issues be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use of proposed Transition Station area by San Mateo County as a trailhead-parking site. <i>(continued)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies**

---

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Facilities must be located such that any future widening of Skyline Boulevard will not be impacted.</li> <li>○ City Master Plans for utilities and roadway infrastructure.</li> <li>○ Investigation into using median or roadway shoulder areas for buried lines instead of street pavement.</li> <li>○ City standards for roadway sections.</li> <li>○ Detailed analysis of splice vault locations.</li> <li>○ Impacts of locating the Transition Station in a seismically active zone.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	<b>City of San Bruno:</b> Scott T. Munns, P.E., Public Works Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition Station location at the existing Sneath Substation farther north along Skyline Boulevard has many advantages over the currently proposed site and should be investigated.</li> <li>• Sneath Substation location would be the City's preferred alternative.</li> <li>• Routes for the underground segment should also be expanded to include Skyline Boulevard and Sneath Lane.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	<b>Town of Woodside:</b> Susan Boynton, Mayor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disappointed that Woodside was not notified of the Public Scoping Meetings in time to send a representative.</li> <li>• New 230 kV line will damage and disrupt areas with the watershed and other open space areas on the Peninsula and may seriously impact native plant and animal species.</li> <li>• Concerned about impacts to biological resources, and potential negative aesthetic impacts of new towers.</li> </ul>
March 17, 2003	<b>City of Daly City:</b> Stan Gustavson, City Attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 3-19, Section 3.3.2.2, Conclusion North Area Component Alternatives, which states that PG&amp;E prefers that the North Area Component be comprised of Route Options that include 4B seems to be inconsistent with other sections of the Final PEA that identifies Route Option 4A as the selected route.</li> <li>• The proposed construction period of 6 to 7 months needs to be reduced to several weeks and measures such as advanced noticing, neighborhood information meetings, an onsite representative during construction, and traffic control.</li> <li>• The existence of overhead power lines is often a defining condition of redevelopment blight; eliminating overhead lines from a project area is a redevelopment priority.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E currently owns in fee and has an adjacent easement directly from Guadalupe Canyon Parkway down to the Martin Substation. The City would like this direct alternative reconsidered both environmentally and part of the CPCN process, however with the existing overhead lines [within Guadalupe Canyon Parkway – Segment 5] included as part of the undergrounding.</li> <li>• Currently there is an unrelated amendment to the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan under consideration by the Plan Operators. The City proposes this combined undergrounding alternative become part of the current HCP amendment.</li> </ul>
March 25, 2003	<b>City of San Bruno:</b> Larry Franzella Mayor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request that the CPUC take immediate action to instruct PG&amp;E to eliminate San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive as a proposed site for an overhead to underground transition station and to study other less conspicuous and less intrusive alternatives.</li> <li>• Instead, the City suggests that CPUC focus on the following possibilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Place the entire project underground in order to avoid a considerable impact and burden on any one city; <i>(continued)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies**

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Place a transition station at some earlier point in the route (for example, at Trousdale in Burlingame);</li> <li>○ To place the transition station adjacent to the existing PG&amp;E substation on the west side of Skyline Boulevard at Sneath Lane where the impact will be less dramatic; or</li> <li>○ Place a transition station in a less conspicuous place on the west side of Skyline Boulevard.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over 200 residents of San Bruno appeared at a special council meeting on Thursday, March 20, 2003, to voice strong opposition to PG&amp;E locating its transition station at the currently proposed site.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E's proposed transition site is directly across the street from the retail/residential area and sites smack in the middle of a designated redevelopment area. The San Bruno Redevelopment Agency (RDA) has had this area on its radar screen for some time.</li> <li>• The proposed PG&amp;E site sits directly atop an earthquake fault, which is an issue of concern to all of us.</li> <li>• The City's Planning Commission already approved the Church of the Highlands' plans to create an open parking lot on the proposed PG&amp;E site. The church already has a ten-year lease from Caltrans on the proposed PG&amp;E site. Accordingly, significant progress has been in reducing blight and developing the area.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E's proposed project will create a new blight that the City/RDA will never be able to undo.</li> <li>• The City and the RDA are seriously concerned that PG&amp;E lacks investment in a true mitigation effort.</li> <li>• Remove from consideration the City's previously-suggested route through Crestmoor Canyon (between San Bruno Avenue and Sneath Lane)</li> </ul> <p><b>Attachments:</b> Joint Resolution of the City Council and the RDA urging the CPUC to instruct PG&amp;E to Eliminate San Bruno and Glenview as a transition station site and study other appropriate alternatives; letters to Billie Blanchard, CPUC from Scott T. Munns, Public Works Director expressing concerns of inaccuracies in PG&amp;E's PEA that do not correctly represent the views of San Bruno and offering alternative routes for consideration; letter to Hedy Born of Aspen Environmental Group from George Foscardo, Community Development Director providing cumulative projects information; letter to CPUC Public Advisor and Members of the CPUC from the Residents of the Crestmoor Neighborhood, signed by 26 residents; eleven letters to the City and Council and Mayors Office expressing opposition to the project from citizens of San Bruno.</p>
<b>SPECIAL DISTRICTS</b>		
January 30, 2003	<b>Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board:</b> Bernard Susanto, Engineering Dept.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preliminary alignment of Segment 2 appears to go through the limits for the San Bruno Grade Separation Conceptual Plan as well as the Linden Grade Separation and South San Francisco New Station Conceptual Plan</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	<b>BKF Engineers</b> (consultant to Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board): David Evans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project could impact the City of San Bruno Grade Separation Project at San Bruno Avenue and Huntington Drive/Caltrain ROW</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-1. Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 18, 2003	<b>Bayshore Sanitary District:</b> Tom Yeager, P.E., Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Engineer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PG&amp;E needs to contact Bayshore Sanitary District to ensure that all underground utilities of Bayshore Sanitary District are shown in the construction plans</li> </ul>
March 13, 2003	<b>Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District:</b> L. Craig Britton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is difficult to thoroughly evaluate the potential impacts to District land because the PEA failed to acknowledge the District as a local jurisdiction that would be affected by the project. Therefore, pertinent information was not included, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identification of federally funded recreation projects that will be constructed on the Preserve over the next two years.</li> <li>○ Identification of the Use and Management Plan for Pulgas Ridge Open Space Preserve.</li> <li>○ The identification of specific locations of staging areas and cable pull/tension sites for the proposed project.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The District challenges the statement under 4.2.1 and 4.2.1x that the project will have either “No Impact” or “less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated”.</li> <li>• Confidential maps provided to the District that illustrate the existing and proposed transmission line and easement (ROW) were highly inaccurate.</li> <li>• Concerned with the potential visual and biological resource impacts the project will have not only on Pulgas Ridge Open Space Preserve, but the entire 14.7-mile overhead segment.</li> <li>• Pursue a project alternative that would re-locate the 100 existing overhead towers closer to the built environment and away from protected open space.</li> </ul>
March 27, 2003	<b>Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District:</b> L. Craig Britton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pursue a project alternative that would not impact or encroach upon dedicated park and open space lands (including land owned/managed by Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, San Mateo County, and SFPUC).</li> <li>• The Jefferson-Martin Project as proposed will compromise the District's efforts to preserve an open space greenbelt for public enjoyment and recreation.</li> </ul>

---



## **APPENDIX B-2**

---

### Summary of Written Comments Received From Private Organizations and Companies

**Appendix B-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 4, 2003	<b>San Mateo County Trail Users Group:</b> Adda Quinn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Alternative 1B is the most aesthetic approach.</li> <li>• Since the project proposes to underground the northern 12 miles of the project, it is feasible to underground the southern segment.</li> <li>• Proposed impact reductions to sensitive serpentine grassland areas in Edgewood Park and Preserve would not avoid construction disturbance for excavation and pouring concrete for foundations.</li> <li>• Alternative 1B would improve security from terrorism and vandalism.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	<b>Highlands Community Association:</b> Clifford E. Donley, President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions need for project.</li> <li>• If the project is necessary, the Highlands Community strongly supports Alternative 1B for environmental, health, safety, and security reasons.</li> <li>• Existing transmission lines should also be included in the underground installation.</li> </ul>
February 5, 2003	<b>Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society:</b> Craig K. Breon, Executive Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building the 14.7-mile southern part of the transmission line is deplorable.</li> <li>• New towers will destroy visual beauty of the watershed and damage habitat.</li> <li>• Construction would require wider foundations, more land for access and excavated material.</li> <li>• Installing towers by helicopters will reduce, but not eliminate impacts.</li> <li>• Alternative 1B is the only sound alternative.</li> <li>• Installing the southern part of the route underground should be as feasible as installing the northern part underground.</li> <li>• Underground all of the transmission line.</li> </ul>
February 20, 2003	<b>Highlands Community Association:</b> Clifford Donley, President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessity of project needs to be determined.</li> <li>• Power generation should be developed near the end use.</li> <li>• If the project must proceed, Alternative 1B should be used with the alignment under Cañada Road combined with any additional lines.</li> <li>• Best for environmental, health, safety, and security reasons.</li> </ul>
February 20, 2003	<b>Highlands Recreation District:</b> V. Sue Breidenbach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why does San Francisco need more electricity?</li> <li>• Negative issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EMF/Health issues</li> <li>○ Visual</li> <li>○ Noise</li> <li>○ Property Values</li> <li>○ Interference with electronic equipment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consider necessity of project.</li> <li>• Consider placing lines west of I-280 or underground.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2003	<b>Sequoia Audubon Society:</b> Robert R. Wilkinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urge careful study of potential impacts of towers on birds, particularly raptors.</li> <li>• What would effects of underground lines be compared to towers, particularly if routed outside of Edgewood Park?</li> <li>• The I-280 Corridor is part of a Scenic and Recreational Easement adjacent to an international heritage site and should be considered in the impact study.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	<b>Sierra Club:</b> Rafael K. Reyes, Chair, Loma Prieta Chapter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support evaluation of Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Scenic and Recreation Easement requires that the watershed be kept in its natural state.</li> <li>• Increase in height and width of new towers would create potentially significant adverse impacts to scenic qualities of watershed.</li> <li>• Construction could create impacts to areas of high environmental sensitivity.</li> <li>• Tower installation by helicopter would not avoid impacts from construction disturbance for excavating and pouring the new towers' foundations.</li> <li>• Habitat for serpentine species, particularly the Bay Checkerspot Butterfly and Edgewood Blind Harvestman, occurs adjacent to existing towers. <i>(continued)</i></li> </ul>

**Appendix B-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New lines should be run underground at a minimum from the Edgewood Substation to MP 2.0.</li> <li>• 60 kV lines should also be run underground, existing towers should be removed by helicopter with foundations left in place.</li> <li>• Installation underground from MP 4.0 to MP 7.0 would also avoid environmental, habitat, and visual impacts.</li> <li>• Installing the alignment under Cañada Road would avoid serpentine grasslands and potential increased exposure to EMF.</li> <li>• Installation of the entire line underground would be the most environmentally protective alternative, increasing visual quality as well as security.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	<p><b>People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area:</b> Amy Meyer, Co-Chairman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lands are within the Golden Gate Biosphere Reserve.</li> <li>• Transmission line should be installed underground for its entire length and existing towers removed.</li> <li>• This solution would improve the aesthetics and bird populations.</li> <li>• Tower replacement and future ongoing maintenance can only create further disturbance for butterfly and insect populations.</li> <li>• The Peninsula's electrical supply should be put underground to decrease the possibility of sabotage.</li> <li>• Supports Alternative 1B and asks that a combined EIR/EIS be written because of the federal government's easements on this land.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	<p><b>Friends of Edgewood Natural Preserve:</b> Carol M. Hunkermeyer, Outreach Coordinator</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support installing the line underground in Alternative 1B along with the existing 60 kV lines and removal of the existing towers.</li> <li>• Installing the southern segment under Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard would be the most environmentally protective alternative.</li> <li>• Installation of new towers would cause disturbance with access roads and construction of towers, harming rare plant and wildlife species endemic to serpentine grasslands and wetlands, and endangering birds from collision with aboveground towers and wires.</li> <li>• Protect these special watershed habitats.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	<p><b>Friends of Edgewood Natural Preserve:</b> Kathy Korbholz, President</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edgewood Preserve provides a window to California's pre-European lands.</li> <li>• Would like to ensure that the following points are addressed in the EIR:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rare, threatened, and endangered species in Edgewood Natural Preserve must be protected.</li> <li>○ A qualified conservation biologist with local knowledge of Edgewood and its special status species should be engaged as part of the EIR process.</li> <li>○ Mitigation measures must be planned and funded for any unavoidable deleterious effects.</li> <li>○ Existing and proposed power lines run through critical habitat for federally threatened Bay Checkerspot Butterfly.</li> <li>○ White-rayed pentachaeta found only at Edgewood and on a small piece of San Francisco watershed land.</li> <li>○ San Mateo thormmint and Marin western flax are federally threatened or endangered plants and nine other plant and animal species of concern exist within Edgewood's boundaries.</li> <li>○ Soil compaction must be avoided due to damage to fragile, low-nutrient soils relied upon by plant and animal species.</li> <li>○ Soil disturbance must be avoided to prevent weed invasion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Recommend removing the existing 60 kV line and install it underground along with the proposed 230 kV line beneath the Cañada Road ROW, removing existing towers by helicopter, and leaving the concrete footings in place.</li> </ul>

**Attachments:** Photo showing weed infestation along underground gas pipeline.

**Appendix B-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies**

Date	From	Comments
February 27, 2003	<b>280 Corridor Concerned Citizens:</b> Jeffrey P. Gray, Esq., Attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members of 280 Corridor Concerned Citizens have a common interest in ensuring the health and safety of local residents, community values, and environment are preserved and protected.</li> <li>• Not clear that the proposed project is needed to meet demand or is best suited to meet objectives.</li> <li>• Deficiencies in PG&amp;E's proposal:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Future demand is overstated due to recent economic trends</li> <li>○ Increased local generation should be considered</li> <li>○ Project would not necessarily increase reliability for San Francisco's power supply</li> <li>○ Health and safety risks from EMF are not adequately addressed</li> <li>○ Project will result in significant visual impacts</li> <li>○ Project will result in significant noise impacts</li> <li>○ Project will have an adverse impact on property values</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Feasible alternatives the CPUC should review:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No project alternative</li> <li>○ Local generation/distributed generation                                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ City of San Francisco – four 50MW turbines</li> <li>▪ Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Project</li> <li>▪ Renewable energy</li> <li>▪ Energy efficiency projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Demand reduction</li> <li>○ Alternative routes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Locate the 230 kV line along the 60 kV ROW with underground segments near residential areas, far enough away to mitigate EMF. 60 kV lines would also be run underground in these places.</li> <li>• Line would be located underground from Jefferson Substation along Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard to Trousdale Drive and moving the 60 kV line underground. From Trousdale, line could go overhead to San Bruno Avenue or continue north underground along Skyline Boulevard to San Bruno Avenue.</li> <li>• Line would be located underground from Jefferson Substation along Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard to Carolands Substation. From Carolands, the line would go overhead to San Bruno Avenue.</li> <li>• Locate the line underground along Alternative 1B from Jefferson Substation to MP 2, then overhead to Ralston Substation, then underground below I-280 and underground along Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard to Trousdale Avenue.</li> <li>• Locate the line west of existing 60 kV ROW, either east or west of I-280. Portions east of I-280 should be located underground. Relocating the 60 kV line underground should also be considered.</li> <li>• Construct a 230 kV line from Moraga Substation in Oakland to Potrero Substation in San Francisco along BART transbay tube, Bay Bridge, underwater cable, or a combination thereof.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	<b>California Native Plant Society:</b> Toni Corelli, Rare Plant Chair, Santa Clara Valley Chapter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PEA fails to list all the threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant populations in the project area.</li> <li>• Concerned about trampling caused by trucks, workers, or staging of tools or materials.</li> <li>• Heavy equipment will devastate sensitive habitats and species.</li> <li>• Digging of trenches can encourage invasive weeds.</li> <li>• In favor of Alternative Segment 1B, putting proposed lines under Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard.</li> <li>• Alternative 1B would be less visually intrusive and avoid impact to sensitive areas.</li> <li>• Helicopters should remove towers and the footings should be left in place.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies**

---

Date	From	Comments
February 27, 2003	<b>California Native Plant Society:</b> Sara Timby, Conservation Co-Chair, Santa Clara Valley Chapter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major concern is the numerous special status serpentine endemic plants that exist in the corridor for the southern segment of the project, particularly through Edgewood County Preserve and the San Francisco watershed.</li> <li>• Minimal disturbance is imperative to the maintenance of these populations.</li> <li>• Suggestion to relocate the lines under existing roads that will minimize disturbance of soil and plans during construction and maintenance.</li> <li>• Timing for removal of old towers must be carefully planned for least disruptive time of year.</li> <li>• Would like to see a method for controlling weed seeds brought in on heavy equipment.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	<b>International Medical Foundation, Inc.:</b> Menghis Bairu, MD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with the potential health impacts that increased EMF will have on families.</li> <li>• Consider moving project west of I-280 or not doing the project at all.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	<b>Committee for Green Foothills:</b> Lennie Roberts, Legislative Advocate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing to support the full evaluation of Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Easements require the watershed lands be kept in their natural state and allow limited public recreational use consistent with the primary purpose of protection of the public water supply and the natural resources of the watershed.</li> <li>• Peninsula Watershed Lands have been included in the Golden Gate Biosphere Reserve.</li> <li>• Project should avoid impacts to scenic resources.</li> <li>• Installation of all or some of the line underground would reduce visual impacts, and burial of the existing 60 kV line should also be considered.</li> <li>• Impacts to environmentally sensitive areas should be avoided, including Edgewood County Park and Natural Preserve which contains habitat for the Bay Checkerspot Butterfly, Edgewood Blind Harvestman, and the Edgewood Park Microblind Harvestman, serpentine grasslands between MP 4 and MP7, and grasslands adjacent to residential areas in Hillsborough and Burlingame.</li> <li>• Helicopter construction cannot avoid all impacts.</li> <li>• Existing towers should be removed by helicopter and footings should be left in place.</li> <li>• Impact to avian species should be avoided.</li> <li>• Risk of vandalism or terrorism would be reduced by installing the lines underground.</li> <li>• The environmental document should comply with NEPA as well as CEQA</li> </ul>
March 7, 2003	<b>Latham &amp; Watkins</b> (representing PG&E, Applicant): J. Wesley Skow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scope of the EIR analysis must relate to PG&amp;E's CPCN Application.</li> <li>• The project alternatives analyzed in the EIR <i>must</i> be properly focused on the basic project objectives and <i>must</i> avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the project.</li> <li>• In an EIR, mitigation measures must be properly focused on project impacts and must meet constitutional requirements.</li> <li>• Various proposals present by the public have technical and economic feasibility concerns.</li> <li>• There are environmental impacts associated with the public proposals that likely will have a substantial impact on the project schedule.</li> <li>• "Partial Underground" proposals present technical, economic, and environmental feasibility issues.</li> <li>• Any CPUC authority to underground the existing 60 kV line has not been properly invoked.</li> <li>• Undergrounding the existing 60 kV line is not permissible under CEQA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The EIR may only analyze alternatives that feasibly attain the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the project. (<i>continued.</i>)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

---

---

**Appendix B-2. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies**

---

Date	From	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It is illegal to require the existing 60 kV line to be placed underground as a mitigation measure for any impacts caused by a new underground 230 kV line unless there is a “nexus” to project impacts and unless the mitigation is “roughly proportional” to those impacts.</li> <li>• The estimated costs of the partial underground and 230 kV/60 kV all-underground proposals represent a substantial increase from the estimated costs of PG&amp;E’s proposed project.</li> <li>• There are environmental impacts associated with the partial underground and the 230 kV/60 kV all-underground proposals.</li> <li>• There are engineering feasibility issues associated with the partial underground proposals.</li> </ul>
March 12, 2003	<b>Hillside Homeowners Improvement Association:</b> Eve Aiello, President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that the new transmission should be put underground in the area of Hoffman Street and Orange Street as it traverses through our neighborhood within the boundaries of Daly City.</li> </ul>
March 12, 2003	<b>Cypress Lawn Memorial Park:</b> Kenneth E. Varner, President & CEO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If Alternative 3B is selected, PG&amp;E must obtain Cypress Lawn’s approval to use the BART underground ROW through Cypress Lawn’s property.</li> <li>• Any encroachment onto Cypress Lawn’s property (e.g., staging of construction equipment, for example trucks etc.) cannot be done without Cypress Lawn’s granting of a temporary construction easement (or some similar temporary property right).</li> <li>• The EIR should clearly identify and provide specific mitigation measures for potential impacts such as construction noise, negative aesthetic and visual impacts, during construction, and traffic during construction.</li> <li>• Memorial services in many cases cannot be delayed until after project construction ends. The EIR should propose specific mitigation measures for these circumstances.</li> </ul>

---

## **APPENDIX B-3**

---

### Summary of Written Comments Received From Private Citizens

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
January 27, 2003	Herbert Kwok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over long-term electric and magnetic effects on health.</li> <li>• Property value will be devaluated.</li> <li>• Overhead transmission lines will degrade the environment and views from property.</li> </ul>
January 27, 2003	Steven Cheechov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns with CPUC oversight of review process.</li> <li>• Need for project has not been shown.</li> <li>• Cost of environmental review is too high.</li> </ul>
January 28, 2003	David Goncharoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why must the new towers be higher than existing towers?</li> <li>• Support putting the transmission line underground.</li> <li>• Noise and hazards caused to nearby residences is unknown.</li> <li>• Project would devalue nearby neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Suggest installing the lines on the other side of I-280.</li> <li>• If news lines are to bring power to San Francisco, PG&amp;E must ensure that quality of life in San Mateo is not reduced.</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	Nell Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over possible long-term health effects on adults and children.</li> <li>• Towers would impede views of watershed.</li> <li>• Project would devalue neighborhood property.</li> <li>• Installing the lines underground would be a better option.</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	Erik Steiner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see removal of the existing transmission towers carrying the 60 kV line.</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	Rosemary Lashkoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project is not needed for San Francisco, as facilities there are adequate or should be upgraded.</li> <li>• Concerned with health issues from higher voltage lines in backyards.</li> <li>• Lines should be installed underground or west of I-280.</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	Marilyn and Steve Ladas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health hazards</li> <li>○ Aesthetics</li> <li>○ Noise</li> <li>○ Construction</li> <li>○ Traffic</li> <li>○ Property Values</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Underground lines</li> <li>○ Move line west of I-280</li> <li>○ No lines</li> </ul> </li> <li>• San Francisco should generate its own power</li> </ul>
January 30, 2003	Kathleen Means	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installing the line underground under Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard is the most environmentally protective alternative.</li> </ul>
January 30, 2003	Bob Caletti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the underground alternative 1B</li> <li>• Suggests installing the existing 60 kV lines underground and removing the towers.</li> </ul>
January 31, 2003	Ronald C. Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move the transmission lines in the Peninsula Watershed underground.</li> <li>• Restore the views of the watershed.</li> <li>• Protect the sensitive habitats from damage.</li> <li>• Supports Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Include the 60 kV lines underground as part of the project.</li> </ul>



---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 1, 2003	Jerry Hearn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefers Alternative 1B which would have the following benefits:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Restore the scenic highway to a more natural state</li> <li>○ Reduce the possibility of impacts on birds</li> <li>○ Reduce the possible impacts of an earthquake on motor vehicles</li> <li>○ Remove construction from the fragile habitats of Edgewood Park</li> <li>○ Reduce the negative impacts on recreational use of nearby trails</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Alternatives for generation facilities nearer to points of use should be considered carefully.</li> <li>• Reduction of demand should be considered.</li> <li>• True needs should be examined.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Spencer Lowe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have reservations about new towers in the neighborhood from an aesthetic and hazard standpoint.</li> <li>• Solution is to run the lines underground, at least adjacent to neighborhoods.</li> </ul>
February 5, 2003	Leslee Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Requests that the existing 60 kV transmission lines also be installed underground and that the existing towers be removed.</li> <li>• Alternative 1B provides security from vandalism and terrorism.</li> </ul>
February 8, 2003	Jeff Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 230 kV lines will be noisier and put out more EMF than the existing 60 kV lines.</li> <li>• Putting lines close to San Mateo homes will reduce property values.</li> <li>• Would PG&amp;E and CPUC compensate homeowners?</li> <li>• There are health risks associated with EMF emissions.</li> <li>• Why can't the lines be placed farther west?</li> </ul>
February 9, 2003	Marilyn J. Walter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favors Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Larger towers would mar the beauty of the area.</li> <li>• Remove existing towers and underground the system.</li> <li>• Installing underground would reduce maintenance costs – especially costs of repairing damage by squirrels.</li> </ul>
February 11, 2003	Jane L., Jane T., and John H. Johnson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about building of new above-ground towers on the southern portion of the project.</li> <li>• Supports Alternative 1B.</li> </ul>
February 12, 2003	Elly Hess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edgewood Preserve is a pristine area and should not be disturbed.</li> <li>• If removing towers, why not underground all the utilities along Cañada Road where there are already disturbed areas.</li> <li>• Remove towers by helicopter and leave cement footings in place for the least amount of damage.</li> <li>• Underground lines would improve security against terrorism.</li> </ul>
February 16, 2003	Bob and Dorothy Young	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favors installing the alignment underground including the existing 60 kV line and removing the existing tower especially from Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve.</li> </ul>
February 17, 2003	Sam Battles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports adoption of Alternative 1B.</li> </ul>
February 17, 2003	Kris Carey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Towers larger than the existing ones would be extremely undesirable.</li> <li>• Towers should be removed.</li> </ul>
February 18, 2003	Mr. & Mrs. George W. Savary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposition to proposed project.</li> <li>• Questioning how project would devalue property.</li> <li>• Project would destroy a magnificent view.</li> </ul>

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 18, 2003	Carolyn & Timothy Healy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasons for the project are not adequate.</li> <li>• New lines would not benefit San Mateo community.</li> <li>• Property values would be reduced by impacts to views.</li> <li>• Concerns over health hazards, noise, and disruption of communications and electronic equipment from 230 kV lines and construction.</li> </ul>
February 18, 2003	Michael and Betsy Nelson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for Alternative 1B and installing the alignment underground.</li> </ul>
February 18, 2003	Phyllis and Mans Garratt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project must not invade the Lexington Avenue area.</li> <li>• Consider the health of the neighborhood and its children and the beauty of the protected open space.</li> </ul>
February 18, 2003	Betty Oen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health effects of EMF create risks for community and negatively impacts property values.</li> <li>• Higher towers negatively impact the appearance of the community.</li> <li>• Need for the project has not adequately been established.</li> <li>• If the power lines must be upgraded, install them underground or on the west side of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 18, 2003	Vince Oen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing the height of transmission towers increases the danger to the neighborhood.</li> <li>• Increased EMF will increase health hazards.</li> <li>• Evaluate impacts of EMF on native animals and flora.</li> <li>• Additional alternatives other than those proposed need to be considered.</li> </ul>
February 18, 2003	Jose Cuan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about EMF effects on health and any connections to cancer.</li> <li>• Increased EMF may have a negative effect on residents near the transmission lines.</li> <li>• Urge PG&amp;E to install the lines underground or move them further away from the homes.</li> <li>• Presence of the lines and towers has a negative impact on property values.</li> </ul>
February 19, 2003	Reza Moini	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate impacts of the project on residents and their children.</li> <li>• Doubts over justification for project.</li> </ul>
February 19, 2003	Carmen and Joseph Mahood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider Alternative 1B seriously.</li> <li>• Having the lines underground is the best for safety and aesthetics.</li> </ul>
February 19, 2003	Richard Cole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for project must be examined carefully.</li> <li>• Evaluation of project justification should be included in No Project Alternative section.</li> <li>• Power generation should be located close to the end user.</li> <li>• Makes little sense to demolish Potrero or Hunters Point power plants.</li> </ul>
February 20, 2003	Michael & Laura Nagle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger towers pose a health risk due to EMF which recent studies have shown to increase incidence in childhood leukemia, brain tumors, and miscarriages.</li> <li>• Larger towers and higher voltage lines would increase noise impacts and reduce visual quality.</li> <li>• Higher EMF would interfere with electronics.</li> <li>• New towers would reduce property value.</li> <li>• Construction could damage ecologically sensitive areas.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E should not be allowed to close down plants in areas needing power because they have deteriorated or become outdated.</li> <li>• Both the 230 kV and the 60 kV lines should be installed underground.</li> <li>• Another option would have lines underground where they are close to homes.</li> <li>• Power lines could be moved west of I-280.</li> <li>• Project could be canceled.</li> </ul>

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 21, 2003	Mr. & Mrs. Silvano G. Mazloum and Family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with potential for increased health risk from EMF.</li> <li>• Opposed to location due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health risks</li> <li>○ Interference with electronic equipment</li> <li>○ Negative impact on aesthetics</li> <li>○ Property Values</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Move proposed line west of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2003	Heather & Chris Cordes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about health risks particularly to their infant.</li> <li>• Larger lines would significantly negatively impact property values.</li> <li>• If the lines are necessary, run them underground or west of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2003	Jean Ann Van Houten	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values the view of the watershed, the deer, the sky, clouds, and lake</li> <li>• Transmission towers would be attractive targets to terrorist attacks and nearby residents would face collateral damage.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2003	Rita Seamans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary concern with health issues, particularly with potential for leukemia or brain tumors.</li> <li>• Move the alignment west of I-280 if the project must be done.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2003	Peggy Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although there is no definite information on the long-term effects of EMF, recent studies show potential health risks including higher incidences of childhood leukemia, brain tumors, and miscarriages.</li> <li>• Suggestion to move the power lines to the west of I-280 away from residences.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2003	Jon Janoska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build local power plants.</li> <li>• Concern with health effects of EMF.</li> <li>• Interested in feasibility of underground lines.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2003	Shirley McKinnie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger transmission towers would further disturb views of the watershed and open space.</li> <li>• How would construction affect the ecology?</li> <li>• Could the alignment be put underground or away from homes?</li> <li>• Concerned with possible health problems from EMF.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2003	Kevin McGowan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with the health, environmental, and property value impacts.</li> <li>• If the project is necessary it should be put underground or west of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 21, 2003	Milton and Sunee Jines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing transmission lines are an eyesore and hazard.</li> <li>• If necessary, the lines could be moved west of I-280 or buried underground.</li> </ul>
February 22, 2003	Mitchell Silong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to overhead transmission lines due to potential health risks, ecological risks, and aesthetic impacts.</li> <li>• There is no immediate benefit to local population.</li> <li>• Project is an intrusion to health, privacy, and finances.</li> </ul>
February 23, 2003	Anthony Kwee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about health issues arising from increased EMF.</li> <li>• Requesting all possible measures be taken in order to reduce EMF emissions to mitigate the impact on health of residents.</li> <li>• Recent EMF studies show potential health risk including higher incidences of childhood leukemia, brain tumors, and miscarriages.</li> </ul>
February 23, 2003	MaryJean King	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern with situations that will cause harm when new lines are in place.</li> <li>• Suggestion to create more local electricity generation within cities where the electricity is needed.</li> <li>• Moving the power lines west of I-280 will damage the environment.</li> </ul>

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
February 23, 2003	Stanley and Alice Lew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the project would create additional health problems for the residents of the area due to EMF.</li> <li>• Other concerns include negative impact on property values, aesthetics, noise pollution, etc.</li> <li>• Urge CPUC to consider local generation, alternative routes, and underground lines.</li> </ul>
February 23, 2003	William H. Mahncke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We must reduce the electrical power, as no feasible renewable energy sources are available.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E has been unable to operate the current system to comply with FCC regulations, causing radio and video interference.</li> <li>• Underground lines would be placed close to natural gas supply lines which if broken could cause unknown damage.</li> <li>• Added height to towers increases risk of towers falling on property due to earthquakes or sabotage.</li> <li>• Property values will fall.</li> <li>• If there is a need for this power, move the lines west by at least ¼ miles or more.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Drs. Pamela Kaiser & Barry Fleisher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about health issues from increased EMF.</li> <li>• Property values will be negatively impacted due to health and safety and visual issues.</li> <li>• Existing stations already have noise impacts.</li> <li>• Advocate moving power lines west of I-280 or placing them underground.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Noreen Hui	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely concerned about the increase in voltage in lines behind Lexington Avenue and Highlands School.</li> <li>• Concerned about potential health risks such as brain cancer, childhood leukemia, and birth defects.</li> <li>• Locate project away from residential areas and schools.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Pak Ho and Household	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the environmental impact on adjacent neighborhood.</li> <li>• Possibility of increased health risk from EMF.</li> <li>• Project will negatively impact property values and beauty of area.</li> <li>• Consider placing the lines underground.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Louis & Theresa Burton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to plan due to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increased noise from 230 kV lines</li> <li>○ Health risks</li> <li>○ Interference with electronic equipment</li> <li>○ Negative impact on aesthetics</li> <li>○ Property values</li> <li>○ Construction impacts</li> <li>○ Damage to protected wildlife areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>• An underground alternative away from the currently populated area deserves more consideration.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	William Glen, Ph.D.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correlation exists between diseases and proximity to EMF, and an increase in EMF from the project would further impinge on Lexington Avenue residences.</li> <li>• Power towers are an eyesore and increasing their height would reduce the aesthetics of the Highlands area.</li> <li>• All power towers should be moved far from dwellings or lines run underground.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Calvin & Ellen Inori	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose the project for reasons of health and negative effect on property values.</li> <li>• Recent studies show connection between EMF and leukemia, cancer, and other serious illnesses.</li> <li>• Not fair to be exposed to more EMF and add larger unsightly towers.</li> <li>• Need for power not adequately proven.</li> <li>• San Francisco should build its own power plants.</li> </ul>

### Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens

Date	From	Comments
February 24, 2003	Raj Singh Dasanjh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential health risk to people and wildlife is too great.</li> <li>• Consider underground alternatives.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Donald Hendricks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project will negatively affect quality of life in the San Mateo Highlands.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Ralph & Doris Voice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for the project has not been demonstrated.</li> <li>• Urgency of the project is not explained.</li> <li>• Adequate alternatives, underground or west of I-280, have not been considered.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Jeanie Bartson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Power lines are ugly.</li> <li>• Project would disrupt the visual quality of the beauty of I-280.</li> <li>• Power lines are unsightly and detract from health.</li> <li>• Aboveground lines can be damaged by weather or terror attacks.</li> <li>• Although earthquakes occur in the area, underground lines present less of a problem.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Donald J. McFarland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed tower will be within 25 feet of his property.</li> <li>• Tower will block view of State Game Refuge, Crystal Springs Lakes, and watershed.</li> <li>• Increased voltage will increase EMF that is a health hazard.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E not disclosing dangers of EMF to nearby residents.</li> <li>• Project will do nothing to solve California's power crisis.</li> <li>• Money on project should instead be applied to new or rebuilt power plants in San Francisco.</li> <li>• Project could reduce value of home from \$1,000,000 by \$100,000 to \$200,000.</li> </ul> <p><b>Attachments:</b> Photos of McFarland Home, View from Home, Proximity to Hillsdale Switching Station, Wildlife in the Game Reserve, and Current Towers and Power Lines</p>
February 24, 2003	Dena Fisher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health issues from increased EMF</li> <li>○ Negative effect on views</li> <li>○ Negative effect on property values of homes near the project.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• No benefit to the neighborhood and only negative effects.</li> <li>• If needed the lines and towers should be located west of I-280.</li> <li>• Where lines are near homes, lines should be located underground.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Susanne & Edward Li	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over potential health risks from EMF causing leukemia, miscarriages, and brain tumors.</li> <li>• Larger towers negatively impact views.</li> <li>• Significant negative impact on property values.</li> <li>• Suggestion to move power line west of I-280 or install the line underground.</li> </ul>
February 24, 2003	Noelle Tan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dust and noise from construction</li> <li>○ Reductions to property values</li> <li>○ Health issues with EMF including increased incidence of childhood leukemia, brain tumors, and miscarriages</li> <li>○ Negative visual impacts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggestion to install power lines on the west side of I-280.</li> <li>• Concern that construction will cause snakes to migrate into nearby neighborhoods.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

Date	From	Comments
February 24, 2003	Lauren and John Black	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over the social irresponsibility, financial waste, and ecological upheaval that the project represents.</li> <li>• While California's has a budget deficit, this project will spend a colossal amount of money.</li> <li>• San Francisco could generate the power locally.</li> <li>• Project would damage the ecology and appearance of the watershed area</li> <li>• EMF poses an unquantified health risk.</li> <li>• Put the lines underground of west of I-280 if necessary.</li> <li>• Is the power truly needed or can it be generated locally?</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Lynn & John Chakel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If San Francisco requires more power, explore local options.</li> <li>• Develop an underground/overground system.</li> <li>• Move towers and lines west between reservoir and HMB neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Opposed to the project because of the following issues:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Potential health issues</li> <li>○ Potential interference with home electronic equipment</li> <li>○ Negative impact on aesthetics of the neighborhood</li> <li>○ Negative impact on property values.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Barbara J. Ross and James Hale Ross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be a way to accomplish project goals without impacting homeowners so much.</li> <li>• Project will destroy views, increase EMF, and lower property values.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Frank Toth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns are:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health risks due to EMF causing physiological changes and damage to organs</li> <li>○ Decreases in property values</li> <li>○ Aesthetics</li> <li>○ Use existing plants</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bury the lines underground.</li> </ul>
February 25-28, 2003	Letter submitted by the individuals listed below	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections and concerns regarding the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health risks due to EMF increasing incidence of childhood leukemia, brain tumors, and miscarriages</li> <li>○ Decreases in property values</li> <li>○ Aesthetics</li> <li>○ Noise.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Support Town of Hillsborough's efforts to have the proposed 230 kV lines installed underground along with the 60 kV lines.</li> <li>• Evaluate whether project is needed.</li> <li>• Putting line so close to homes does not protect the community.</li> <li>• Project only serves the interests of San Francisco and PG&amp;E while Peninsula residents suffer consequences.</li> </ul>

Submitted by: Sunil & Rujni Arora, Kathy Battat, Melissa & Rich Beames, Suzy & Jeff Cantor, Maurice Chin, Peggy Condon and Mark Neumann, Sharon & Gregg Domenico, David & Sheila Cooper, Joan Fox, Jacqueline/Maurice, Allan Jin, Diane Kounalakis, Pooh Ming Lau, Lisa Kearns, Sez Ka Lau, Charles Lebo, Elene Lee, Patsy Leung, Damien Lombardo, Francesca Lombardo, Gilbert Lombardo, Ida Lombardo, Jackson Lombardo, Julien Lombardo, Regina Lombardo, Jennifer Low, Jennifer Lum-Yee & Oscar Yee, Mark [surname not legible], Galina Miloslavsky, Galina Miloslavsky & Alec Miloslavsky, Louie & Mary-Ann Ortiz-Luis, Frank F. Pasacreta, Lani Pringle, Kristine Shannon, Sandra Shmunis, Morimasa Tonaki, Unsigned, Christopher D. White MD, Yeung (first name not legible), Warren & Joanne Wolfeld

---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 25, 2003	Mahnaz Roshan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request changes to PG&amp;E project, as it will endanger health and safety.</li> <li>• Project will turn neighborhood into an unsafe industrialized-looking community.</li> <li>• Noise from high voltage lines and size of towers will be a blight to community.</li> <li>• Consider installing the lines underground – both the 230 kV and existing 60 kV line.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Raymond and Charlene Weiss and Family	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of the proposed power lines is too close to homes.</li> <li>• Project creates an eyesore and potential health hazard.</li> <li>• If the lines are necessary, locate them west of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Diane & Alex Gallegos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health issues</li> <li>○ Necessity of project</li> <li>○ Decreases in property values</li> <li>○ Aesthetics</li> <li>○ Noise.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Please find an alternative to this project.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Jean Connolly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If San Francisco needs power, improve San Francisco power plants.</li> <li>• If power must come from the Peninsula, compromises should be reached.</li> <li>• Lines should be underground/overground or completely underground.</li> <li>• Concern with health issues and reductions to property values.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Donald Coyne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider installing the lines underground or generating more power in San Francisco.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Carla and Sami Jadallah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about potential health risks from higher EMF.</li> <li>• Lines should be underground or away from homes.</li> <li>• Property values will be dramatically decreased.</li> <li>• Project will have increased noise from lines.</li> <li>• Household electronic equipment may also be affected.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Dr. and Mrs. David Haskin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned over cancer risks in neighborhood and handling by PG&amp;E of health issues.</li> <li>• Held open meeting regarding possible effects on home values.</li> <li>• Displeased with interviews by PG&amp;E representatives and information provided to the public by PG&amp;E.</li> <li>• Statistical analysis of neighborhood survey should be acted upon.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Howard McDonell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underground lines would be the best alternative if possible.</li> <li>• If new towers must be built they should be located west of I-280 and as low as possible.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Ed Coral & Hilary Coral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legitimate health issues arise from a five-fold increase in electricity transmitted.</li> <li>• Further research and data regarding EMF is needed.</li> <li>• Concerns with environmental justice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlands is least well-off of all the hillside communities</li> <li>○ Also has greatest concentration of minorities and lower-income whites.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Nancy Risso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Against the project.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Joan Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because of health hazards and property values these changes must be considered carefully.</li> <li>• Project could endanger children and elders in the community.</li> <li>• Consider putting the line underground.</li> </ul>
February 25, 2003	Carolyn Russo & Greg Barsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project will harm the beauty and aesthetic quality of the neighborhood and region</li> <li>• Explore alternative transmission routes or underground transmission</li> </ul>

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 25, 2003	Ruth M. Anderson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to the proposed project.</li> <li>• Installing the proposed line underground along with the existing 60 kV line would be best.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Betty W. Jue and Victor Tan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that construction will disturb rattlesnakes and drive them into the nearby neighborhoods.</li> <li>• If the project is necessary, move the tower and power lines west of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Sherry & Dan Nolan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncomfortable with existing lines.</li> <li>• Many in area have died of cancer-related illnesses.</li> <li>• Develop the project away from homes or underground.</li> <li>• Development of additional lines in the area makes it a less desirable community.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Rose Yee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grave concerns about health risks from EMF, particularly higher incidence of childhood leukemia, brain tumors, and miscarriage.</li> <li>• High incidence of breast cancer in Eichler Highlands in San Mateo.</li> <li>• Assessment must be made of need for power.</li> <li>• Power lines, if necessary, should be moved west of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Bettina & Stephen Holquist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following concerns justify an alternative plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ View of Crystal Springs Hills will be diminished</li> <li>○ Increase in EMF</li> <li>○ Noise from the lines will increase</li> <li>○ Increased fire hazard</li> <li>○ Impact to health due to use of heavy equipment during construction</li> <li>○ Project impacts will particularly impact their son who has cerebral palsy and a cardiac condition.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Power lines should be moved west of I-280 and installed underground.</li> <li>• Increase in local generation in San Francisco would be ideal.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Hugo Miranda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Negative impact on aesthetics</li> <li>○ Negative impact on property values</li> <li>○ Negative impact on health.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Best solution is to install project underground.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Dennis Tom, MD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following alternative would address concerns about EMF exposure, neighborhood property values, environment, and habitat impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ From Jefferson Substation underground along Cañada Road to Edgewood Road, underground combined 230 kV/60 kV lines along current tower alignment to MP 4, lines would cross I-280/I-92 junction and follow current tower alignment underground to Hillsdale Substation. Lines would then run overhead to MP 7, then back underground to MP 9 and Carolands Substation. Lines would continue overhead across to west side of I-280 along existing ROW to MP 15.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Effects of underground lines on watershed lands would be offset by removal of existing towers between MP 1 and MP 9 and planting of new native flora.</li> </ul>



---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 26, 2003	Joanne Hong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections and concerns regarding the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health risks due to EMF increasing incidence of childhood leukemia, brain tumors, and miscarriages</li> <li>○ Decreases in property values</li> <li>○ Aesthetics</li> <li>○ Noise.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Support Town of Hillsborough's efforts to have the proposed 230 kV lines installed underground along with the 60 kV lines.</li> <li>• Evaluate whether project is needed.</li> <li>• Putting line so close to homes does not protect the community.</li> <li>• Project only serves the interests of San Francisco and PG&amp;E while Peninsula residents suffer consequences.</li> <li>• Protect the people of California.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Teresa Tom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health issues from increased EMF</li> <li>○ Negative impact on aesthetics due to increased noise and reduced visibility</li> <li>○ Increased risk of lightning strikes</li> <li>○ Negative impact on property values</li> <li>○ Long construction period involving loud heavy equipment and helicopters.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Preferable to route the project west of the Crystal Springs Reservoir.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	John & Nancy Levin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about health issues from increased EMF.</li> <li>• Towers would be too close to homes and school.</li> <li>• Power for San Francisco should be generated closer to San Francisco.</li> <li>• Perhaps an underground project should be considered more seriously.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Kurt & Marcena May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the following items:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Potential health hazard</li> <li>○ Decreases in property values due to perceived health hazard</li> <li>○ Increase in negative visual impact also impacting property values.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Put all lines underground.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Ivan & Erika Crockett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns are negative impacts on quality of life, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Safety issues in collocating gas lines and high voltage transmission lines</li> <li>○ Health issues arising from increased EMF</li> <li>○ Loss of open space</li> <li>○ Fire danger from transmission lines and towers in open space</li> <li>○ Negative aesthetic impacts due to noise lines and blocked views</li> <li>○ Property values would be negatively impacted.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Alternatives include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Install the proposed 230 kV line underground, include the 60 kV line along Alternative 1B.</li> <li>○ A combination overhead/underground route, running underground from the Ralston Substation to the Hillsdale Substation along route 1A, but far away from the residences, then overhead across the canyon, then underground again in Hillsborough along Route 1A until Carolands Substation, crossing west of I-280 and continuing overground staying west of I-280.</li> <li>○ Move the 230 kV and 60 kV lines west of I-280.</li> <li>○ Develop more local power generation for increased reliability.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
February 26, 2003	Biruta Plugis Sereda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern and reservation for the power line expansion due to links between EMF and disease.</li> <li>• Expand and increase power sources near existing demand areas.</li> <li>• More research should be done on installing lines underground.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Jessie Louie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed line is too close to West School and poses a danger to the students due to increased EMF.</li> <li>• Affects the appearance of the community.</li> <li>• Consider alternatives such as underground power lines or redirect route of the power line.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Lila Lynn Humphrey & Mike Humphrey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project towers would be too close to residential house.</li> <li>• Potential to harm the health, peace of mind, aesthetics, and property values of neighborhood.</li> <li>• Consider dropping the proposal.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Karen, Andrew, and Granger Brenneman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project will have a significant negative impact on open space in the Mid-Peninsula and on the safety and quality of life in San Mateo Highlands.</li> <li>• 230 kV towers would dominate the landscape and diminish views of Skyline Crest and Crystal Springs.</li> <li>• Affects of EMF on health of children and elderly not yet known.</li> <li>• Community would become a grimmer, possibly healthier, industrial outpost.</li> <li>• Property values would be negatively impacted.</li> <li>• Rationale for project need has not been adequately explained.</li> <li>• Can the state afford the project right now?</li> <li>• If the project is necessary, placing the 230 kV and 60 kV lines underground is the logical choice.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Scott D.S. Young, Charles Krauz, Sarah Le Forge, Michael Yantos, Carolyn Dorsch, John Steiner, Elizabeth Evos, James Dawes, Karen Meredith, Alan Fernandez, and Andy Butcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support underground Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Construction and maintenance of new towers would diminish the beauty and ecology of Edgewood Park and other natural areas along the San Francisco watershed.</li> <li>• Installation of new towers would impact sensitive serpentine grassland areas, home to many unique and threatened species.</li> <li>• Towers would degrade the scenic and recreational value of the watershed and would be detrimental to avian species.</li> <li>• Installing the transmission lines underground would greatly lessen impacts and improve security from terrorism and vandalism.</li> <li>• Strongly encourage CPUC to select Alternative 1B for the southern portion of the project, install the 60 kV lines underground as well, and remove the existing towers.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Allen Mulch, Gary Ruezz, and Leona Ruegg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support underground Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Construction and maintenance of new towers would diminish the beauty and ecology of Edgewood Park and other natural areas along the San Francisco watershed.</li> <li>• Installation of new towers would impact sensitive serpentine grassland areas, home to many unique and threatened species</li> <li>• Towers would degrade the scenic and recreational value of the watershed and would be detrimental to avian species.</li> <li>• Installing the transmission lines underground would greatly lessen impacts and improve security from terrorism and vandalism.</li> <li>• Strongly encourage CPUC to select Alternative 1B for the southern portion of the project, install the 60 kV lines underground as well, and remove the existing towers.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 26, 2003	Betty W. Jue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to the project for the following reasons:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health issues arising from increased EMF and construction air pollution</li> <li>○ Property values would be negatively impacted</li> <li>○ Loss of open space</li> <li>○ Noise and pollution during construction.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Urge CPUC to address the need for more electricity in San Francisco.</li> <li>• Suggest moving power lines west of I-280 or under Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Perla C. Schmidt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with the environmental impact of the project.</li> <li>• Urge PG&amp;E to consider the alternatives proposed by the 280 Concerned Citizens Coalition.</li> </ul>
February 26, 2003	Ronald Small	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main concern about the project is potential danger to health from increased EMF, particularly for his wife who suffers from multiple sclerosis and has a compromised immune system.</li> <li>• Need for project has not been demonstrated.</li> <li>• If project is necessary, the route near populated areas should be underground or on the west side of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Kay Blickley Schilling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections and concerns regarding the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health risks due to EMF increasing incidence of childhood leukemia, brain tumors, and miscarriages</li> <li>○ Decreases in property values</li> <li>○ Aesthetics</li> <li>○ Noise.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Support Town of Hillsborough's efforts to have the proposed 230 kV lines installed underground along with the 60 kV lines.</li> <li>• Evaluate whether project is needed.</li> <li>• Putting line so close to homes does not protect the community.</li> <li>• Project only serves the interests of San Francisco and PG&amp;E while Peninsula residents suffer consequences.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Lawrence A. Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the power really needed?</li> <li>• Put the line west of I-280.</li> <li>• Location west of I-280 will not cause harm to views and property values.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	unsigned, using Lawrence A. Smith's email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Line would serve San Francisco without benefit to Peninsula residents.</li> <li>• Lines are noisy and will affect property values and health.</li> <li>• Disappointed in PG&amp;E.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Shahrzad G. Kaveh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about health issues from increased EMF.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Drew Donovan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only drawback to current views of the San Francisco watershed is the existing power lines.</li> <li>• Incumbent on PG&amp;E to act responsibly and put the power lines underground or along an easement away from homes.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Lester D. & Ruthild Candee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity for San Francisco may or may not be needed.</li> <li>• Local generation options should be explored.</li> <li>• Proposed project would have a negative impact on property value because of safety and health concerns about EMF.</li> <li>• If the project is necessary, consider putting the lines underground, away from homes, west of I-280.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
February 27, 2003	Bruce Eimon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planned lines are close to daughter's elementary school.</li> <li>• No reason for San Mateo residents to suffer for the benefit of people in San Francisco.</li> <li>• San Francisco should build its own power plant.</li> <li>• If necessary, put the lines underground to eliminate the EMF exposure.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Daniel Chau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal imposes the following negative impacts to residents along the route:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health and safety due to EMF increases, particularly of children attending Highlands Elementary School</li> <li>○ PG&amp;E failed to support the need for this project</li> <li>○ PG&amp;E failed to consider adequate alternatives in the PEA.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposed project would negatively impact visual aesthetics and property values.</li> <li>• Support the following options:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No expansion</li> <li>○ Other locations to mitigate power distribution problems</li> <li>○ Towers located west of I-280</li> <li>○ Underground lines</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Deborah Cogswell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious consideration should be given to any and all alternatives to the proposed project.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Don M. Wong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeming lack of concern for the health of the San Mateo Highlands and Hillsborough residents.</li> <li>• Noise, dust, and affects to property value are also major concerns</li> <li>• Examine whether or not project is needed.</li> <li>• If necessary, for reliability, the route should not go through Martin Substation.</li> <li>• If the line must come through San Mateo County, move the line as far from homes as possible.</li> <li>• Propose running the line underground from the Ralston Substation to the Hillsdale Substation, sufficiently far enough away from residences, overhead across the canyon, then underground again to Carolands Substation, then overhead west of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Cathy Barber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about increase in power capacity of project because of EMF risks.</li> <li>• Existing lines are near hundreds of people, many small children.</li> <li>• Too many impacts for project to move forward.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Drew Shell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deeply concerned about the environmental, aesthetic, safety, and health impacts of the overhead portion of the project.</li> <li>• Construction and maintenance impacts could harm Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve.</li> <li>• Environmental justice issue as the project benefits San Francisco, but provides no benefit to Peninsula residents.</li> <li>• Request the project use Alternative 1B to protect and preserve sensitive habitat.</li> <li>• Remove existing towers to improve the safety, environmental quality, and aesthetic character of the I-280 corridor.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Frank Mak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed 230 kV lines present greater EMF dangers for existing residences.</li> <li>• New towers will be within 600 feet of West School and 400 feet of many residences.</li> <li>• Recent studies show EMF can increase the risk of miscarriages, childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, and ALS.</li> <li>• Towers will be unattractive and will diminish property values.</li> <li>• Construction will also bring disruptions and noise to the community.</li> <li>• Suggest putting the lines underground or west of I-280.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 27, 2003	Gregory Stein	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paid a substantial price for property with a view of the coastal mountains.</li> <li>• Project will have a detrimental effect to the value of real estate and reduction in quality of life.</li> <li>• Project would compromise the view and the desirability of the property.</li> <li>• Project amounts to a transfer of wealth and living standard from the residents of the San Mateo Highlands to the residents of San Francisco.</li> <li>• Concerned about noise from lines and construction.</li> <li>• Suggest the following alternatives:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No project</li> <li>○ Local electricity generation within the San Francisco area</li> <li>○ Alternative transmission such as underground lines or lines that do not compromise my quality of life.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Project is unwarranted, unreasonable, and unfair</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Margaret Kujiraoka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over increased EMF that can increase the potential for health concerns such as brain cancer, childhood leukemia, and birth defects.</li> <li>• California guidelines do not allow schools to be built within 200 feet of high voltage transmission lines, yet there are over 400 students at Highlands Elementary School one block from the existing lines.</li> <li>• Other countries have concluded that there is a connection between EMF exposure and cancer and in response have set regulations distancing residences and schools from transmission lines and requiring utility companies to mitigate the effects of lines.</li> <li>• Concerned about potential health risks, aesthetic impacts, and property value impacts of project.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Mel & Sherrie Friedman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believe that proximity of the transmission lines to homes and Highland School presents a danger to children.</li> <li>• Support the project moved west of Crystal Springs or placed underground.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Mina Eimon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with risk of exposure to EMF.</li> <li>• Proposed lines are within 600 feet of an elementary school.</li> <li>• Hillsborough residents suffer the consequences of the project while San Francisco and upper San Mateo County reap benefits.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E needs to explore options such as installing an underground route or building a power plant in San Francisco.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	D.W. Russell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project would be a detriment to our environment and preferences as a highly attractive and desirable living area.</li> <li>• Project will increase health and safety hazards and compound existing visual detriments.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	William & Sharon Catechi and John & Nicole Catechi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has taken 25 years to grow trees tall enough to partially block the existing towers.</li> <li>• Concerns over health and safety risks from increased EMF.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E should be committed to improving the aesthetics of the neighborhoods</li> <li>• Cost of the project should not include the expense of degrading the quality of neighborhoods.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Yuen Ling Tam & Owen Cheung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New towers will have a negative effect on property values.</li> <li>• Project will expose families to increased health risks.</li> <li>• Consider moving lines away from houses or putting them underground.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Yen Lee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is it necessary to upgrade the transmission lines?</li> <li>• If an upgrade is necessary, lines should be put underground or west of I-280.</li> <li>• Concerned about property values and impact to neighborhood.</li> </ul>

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
February 27, 2003	Jay Roshan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed project will damage our families and neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Lines should be installed underground.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	John Minkel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing lines are already a danger and should be underground.</li> <li>• No one is sure of the impact of EMF, but to increase would only be negative.</li> <li>• Relocate the lines underground, next to I-280 or west of I-280.</li> <li>• Concerned about negative effects on property values.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Dr. Paul Hsiao & Dr. Pi Ling Fan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increased EMF emissions close to home without proper long-term impact analysis and safety evaluation is a health risk.</li> <li>• Project would be more acceptable if it were moved west of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Signed by the individuals listed below.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents of the children who attend Highlands Elementary School concerned for the safety of the children.</li> <li>• Concerned about the health risks that accompany increased EMF.</li> <li>• Students should not be subjected to classroom disruption, congestion and air pollution that will occur as a result of construction, earthmovers, and overhead helicopters.</li> <li>• Urge consideration of the no project alternative due to overstated need for electricity.</li> <li>• If there is a need for electricity, it should be generated in San Francisco.</li> <li>• If transmission lines must be installed, locate the lines underground so that EMF will be reduced.</li> </ul> <p>Signed by: Judy C. Kwee, Jackie Chan, Noreen Hui, Sherie Freidman, Gail Oshima, Alejandra Virgen, Isabel Marquez, Alex Howard, Eunice Sherer, Collen M. Sullivan, Derek Vroom, Linda Vercelli, Ana Lopez, Maria Sandoval, Laurel Nagle, Donald Nagle, Anton McBurnie, Pat Garcia Luna, J.J. Garcia Luna, Lee Anne Mau, Denise Haas, Karen Li, Grace Kim, Brigitte S. Shearer, Debbie Cooper, Steve Hamaguchi, Adele C. Runcke, Emiko Fujii, Florence Yuen, Shannon Dobbs, Carolee Fucigna, Bonnie Halpern-Relsher, Connie Hamaguchi, Pam Barasch, Kandace Torreano, Julie Lord, Meire Bremer, Diane Prentiss, Janet Fuller</p>
February 27, 2003	Anthony B. and Judy C. Kwee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the potential health effects of increase in voltage in lines.</li> <li>• Sweden has concluded that there is a definite connection between EMF and cancers.</li> <li>• Utility companies and government continue to tell the public that there is no correlation between EMF and cancer.</li> <li>• Properly bury the lines as far from residences and schools as possible.</li> <li>• Encasement in oil-filled steel pipes will greatly mitigate EMF.</li> <li>• Primary concern is health; secondary concerns are with aesthetics and property values.</li> </ul> <p><b>Attachment:</b> Portion of the book <i>The Great Power-Line Cover-Up</i>, by Paul Brodeur</p>
February 27, 2003	Race J. Chen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in voltage could create health risks or at least perceptions of health risks.</li> <li>• Line could be partially buried or relocated west of I-280.</li> <li>• Potential harm to nearby residents outweighs the benefits.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Ed & Elsie Carlson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The power lines should be installed underground.</li> <li>• Towers are ugly and a health hazard.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Kwan Yee Liu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urge that underground alternative or moving towers to the uninhabited side of I-280 be adopted.</li> <li>• Future findings may show EMF to be more harmful.</li> <li>• Landslide and earthquake hazards, aesthetic and property value impacts should be considered.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 27, 2003	Eunice & Jim Scherer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely concerned about the health effects from increased EMF.</li> <li>• Is the power really needed in San Francisco?</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Kristina Klausen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project as proposed would have the following detrimental impacts:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increased health risks from EMF potentially including higher incidence of childhood leukemia, brain tumors, and miscarriages</li> <li>○ Health risks to older homeowners and children, particularly as Highlands Elementary School, Highlands Recreational Center, and the Youth Services Center on Tower Road are in close proximity to the towers</li> <li>○ Dealing responsibly with EMF risks today could avoid costly retrofits in the future when definitive evidence of the risks of EMF becomes available</li> <li>○ Towers would dwarf Eichler homes and adjacent trees and be unsightly</li> <li>○ Floor-to-ceiling windows of Eichler homes make the neighborhood more vulnerable to visual impacts</li> <li>○ Eichler neighborhood is an example of California’s architectural history</li> <li>○ Construction noise would be disruptive to neighborhood</li> <li>○ Noise can be heard from high voltage lines</li> <li>○ Properties in the Highlands average around \$800,000 and values could be significantly impacted by the project</li> <li>○ Drop in property values could lead to a decline in the quality of the neighborhood.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Alternatives:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No project</li> <li>○ Move the power lines west of I-280</li> <li>○ Install the proposed 230 kV lines underground and ideally install the existing 60 kV lines with them with proper shielding</li> <li>○ Developing an underground/overhead route with the lines underground when close to homes and overhead when they are not near homes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	R. Nuri Otus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project is aesthetically objectionable.</li> <li>• There are many cases throughout the country linking high-voltage power lines to brain tumors and cancer.</li> <li>• Urge CPUC to deny PG&amp;E’s proposal and require a plan that would move the power lines underground wherever possible.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Pamela Merkadeau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project seems to have ignored aesthetic, health and safety effects to local property owners.</li> <li>• Impact to property values, perhaps amounting to a taking, would be negative.</li> <li>• Project has also ignored the environmental and wildlife issues.</li> <li>• Measures must be taken to preserve what remains of the natural landscape.</li> <li>• Alternative solutions must be fully considered and evaluated.</li> <li>• Need for project must be fully evaluated.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Arline Dixon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many homes in very close proximity to towers.</li> <li>• Have seen no safety information about the EMF relating to the new project.</li> <li>• New homebuyers do not want to buy homes if larger towers carrying more power are nearby.</li> <li>• Human health should never be sacrificed to save dollars.</li> <li>• Route should be underground or away from homes.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

Date	From	Comments
February 27, 2003	Mr. & Mrs. Robert J. Traube	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New lines would increase risks to residents from increased EMF.</li> <li>• Perception of danger affects purchases of property.</li> <li>• Ugly towers would destroy views.</li> <li>• Let the residents of San Francisco pay for the negative impacts the towers would create by the imposition of a surcharge on their electric bills which could be used in a variety of ways, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pay for appraisal of homes potentially affected by the project, then pay for a second appraisal when the property is sold, then pay for a loss of value incurred</li> <li>○ Pay for investigation of alternative means of delivering the power such as underwater cable systems</li> <li>○ Construct a generation facility in San Francisco.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There is uncertainty over the need for the project.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Karen M. Heaney Hook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing power lines are noisy and dangerous.</li> <li>• Homeowners should not be required to endure increases in changes to these lines.</li> <li>• No notice was given to Laurel Hill Drive residents when a new line was installed.</li> <li>• Public was not informed of this project until a citizens group was formed.</li> <li>• Additional funds can be procured to move lines underground.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Janet Paslin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about EMF from project and impacts to views.</li> <li>• If power lines are absolutely necessary, put them underground or closer to I-280 for health and the environment.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	George & Julie Beck	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not convinced about minimum risk and do not trust PG&amp;E's assurances.</li> <li>• Noise and construction impacts, particularly to open space, would be detrimental.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E is taking an easy way out with the least problematic solution to them.</li> <li>• If power is needed in San Francisco, let generation facilities be built in San Francisco.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Marjorie H. Palmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urge all the lines be installed underground.</li> <li>• CPUC must act responsibly and protect communities from health hazards and aesthetic impacts.</li> <li>• Communities already face EMF impacts from GTE and Cellular One.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Elias Salameh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project will affect health, state of mind, and property value.</li> <li>• Existing lines generate noise.</li> <li>• Do not pursue the matter of expansion of the lines.</li> </ul>
February 28, 2003	James F. Mahon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not want friends and neighbors exposed to dangers of EMF.</li> <li>• Obvious solution is to install the lines underground.</li> <li>• Towers are no longer needed.</li> <li>• If underground lines are more expensive, then users should be required to pay more.</li> <li>• Innocent people should not be exposed to danger for the benefit of PG&amp;E and unknown users.</li> </ul>
February 28, 2003	Sharon and Herbert Hwang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Towers will be too close to residences and a site closer to I-280 would be more appropriate.</li> <li>• Project has potential to negatively impact views and property values because of safety and health concerns.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Agnes A. Serra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for project not adequately proven.</li> <li>• Increased power will increase EMF and impact property values.</li> <li>• Concerned about health hazards, EMF, and noise.</li> <li>• The project is too close to homes.</li> </ul>



---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 27, 2003	Rita Castello	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternatives to the project include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Decide whether the power is really needed in San Francisco, then look for more local alternatives</li> <li>○ Make the lines further west from the residential area, Highlands School and Recreation Center</li> <li>○ Put the power lines underground.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The project puts the health and safety of children and families at risk.</li> </ul>
February 27, 2003	Karen Olson Stern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternatives to be included in the EIR analysis:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No project, as PG&amp;E has overstated growth projections for San Francisco</li> <li>○ Local electricity generation</li> <li>○ Town of Hillsborough's alternative for an underground/overground route</li> <li>○ Move the lines west away from residences, preferably west of I-280</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns with the project are as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Potential health risks from increased EMF</li> <li>○ Visual and audible aesthetic impacts from larger towers with noisier lines</li> <li>○ Significant negative property value impact</li> <li>○ Inconvenience of a long construction period involving heavy equipment and helicopters.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
February 28, 2003	Patricia J. Doolittle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hope that PG&amp;E will find ways to produce needed power in a way that is more acceptable to all the people involved.</li> <li>• If each individual loss of home value were \$100,000 to \$200,000 plus in value, many revenues would be impacted.</li> <li>• Consider a second high voltage along the same existing line down by the Bay. If the point is to have a backup, the second line could be that backup. If more power is needed, the second line moving along the same towers as the first line near the Bay could be installed for that reason as well.</li> <li>• If the power substations need to be updated to be more reliable or to deliver more power, then expand the substation near the line that runs along the Bay. Put the substation in a large building, if people near the substation object to the larger substation.</li> <li>• New power plants and substation could be placed underground so people do not have to look at them.</li> <li>• In favor of suggestions presented by people objecting to the current plan in favor of a new line along the 280 corridor.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E could be overstating their need for this project.</li> <li>• In support of a combination of above ground and below ground lines as proposed by the Hillsborough citizens. The lines near the highlands would be placed below.</li> </ul>
March 2, 2003	Steve Shannon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appears to be no major barriers to bury the lines underground.</li> <li>• If underground lines are not an option, there is a lot of land west of I-280.</li> <li>• Recent studies indicate that some scientists believe EMF causes increased risks.</li> </ul>
March 2, 2003	Mark Nachlis and Michelle Corbett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with increased EMF as lines are only 300-400 feet from young children.</li> <li>• Also concerned with home resale values.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-3. Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
March 5, 2003	Prof. Ellen Peel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely concerned about the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project currently being proposed.</li> <li>• Most concerned about the potential health danger to our baby and ourselves.</li> <li>• Property values can be lowered.</li> <li>• The temporary disruption and permanent disfigurement of the landscape are problems.</li> <li>• Strongly urge the reconsideration of the project, must investigate alternatives that take into account the needs of residents and the environment.</li> </ul>
March 12-13, 2003	Scott Buschman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfair and shameful to close comment period at a time when residents and other shareholders are only learning about the project.</li> <li>• Highway 280 will lose its distinction of the most beautiful freeway in the world, no way to mitigate the impacts that towers will cause.</li> <li>• Placing the station on top of an active earthquake fault is a disaster waiting to happen.</li> <li>• Alternatives do not look like alternative routes; rather they are alternative ways of placing the lines.</li> <li>• The station will be an eyesore and make this part of town look blighter.</li> <li>• The abandoned gas station property across the street from the proposed transition station site has recently been sold and is slated for residential development. The property owner may back out of the deal because of the propose project.</li> <li>• To what health risks from EMFs will the proposed project expose the children and teachers at John Muir Elementary school and nearby residents?</li> <li>• Residents near the station should not have to endure extra operational noise in the area.</li> <li>• The proposal runs counter to San Bruno goals associated with undergrounding utilities.</li> <li>• San Bruno has already had to suffer a disproportionate percentage of impacts from many state and countywide projects.</li> <li>• Alternative routes, such as going down Hickey or Westborough, not San Bruno Avenue, and with the transition station at Highway 92. Or maybe along Highway 101 via Highway 92. Maybe have the alignment follow Highway 1 down near Serramonte Boulevard and tie in at a Daly City station.</li> </ul>

---

## **APPENDIX B-4**

---

### Summary of Oral Comments Received At Scoping Meetings

**Appendix B-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Scoping Meeting, January 29, 2003 — San Bruno, CA</b>		
January 29, 2003	Joe Monterosso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing homes and arranging with PG&amp;E to underground lines – will he be reimbursed for their work?</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	<b>Committee for Green Foothills:</b> Lennie Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edgewood Park &amp; Preserve and aesthetic values of the peninsula in general should be maintained.</li> <li>• Supports Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Project should avoid affecting Edgewood Park, which is habitat to threatened and endangered species and includes serpentine grasslands.</li> <li>• Suggests current 60 kV lines be installed underground and towers removed.</li> <li>• Question over CEQA vs. NEPA process and best evaluation of alternatives.</li> <li>• Underground lines would have increased security from terrorism and vandalism.</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	<b>City of San Bruno:</b> Rick Cole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Line crosses a proposed new major rail project.</li> <li>• Potential safety problems due to vicinity of San Andreas Fault.</li> <li>• Visual protection for proposed project would need to be evaluated.</li> <li>• Questions regarding private property vs. state ROW.</li> <li>• Suggestion that lines be installed along Skyline Boulevard to keep lines out of the view corridor.</li> <li>• Concerns over proximity of lines to residences.</li> <li>• City of San Bruno wants to preserve the utility corridor along San Bruno Avenue.</li> <li>• Would putting the lines in San Bruno Avenue affect water systems or water lines?</li> <li>• Consider Sneath Lane for an alternative east-west route.</li> <li>• Consider I-380 corridor that has open areas that could be used.</li> <li>• Possible conflicts with underground fiber optic lines.</li> <li>• Coordination with other local agencies is very important.</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	Jackie H. Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for the project must be evaluated, particularly differentiating between San Francisco and peninsula needs.</li> <li>• Concerned about communication issues between PG&amp;E, cities, and the public.</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	Rose A. Urbach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with how the project will affect San Bruno traffic with the amount of existing construction in San Bruno.</li> <li>• Concerned about crowded utility corridors in streets having the capacity for new transmission lines.</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	<b>South San Francisco Schools:</b> Shawn Ropp, Director of Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with health risks due to EMF and proximity of the new line to schools and residents of South San Francisco.</li> <li>• Consider schools in discussions of routing through residential areas.</li> </ul>
January 29, 2003	Michele Nemschoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about late receipt of notice.</li> <li>• Will comment on February 4.</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, 2:00pm February 4, 2003 — San Mateo, CA</b>		
February 4, 2003	<b>Town of Hillsborough:</b> Martha DeBry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the project will affect safety and aesthetic values with no direct benefits for peninsula communities.</li> <li>• Consider installing the lines underground or on the west side of I-280.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Richard Cole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has not been a good case made for the project need.</li> <li>• Has PG&amp;E shown a user need?</li> <li>• Power generation should be closer to the end users.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 4, 2003	<b>Committee for Green Foothills:</b> Lennie Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Francisco watershed recognized as a designated International Biosphere Reserve.</li> <li>• Alternative 1B should be modified to include installation of the 60 kV line underground as well as the 230 kV and should be installed under streets.</li> <li>• This would avoid impacts to Edgewood Park.</li> <li>• Alternative 1B improves security from terrorism and vandalism.</li> <li>• As the northern section is already planned to be underground, it should be feasible for the southern section to be underground as well.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Wilson Pinney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider a very thorough study of underground alternatives.</li> <li>• Seismic threat to the lines must be investigated.</li> <li>• Concern over conflicts with gas pipelines – or could corroding pipeline replacement be included in project.</li> <li>• Renewable energy has not been addressed.</li> <li>• Consider the finite supply of fossil fuel and substitute renewables.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	<b>Davis Wright Tremain</b> (representing 280 Corridor Concerned Citizens): Ed O'Neil & Jeff Gray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous demand studies do not accurately represent current demand.</li> <li>• PG&amp;E understates the future electricity supply.</li> <li>• Is this the best project for meet demand?</li> <li>• Is this the best route or best design?</li> <li>• Concerns over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EMF/Health issues</li> <li>○ Visual</li> <li>○ Noise</li> <li>○ Corona</li> <li>○ Property values.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Recommendation to alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Include installation of the 60 kV line underground in Alternative 1B</li> <li>○ Alternative 1A should be moved west of I-280</li> <li>○ Consider Route 1B as proposed to Trousdale Avenue, then to the Transmission Station aboveground</li> <li>○ Consider Route 1B to Trousdale Avenue then underground to San Bruno Avenue</li> <li>○ Consider 1B underground until MP 8, then overhead, but all west of I-280</li> <li>○ Consider 1B underground to MP 2, avoiding Edgewood Park, then overhead to MP 4, then underground along 1B route to Trousdale Avenue, then overhead to 1A</li> <li>○ Consider 1B underground to MP 2, overhead to MP 5, then underground along 1B route</li> <li>○ Consider other routes also.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Michelle Nemschoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about her kids and increased EMF with the lines through her property line.</li> <li>• Increased size of towers would decrease the aesthetic value for adjacent homes.</li> <li>• If San Francisco needs electricity, San Mateo should not have to pay the price</li> <li>• Suggested considering local generation.</li> <li>• If new transmission lines must be added, the alignment should be underground as in Alternative 1B.</li> <li>• Also option of installing underground portions as required.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

Date	From	Comments
February 4, 2003	Debra Kemper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about a lack of notice to homes near the route.</li> <li>• Consider EMF impacts on families with young children and a school two blocks from the proposed alignment.</li> <li>• Consider noise impacts from helicopter construction on schools and young kids.</li> <li>• Higher transmission towers will reduce the aesthetic value of the San Francisco watershed and will reduce property values.</li> <li>• Are demand reductions or new power plants in San Francisco possible?</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Clifford Donley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with Mr. Cole about the No Project Alternative and concern about project need.</li> <li>• Agrees with Mr. Pinney about health and security concerns.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Sylvia Mercado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The noise from the existing power lines is frightening, from larger lines would be more so.</li> <li>• Concerned about long-term health effects on children and adults.</li> <li>• New towers will affect property values.</li> <li>• Alignment will be within one block of an elementary school.</li> <li>• Is there a need for this?</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	<b>City of Burlingame Public Works:</b> Victor Voong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large water lines parallel El Camino that could conflict with an underground alternative.</li> <li>• The project could also conflict with plans for a new Mills Peninsula Hospital on El Camino and Trousdale.</li> <li>• Residents on Loma Vista Drive are concerned about project.</li> <li>• Would the 60 kV line later be upgraded and how would people be notified.</li> </ul>
<b>Scoping Meeting, 7:00pm February 4, 2003 — San Mateo, CA</b>		
February 4, 2003	<b>Friends of Edgewood Natural Preserve:</b> Kathy Korbholz, President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edgewood Park contains rare, threatened and endangered species, including Bay checkerspot butterfly critical habitat, which must not be disturbed.</li> <li>• A qualified conservation biologist should be engaged to assess project impacts to species in the park.</li> <li>• A US Fish and Wildlife Service recovery plan for serpentine habitat includes Edgewood Park.</li> <li>• White-rayed pentachaeta only found in Edgewood Park and the I-280-Cañada Road-Edgewood Park Triangle.</li> <li>• Truck travel in the park causes soil compaction, which is bad for species in the park.</li> <li>• Ruts from previous truck travel remain evident in the park.</li> <li>• Suggestion to avoid digging trenches or removing the old tower footings.</li> <li>• The existing gas pipeline ROW, which is disturbed by maintenance allows weeds to spread in the park.</li> <li>• Suggestion to modify Alternative 1B to remove the existing 60 kV towers in the park by helicopter, leaving the footings in place, then underground the lines in Cañada Road.</li> </ul>
<b>Attachment:</b> Photo showing weed infestation along underground gas pipeline.		
February 4, 2003	William Mahncke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing footings of one tower are within 65 feet of his home.</li> <li>• Installing a 230 kV line would quadruple what is there now.</li> <li>• Concern that PG&amp;E is operating the lines against FCC regulations and that radiation from the lines interfere with communications and electronic equipment.</li> <li>• If explosives are used to blast the serpentine, asbestos could get spread through the neighborhood.</li> <li>• Supports keeping the lines aboveground.</li> <li>• Suggests moving the alignment west of the community by ¼ mile.</li> </ul>

**Appendix B-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Comments</b>
February 4, 2003	Eugene Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports points of 280 Concerned Citizens Group.</li> <li>• Concerned about EMF increase over existing lines.</li> <li>• Need to consider alternatives that reduce EMF impacts.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Paul Grech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with EMF effects of 230 kV line.</li> <li>• Questioned need for project.</li> <li>• Suggested moving the towers to the west side of I-280 or running the lines underground for aesthetic purposes.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Don McFarland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about EMF from existing switching station near his property and how new towers would increase EMF and reduce his property value.</li> <li>• Reductions in property values caused by the project should be considered in the cost to bring electricity to San Francisco.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Carla Jadallah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from new 230 kV lines will be much greater than that of existing 60 kV lines.</li> <li>• In an earthquake, towers and lines within 60-70 feet of homes could cause damage.</li> <li>• Concerned with fire risk to neighborhood from construction.</li> <li>• Larger towers would worsen views from neighborhood homes.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Cathryn Carlin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kids play in the back yard near towers; concern about EMF.</li> <li>• Take this historic opportunity to underground the existing line.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Lennie Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar issues as raised in afternoon meeting (above).</li> <li>• Review situation when Stanford Linear Accelerator installed power lines and an acceptable agreement was reached.</li> <li>• Watershed lands are designated by the United Nations as part of the International Biosphere Reserve.</li> <li>• In favor of undergrounding along Canada Road/Skyline Boulevard and underground the existing 60 kV as well, as much as is feasible, especially to avoid serpentine grasslands (underground in roads).</li> <li>• Undergrounding improves security from terrorism.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Lenny Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new towers would be larger and more visually intrusive.</li> <li>• Affects on views would reduce property values.</li> <li>• Scientific community does not fully understand EMF impacts.</li> <li>• A school is one block from the alignment.</li> <li>• Solution is to underground the line to eliminate EMF and aesthetic concerns.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Jose Cuan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with health effects of EMF from the tower behind his house and cancer risks.</li> <li>• Need more research on EMF.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	Michele Nemschoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Member of 280 Concerned Citizens Group.</li> <li>• Measured EMF at her house when purchased (1 milligauss was acceptable to her).</li> <li>• House would lose value by \$200,000 if project approved, but she would move.</li> <li>• There are several alternative routes she could live with (underground along existing overhead route including 60 kV; combinations of overhead/underground portions).</li> <li>• There is no benefit of this project to the Highlands.</li> <li>• Eichler homes have lots of glass; new larger towers would have a big impact.</li> </ul>
February 4, 2003	<b>Town of Hillsborough:</b> Tom Casten, Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with the affects the project would have on aesthetics, health, security, and lifestyle.</li> <li>• Underground alternatives and suggestions to install the alignment to the west need to be looked at separately.</li> <li>• Suggest retrofitting San Francisco power plants.</li> <li>• Look at transmission to San Francisco from the East Bay.</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-4. Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings**

---

Date	From	Comments
<b>Scoping Meeting, 7:00pm February 6, 2003 — Daly City, CA</b>		
February 6, 2003	<b>City of Daly City Public Works:</b> D. Peter Gleichenhaus, Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with underground construction in residential areas, particularly with respect to traffic needs.</li> <li>• Suggest installing underground lines to reduce aesthetic, biological, and recreation impacts.</li> <li>• Daly City working to improve appearance of city with Geneva Streetscape Plan.</li> <li>• Request that PG&amp;E take opportunity to improve the appearance of the Martin Substation.</li> </ul>
February 6, 2003	Drew Donovan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installing transmission lines underground would improve the area.</li> <li>• Protect the Sawyer Camp Trail from impacts.</li> </ul>

---



## **APPENDIX B-5**

---

### Summary of Agency Consultations

**Appendix B-5. Summary of Agency Consultations**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Issues Discussed</b>
Town of Hillsborough	January 22, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about EMF and proximity of proposed taller towers to residences</li> <li>• Definition of 100' easement is not clear</li> <li>• Suggested relocation of I-280 crossing from north of Carolands Substation to south of Carolands; OK to use City's water tank property</li> <li>• Proposed project would have no electrical benefit to Hillsborough; why impose needs of San Francisco on peninsula residents?</li> <li>• Research co-generation in San Francisco – use of methane for power generation</li> <li>• Minimize the number of I-280 crossings; keep towers from MP 9 to 11 on west side of freeway</li> <li>• From MP 7 to 11, install underground or on west side of freeway</li> <li>• Concern about effect of underground line on natural gas pipelines</li> </ul>
Town of Colma	January 23, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name of McClellan Extension to be Lawndale Boulevard. Construction nearly finished and landscaping to start. Concern about digging up new roadway.</li> <li>• Concern about construction through newly paved roads (Mission is new and has had lots of recent construction)</li> <li>• Hillside from Lawndale to Daly City line will be re-designed with median in center and defined parking; proposed project should not detract from new construction work (scheduled for August 2003)</li> <li>• Consider use of A Street since it will be paved soon anyway</li> <li>• There are historic buildings in PEA Option 3B (BART ROW) so this should be avoided. Also BART vent structures may obstruct construction.</li> <li>• At Serramonte and El Camino Real (northeast corner) there will be a new police station</li> <li>• Consider use of Junipero Serra as a north-south route</li> <li>• Consider use of SFPUC water line through Colma; there is a 60-foot ROW easement and CCSF fee title</li> </ul>
County of San Mateo	January 30, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board of Supervisors has taken no position on the project yet but has concerns about impacts</li> <li>• County owned properties could be affected at Tower Road near Highway 92 (school, juvenile facility, emergency/fire facilities)</li> <li>• Future new facilities at Tower Road are in design stages and need to be coordinated with proposed project location</li> <li>• What effect would the wider ROW through Edgewood Park have on potential prescribed burns?</li> <li>• Scenic value of corridor – use GGNRA values for defining scenic protection</li> <li>• County has a trail easement on Sawyer Camp Trail</li> <li>• GIS base map data is available from the County</li> <li>• Edgewood Park is a County Park and has very rare and sensitive vegetation; biological resource data will be provided. Underground in Canada Road would be improvement to proposed route.</li> <li>• Consider installing the whole project underground, avoiding sensitive habitat and features</li> <li>• Long life expectancy of project means that benefit of improvements will be long-term</li> <li>• Consider project need based on today's economy; be sure need assessment is based on current data</li> <li>• EMF concerns need to be addressed</li> <li>• Underground segments may encounter contaminated soils; need good mitigation for this possibility</li> <li>• San Bruno Mountain is a County Park with very sensitive resources and this project may require an amendment to the Habitat Conservation Plan (time-consuming process)</li> <li>• Consider tower designs that improve aesthetics (including architectural design and color) and consider all types of tower designs for TSPs</li> </ul>

---

**Appendix B-5. Summary of Agency Consultations**

---

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Issues Discussed</b>
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	February 19, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owner of Pulgas Ridge Preserve. Concerns:</li> <li>• Visual and recreation impacts to the Preserve and adjacent open space</li> <li>• Transmission line effects on birds</li> <li>• PG&amp;E requirement for wider easements, and location of easements</li> <li>• Proposed use of cable pulling site and staging area within Preserve boundaries</li> <li>• Easement language currently does not include communication uses</li> <li>• Effect on income from cell sites on tower at Edgewood Road and relocation of cell equipment</li> <li>• Preserve not addressed in PEA</li> </ul>
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Water Supply & Treatment Division	February 19, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SFPUC owns Watershed Lands on which most of the overhead portion of the proposed project would be located. Concerns:</li> <li>• City/County of San Francisco needs reliable power, but impacts of the project need to be minimized</li> <li>• Sensitive resources in existing corridor (serpentine grasslands) would be disturbed during construction</li> <li>• New utility corridors should not be created</li> <li>• Construction disturbance needs to be restricted</li> <li>• Invasive plants need to be controlled; mitigation may not be effective</li> <li>• Drainage alteration could affect water quality so is of major concern (concern even for construction in Edgewood Park or Pulgas Ridge Preserve because drainage is toward SFPUC watershed)</li> <li>• Cultural resources exist in the Watershed Lands</li> <li>• Construction could affect water supply appurtenances; coordination with engineers required</li> <li>• Use of Crystal Springs Dam in PG&amp;E's Option 1B requires SFPUC approval; currently restricted operations based on order from CA Division of Dam Safety</li> <li>• Canada Road replacement over dam may prevent use of dam for Option 1B</li> <li>• California red legged frogs have habitat on top of dam so impacts to the dam require habitat mitigation (or removal/relocation)</li> <li>• California Department of Fish &amp; Game Refuge is an overlay over entire Watershed</li> <li>• Proposed trailhead parking lot at San Bruno Avenue &amp; Glenview (where transition station is proposed)</li> <li>• Fire hazards are major concern due to increased erosion &amp; sedimentation that would follow a fire, affecting water quality. Fuel management plan is important.</li> <li>• Expanded easement would require SFPUC involvement in vegetation management planning</li> </ul>
National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area	February 21, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GGNRA administers scenic and scenic/recreation easements that overlay Watershed Lands. Easements give NPS proprietary rights</li> <li>• Provided maps of easement locations</li> <li>• NPS legal authority over easement lands is from easement itself and Federal legislation (conservation easement) and from restrictive covenants that allow control over use of Watershed Lands; also California real estate law defines rights of easement holders</li> <li>• Rights affect excavation, vegetation removal, and structure installation</li> <li>• Project as currently proposed would interfere with NPS easement rights, affecting both scenic and scenic/recreation easements</li> <li>• Underground alternatives (e.g., PG&amp;E's 1B) would not conflict; NPS sees benefit in also undergrounding existing 60 kV towers with the 230 kV</li> <li>• Consider mitigation for project impacts including contributions to Bay Area Ridge Trail Council</li> <li>• Concern about views from Sweeney Ridge (GGNRA property adjacent to watershed lands) and the Portola Discovery Site</li> <li>• Concern about the viewpoints to be used in EIR visual impact analysis</li> <li>• Concern about invasive plant species</li> </ul>

---

---

**Appendix B-5. Summary of Agency Consultations**

---

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Issues Discussed</b>
City of San Bruno	February 24, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider alternative with segment parallel to I-280 or I-380 – PG&amp;E's gas pipelines are in this ROW</li> <li>• Transition station location conflicts with plans for residential development east of site and also with trailhead parking identified in General Plan</li> <li>• Consider alternatives to use of San Bruno Avenue, including Millbrae Avenue to BART ROW, Skyline to Sneath Lane &amp; Sneath to BART ROW</li> <li>• Consider moving transition station to west side of Skyline Boulevard for safety and recreational access</li> <li>• Skyline may be widened to 4 lanes so line location should not preclude that</li> <li>• Concern about conflict with planned grade separation at Caltrain ROW at San Bruno Avenue and Huntington Drive</li> <li>• Request definition and location of proposed splice vaults</li> <li>• Consider putting the Option 1B underground segment in the Caltrain ROW and not in El Camino Real (Caltrans will be re-paving El Camino from Burlingame to South San Francisco)</li> </ul>
Town of Woodside	March 31, 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The town has not received a copy of PG&amp;E's PEA and Application.</li> <li>• How will the need for the project be evaluated by the CPUC?</li> <li>• For how long would the project meet expected demand growth?</li> <li>• Will the No Project Alternative be described and analyzed?</li> <li>• The town places a very high value on the scenic I-280 corridor since it provides the entry to Woodside. The town works to preserve scenic views from the freeway and is concerned that this project minimize visual impacts.</li> </ul>

---