

Section 2.3 Dublin Area Comments

**TABLE 2.3.B SUMMARY OF SPEAKERS' ORAL COMMENTS
PRESENTED AT THE MAY 8, 2000 SCOPING MEETING: DUBLIN, CA**

Table 2.3.B: Index		
Speaker	Community/Organization	Page
Kelly Brodbeck	United American Energy	11
Joye Fukuda	City of San Ramon	11
Guy S. Houston	Mayor, City of Dublin	9
William M. Kettler	City of Livermore, Planning Division	10
Mark Numainville	Assemblywoman Lynn Leach's Office	9
Tom O'Malley	Tri-Valley Business Council	11
Peter R. Oswald	Sunset Development Corporation – Bishop Ranch Business Park	11

TABLE 2.3.B SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS: DUBLIN, CA							
#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
1		Mark Numainville, Assistant to Calif. Assemblywoman Lynn Leach	Urges speedy approval of the proposed project because the Tri-Valley Area is currently borrowing power from other areas.			NA	No change in scope as a result of this comment favoring the proposed project.
2	A	Guy Houston, Mayor of Dublin	Prefers undergrounding of all transmission lines but agrees that this is not economically viable. As a result, supports the proposed project as the best choice for minimizing visual impacts in Dublin and solving the Tri-Valley's future power distribution shortfall. Commends PG&E for its coordination and consultation with the City in developing the proposed route alignment.			NA	See response to item 1 in Table 2.3.B

TABLE 2.3.B SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS: DUBLIN, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
2	B	Guy Houston, Mayor of Dublin, cont.	Avoid Alternative No. 2 because it would adversely affect 10,000 Dublin residential and retail units.		X (partial)	X	The CPUC is not bound by the alternatives to the proposed project presented by PG&E in the PEA. CEQA requires that a range of reasonable alternatives be evaluated. Accordingly, alternatives to the proposed project have been considered for study in the EIR. See Section 3 for a summary of the results.
3	A	William M. Kettler, Associate Planner, City of Livermore	Locating the proposed substation at May School and N. Livermore Rds. would conflict with the N. Livermore Specific Plan now being prepared by the City, because it would transect the area proposed for low density, high value housing.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives on land use and the plans and policies of other relevant agencies.
	B		The proposed N. Livermore Substation would create an adverse visual impact.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential visual impacts of the proposed N. Livermore Substation and consider alternatives that could reduce these impacts. See Section 3 of this report for the alternatives to be studied in the EIR.
	C		Consider alternatives that include moving the proposed N. Livermore Substation to the north or undergrounding the transmission lines at the proposed site. The commenter had submitted a letter to the CPUC on 3-17-00 outlining these suggestions.		X	X	The alternatives you suggested were thoroughly considered for study in the EIR by the CPUC during scoping. Please see Section 3 of this Scoping Report (Alternatives Screening Results) for a summary of the alternatives selected/not selected for study in the EIR and the reasons for these decisions.
4		Peter Oswald, Senior Vice-Pres., Sunset Development Co. (developers and property managers for Bishop Ranch Business Park)	Supports the proposed project in view of the increasing demand for reliable power at Bishop Ranch Business Park, where an additional 1 million sq. ft. of office space is under development and a greater proportion of tenants are 7-day-a-week, 24 hour-a-day high tech companies.			NA	See response to item 1 in Table 2.3.B.

TABLE 2.3.B SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS: DUBLIN, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
5		Tom O'Malley, Pres. Tri-Valley Business Council, Livermore	Encouraged by PG&E's flexibility and sensitivity to local issues. Is hopeful that the project can be completed quickly because the Tri-Valley Business Council has identified electric power as a key infrastructure need to support economic vitality through 2010.			NA	See response to item 1 in Table 2.3.B.
6	A	Kelly Brodbeck, United American Energy Co., San Ramon	Consider local generation as an alternative to meet the Tri-Valley's electric power transmission and distribution needs.		X		The alternative you suggested was thoroughly considered for study in the EIR by the CPUC during scoping. Please see Section 3 of this Scoping Report (Alternatives Screening Results) for a summary of the alternatives selected/not selected for study in the EIR and the reasons for these decisions.
	B		Clarify the project objectives, especially for the southern part of the Tri-Valley area. Data in PG&E's PEA which state that about 450 MW of additional power would be needed to serve the project area for 50 years conflicts with the estimate from an April, 2000 ISO Grid Operations Meeting at which the southern Tri-Valley Area alone was characterized as needing 615 MW of additional power.			X	The focus of the CEQA review is not to assess project need, but the potential environmental impacts of PG&E's proposed project. The CPUC will assess the need for the project in the General Proceeding.
7		Joye Fukuda, City of San Ramon	Supports the proposed project and appreciates PG&E's coordinating with the City of San Ramon in the process to-date			NA	See response to item 1 in Table 2.3.B

TABLE 2.3.C SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS: DUBLIN, CA AREA CONCERNS / ISSUES

Alphabetical Index of Commenters for Table 2.3.C

Source	Community/Organization	Page
C. Roberta Hunter	Landowner, Proposed Dublin Substation Location	12
Guy Houston	Mayor, City of Dublin	13
Peter Oswald	Senior Vice-Pres. & Dir. Of Governmental Affairs, Sunset Development Co., San Ramon	13

TABLE 2.3.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: DUBLIN, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
1		C. Roberta Hunter, Emmett, Idaho	<i>Commenter is a registered nurse and part owner of the land where the proposed Dublin Substation would be located and had the following concerns:</i>				
	A		My involvement with health issues in my work as a nurse and in my experience with my sister-in-law's death from cancer leads me to conclude that there is an increased risk of cancer from the electric and magnetic fields to individuals who reside near substations and their associated transmission lines.	X			The potential impacts of electromagnetic fields (EMF) on human health will be evaluated in the EIR using available information.
	B		The proposed Dublin Substation would substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and the scenic quality of the area.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential visual impacts of the proposed Dublin Substation.
	C		The proposed Dublin Substation would use the choicest homesites within that five-acre parcel. This would reduce the prime building area, adversely affecting both the current and future market value of the land and reducing the potential for future sale of the land.			X	As prescribed by CEQA, the EIR will not analyze the potential economic impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives, except insofar as these might have physical effects or might indicate the significance of physical effects such as preclusion of an allowed land use.
	D		Look for another viable site for the Dublin Substation		X		Alternative sites were thoroughly considered for study in the EIR by the CPUC during scoping. Please see Section 3 of this Scoping Report (Alternatives Screening Results) for a summary of the alternatives selected/not selected for study in the EIR and the reasons for these decisions.

TABLE 2.3.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: DUBLIN, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
2		Peter Oswald, Senior Vice-Pres. And Dir. of Gov. Affairs, Sunset Development Co., San Ramon	<i>(Developers and property managers for Bishop Ranch Business Park)</i> Strongly supports the proposed project and urges its approval because the safe and reliable delivery of electricity is essential to the future economic viability of the 250 corporations located in the Bishop Ranch Business Park and to the economic vitality of the Tri-Valley area.			NA	No change in scope as a result of this comment favoring the proposed project.
3	A	Guy Houston, Mayor of Dublin	The Vineyard Substation in Pleasanton does not supply that city with sufficient electric capacity. The substation has a load of 204.1MW but a capacity of 99.4MW. The City of Dublin will not bear the burden of providing energy to the Vineyard Substation via Alternative No. 2. This burden should be borne by the City of Pleasanton.			NA	The CPUC is not bound by the alternatives to the proposed project presented by PG&E in the PEA. However, CEQA requires that a range of reasonable alternatives be evaluated. Please see Section 3 of this Scoping Report (Alternatives Screening Results) for a summary of the alternatives selected/not selected for study in the EIR and the reasons for these decisions. No change in scope as a result of this comment opposing a component of PG&E's Alternative No. 2.
	B		The City of Dublin has officially gone on record in favor of PG&E's proposed project in a resolution unanimously adopted by the City Council on 10-5-99.			NA	See response to item 2 in Table 2.3.C.
	C		The City of Dublin is specifically opposed to the Alternative No. 2 route along Fallon Rd. The median of Fallon Rd. is not designed to accommodate an above-ground 230kV transmission line. In addition, this proposed transmission line would run right through an area with hundreds of homes now authorized as part of the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan.	X		NA	See response to item 3A in Table 2.3.C. The EIR will also analyze the impact of the proposed project and its alternatives on land use and the plans and policies of relevant agencies.
	D		An elementary school that is planned for construction would lie within 400 feet of the Alternative 2 transmission line route along Fallon Rd.		X		The EIR will analyze the potential impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives on public safety, land use and the plans and policies of relevant agencies.

TABLE 2.3.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: DUBLIN, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
3	E	Guy Houston, Mayor of Dublin, cont.	Alternative 2 would degrade the visual quality of the area around Fallon Rd. and I580, which are both designated as scenic corridors in the Eastern Dublin Specific Plan and by Eastern Dublin Scenic Corridor Policies and Standards.		X		The EIR will evaluate the potential visual impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives.
	F		Residents near the transmission line route along Fallon Rd. will be exposed to potentially hazardous EMFs.		X		See the response to item 1A in Table 2.3.C.
	G		Alternative 2 would have a tremendously negative impact on property values along the Fallon Rd. transmission line route.			X	See response to item 1C in Table 2.3.C.

2.4 LIVERMORE AREA COMMENTS

2.4.A RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY SPEAKERS AT THE MAY 8, 2000 EVENING MEETING: LIVERMORE, CA

1. Regarding PG&E's historic easement across North Livermore, how did they acquire it and how long have they owned it? How does local jurisdiction/approval affect CPUC approval/authority?

According to PG&E, it acquired 41 easements/grant deeds/agreements/encroachments and other permits required for the Tesla – San Ramon 230 kV ROW between 1958 and 1962. Some relocation agreements were secured in 1986 and 1987 when the wind farms were developed (in the Altamont Pass area). All but two of the easements were acquired by standard negotiation; two properties, representing three separate parcels, were acquired by eminent domain.

California state law confers authority for the siting of regulated electric utility facilities, including PG&E power lines and substations, on the CPUC, and local governments in California do not have discretionary authority over such projects. However, the CPUC's General Order 131-D requires utilities to confer and consult with local government in order to avoid or minimize conflicts with local land use, design and safety standards.

2. Why is Aspen involved? Why doesn't the CPUC handle the CEQA process on its own?

Many highly qualified environmental scientists and specialized professionals are needed to effectively prepare an EIR. It would not be cost effective or practical for the CPUC, or most other public agencies, to maintain a permanent staff of specialists with the requisite expertise for the range of diverse projects that come before it, located throughout the state. As a result, the CPUC contracts with private, independent consultants like Aspen to complete EIRs under its direction.

3. What methods were used to inform people of the meetings? Seems like the scoping period is too short for people to comment on the project.

About 10 days prior to the scoping meetings, printed announcements were mailed to the 1,141 individuals, groups and government agencies identified for the initial project database (as described in Section 1.2); five to six days prior to the Scoping Meetings, quarter-page ads were published in two newspapers which serve the project area (also in Section 1.2); a notice was posted on the CPUC's project website; and the dates, times and locations of the three scoping meetings were included in the Notice of Preparation (of EIR), which was mailed out to the affected public agencies, as well as other parties interested in the CPUC's General Proceeding, about two weeks in advance of the Scoping Meetings.

The scoping comment period officially began with the distribution of the NOP on April 21, 2000 and officially closed on May 22, 2000. However, because of the high level of interest in this project, the CPUC received and accepted written comments as late as June 1, 2000. CEQA requires 30 days to be provided for comment on a Notice of Preparation (of EIR), with the target of such opportunity

the other agencies/jurisdictions with permitting, approval or other roles in the proposed project.

4. Will there be similar meetings in the future? Hearings on the Draft EIR in the local area?

The CPUC plans to conduct informational meetings in the project area after the release of the Draft EIR for review, expected in late November, 2000, to assist the public and agencies in reviewing and effectively commenting on the Draft EIR. The CPUC tentatively plans to hold at least one public participation hearing in the project area in January, 2001, before the end of the Draft EIR comment period.

5. What is the height of the towers and size of the proposed substations?

Depending on the necessary configuration of lines on the tower (e.g., distribution lines and other lines, such as telecommunications, co-located with the transmission line) and the type of transmission tower used in a given locale, the towers would range from 80 to 150 feet in height.

The proposed Dublin and Livermore Substations would each be approximately 5 acres in size, including access roads.

**TABLE 2.4.B SUMMARY OF SPEAKERS' ORAL COMMENTS
PRESENTED AT THE MAY 8, 2000 SCOPING MEETING: LIVERMORE, CA**

Alphabetical Index of Commenters for Table 2.4.B		
Speaker	Community/Organization	Page
Carol Gerich	Resident, City of Livermore	18
Willy Joslin	Doubletree Ranch Homeowners Association	19
Jeffrey Mecozzi	Resident, City of Livermore	19
Ed Miralle	Doubletree Ranch Homeowners Association	19
Brenda Morris	Resident, City of Livermore	21
Charles Richey	Landowner of proposed substation location	18
Richard & Mary Stanley	Residents, City of Livermore	17
Al Vieux	Landowner, City of Livermore; resident, City of Tracy	21
Richard Ward	Resident, City of Livermore	20
Carter Wreden	Livermore – Pleasanton Rod & Gun Club	20

TABLE 2.4.B SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
1	A	Richard and Mary Stanley, Livermore	Opposed to the substation proposed at May School and North Livermore Rds. because of adverse visual impacts.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential visual impacts of the proposed N. Livermore Substation and consider alternatives, which could reduce these impacts. See Section 3 of this report for the alternatives to be studied in the EIR.
	B		Prefer locations for the substation at Manning and North Livermore Rds. or further west from the proposed location such as Crosby's property where it could be tucked into the hillside to minimize visual impacts.		X	X	The alternatives you suggested were thoroughly considered for study in the EIR by the CPUC during scoping. Please see Section 3 of this Scoping Report (Alternatives Screening Results) for a summary of the alternatives selected/not selected for study in the EIR and the reasons for these decisions.

TABLE 2.4.B SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
1	C	Richard and Mary Stanley, Livermore, cont.	Prefer undergrounding of proposed 230kV transmission lines.		X		The alternative you suggested was thoroughly considered for study in the EIR by the CPUC during scoping. Please see Section 3 of this Scoping Report (Alternatives Screening Results) for a summary of the alternatives selected/not selected for study in the EIR and the reasons for these decisions.
2	A	Charles Richey, Pleasanton	Concerned that the proposed Dublin Substation, if located in the center of his property, would result in a substantial loss of the parcel's buildable land and, in turn, a loss in market value.	X		X	The EIR will analyze the potential environmental effects of the proposed project and its alternatives on land use. As prescribed by CEQA, the EIR will not analyze the potential economic impacts of the project and its alternatives, except insofar as these might have physical effects or might indicate the significance of physical effects such as preclusion of an allowed land use.
	B		Locate the Dublin Substation elsewhere.		X		See response to item 1C in Table 2.4.B.
3	A	Carol Gerich, Livermore	The project, specifically the North Livermore Substation, would conflict with many of the land use plans and policies being developed for that area in the N. Livermore Specific Plan. These potential impacts include adverse effects on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • visual and aesthetic values • recreational uses • traffic • the country character which the N. Livermore Specific Plan is trying to maintain 	X			The EIR will analyze the potential impacts of the proposed project on visual resources, traffic, recreation and land use plans and policies of other relevant agencies.
	B		Consider gas generation as an alternate source of power		X		See response to item 1C in Table 2.4.B.
	C		Underground the transmission lines		X		See response to item 1C in Table 2.4.B.

TABLE 2.4.B SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
4	A	Ed Miralle, Doubletree Ranch Homeowners Assn., Livermore	Overhead transmission lines would result in a “permanent environmental atrocity” in the Livermore Valley and would also create especially undesirable visual impacts to my residence that overlooks Manning and N. Livermore Rds., the intersection where the proposed transmission lines would meet.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential visual impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives.
	B		Put the transmission lines underground.		X	X	Undergrounding “all” power lines is not economically viable. However, undergrounding is a component of alternatives for the EIR. (See Section 3 of this Scoping Report for a summary of the alternatives selected/not selected for study in the EIR and the reasons for these decisions.)
5	A	Willy Joslin, Doubletree Ranch Homeowners Assn., Livermore	Concerned that overhead transmission lines will interfere with future development in those areas of Livermore, and that local vineyards will have difficulty sustaining their operation without some development nearby.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential land use impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives.
	B		Concerned that the frequent high winds in the Livermore area could blow over the proposed transmission towers. He cited a recent instance in France where high winds caused hundreds of power poles to topple.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential impacts of the proposed project on public health and safety.
6	A	Jeffrey Mecozzi, Pres., Doubletree Homeowners Assn., Livermore	Acknowledges the need to bring additional power to the Tri-Valley area and PG&E’s historic easement across the area, but objects to running 230 kV lines through pristine pastoral valleys. Is concerned about the potentially adverse impact of the transmission lines on the Valley’s visual quality.	X			See response to item 4A in Table 2.4.B.
	B		The proposed N. Livermore substation will degrade scenic vistas and the rural character of that area.	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.B.

TABLE 2.4.B SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
6	C	Jeffrey Mecozzi, Pres., Doubletree Homeowners Assn., Livermore, cont.	The proposed substation would conflict with the land use planning goals of the proposed N. Livermore Specific Plan.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential impact of the proposed project on land use and the land use plans and policies of relevant agencies.
	D		The proposed power lines and substation could have a negative effect on property values.			X	As prescribed by CEQA, the EIR will not analyze the potential economic impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives, except insofar as these might have physical effects or might indicate the significance of physical effects such as preclusion of an allowed land use.
	E		Analyze the potential impacts of EMF on crops, livestock and humans	X			The potential impacts of EMF will be evaluated in the EIR using available information.
	F		Evaluate the added risk of overhead power line accidents on public services such as fire departments.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives on public services and services systems including fire departments.
	G		Underground all power lines to preserve the quality of life in the Tri-Valley area.		X	X	See response to item 4B in Table 2.4.B.
7	A	Carter Wreden, Pres. Livermore Rod & Gun Club, Livermore	Proposed overhead transmission lines would degrade the aesthetics of the North Livermore area.	X			See response to item 4A in Table 2.4.B.
	B		Suggests that proposed N. Livermore Substation be located at Dagnino and May School Rds. to eliminate the proposed north/ south transmission line from creating visual pollution along N. Livermore Rd.		X	X	See response to item 1C in Table 2.4.B.
	C		Prefers undergrounding of all the transmission lines to avoid visual degradation of the Livermore Valley.			X	See response to item 4B in Table 2.4.B.
8	A	Richard Ward, Livermore	Lives near the landfill in the Vasco Rd. area and is concerned about the transmission lines' proposed location on the active Greenville Fault (5.6M earthquake in 1980.)	X			The potential impacts of seismic activity on the proposed project and its alternatives will be evaluated in the Geology section of the EIR.

TABLE 2.4.B SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks	
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope		
8	B	Richard Ward, Livermore, cont.	Downed power lines from the proposed transmission towers near the Vasco Rd. landfill could fall near the landfill's methane burner/gas flare assembly, posing a risk of explosion and a landfill fire.	X			See response to item 5B in Table 2.4.B.	
	C		The proposed transmission line near the Vasco Rd. landfill would further degrade that watershed.	X			See response to item 4A In table 2.4.B.	
	D		Site the proposed power transmission line further north through the Los Vaqueros Watershed.			X	See response to item 1C in Table 2.4.B.	
	E		Consider relocating the substation proposed at May School Rd. in Livermore farther north along the main transmission line.			X	See response to item 1C in Table 2.4.B.	
9		Brenda Morris, Livermore	Locate the proposed N. Livermore Substation at Dagnino and May School Rds. near the Rod & Gun Club to reduce undesirable visual impacts.	X		X	See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.B.	
10		Al Vieux, Tracy	<i>(The speaker lives near the Tesla Substation. Based on that experience he had the following concerns about the proposed N. Livermore Substation):</i>					
	A		The shotgun-like noisemakers PG&E has installed to keep birds away from the Tesla Substation, if used in N. Livermore, would be heard throughout the valley.	X			The potential noise impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives will be analyzed in the EIR.	
	B		Typically, birds fly into the transmission lines at the Tesla Substation and fall to the ground, starting grass fires. Evaluate the risk of these kind of fires at the proposed N. Livermore Substation, bearing in mind that the rural terrain can make it more difficult for the fire department to find these fires.	X			See response to item 5B in Table 2.4.B.	
	C		The electric energy emitted by the transmission lines and substations is not healthy	X			See response to item 6E in Table 2.4.B.	
10	D	Al Vieux, Tracy, cont.	Install the electric power lines underground, like fiber optic cables, to eliminate adverse visual impacts.		X	X	See response to item 4B in Table 2.4.B	

TABLE 2.4.C SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE AREA CONCERNS / ISSUES

Alphabetical Index of Commenters for Table 2.4.C		
Source	Community/Organization	Page
Raymond Bonetti	Livermore Resident	35
Gene and Patricia Broadman; and Ted Taylor	Livermore Residents	34
Jim & Kathi Calhoun	Livermore Residents	24
Patricia E. Curtin	Law Offices of Gagen, McCoy, McMahon & Armstrong, Danville	26
Connie and Russ Fulwood	Livermore Residents	26
Doug Hill	Livermore Resident	32
Stan Martin	Livermore Resident	23
Brenda Morris	Livermore Resident	27
Christopher O'Brien	Livermore Resident	30
Marc Roberts	Community Development Director, City of Livermore	31
Robert Schock	Livermore Resident	29
Susan Benton Schock	Livermore Resident	24
Leland Stanley and family	Livermore Residents	25
Keith Thomassen	Livermore Resident	24
Larry and Gail Vardenega	Livermore Residents	29
Richard Ward	Livermore Resident	32

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
1	A	Stan Martin, Livermore	The overhead transmission lines along Manning and N. Livermore Rds. which are part of the proposed project will be an "undesirable eyesore" that degrades the view amenity of my recently purchased home in Doubletree Ranch. I paid a premium for this property because of the view.	X			The EIR will evaluate the potential visual impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
1	B	Stan Martin, Livermore, cont.	Place the transmission lines running to the N. Livermore Substation underground. The additional cost will provide a much better return in investment looking ahead 10 to 15 years when the area is more fully developed.		X		The alternative suggested was thoroughly considered for study in the EIR by the CPUC during scoping. Please see Section 3 of this Scoping Report (Alternatives Screening Results) for a summary of the alternatives selected/not selected for study in the EIR and the reasons for these decisions.
2	A	Susan Benton Schock, Livermore	Even if the factors of locally high winds, earthquake faults, endangered wildlife, property value impacts, fire and health hazards and noise are dealt with, the proposed project's transmission lines and substation along Manning Rd. and N. Livermore Ave. would have a negative and intrusive visual impact on that area's rural environment.	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	B		Use the forward thinking, advanced technology of underground transmission lines to preserve the rural, scenic beauty of the Livermore area.		X		See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.
3	A	Jim & Kathi Calhoun, Livermore	We would look directly out at the proposed N. Livermore Substation and overhead power lines from our home. The adverse impacts of the substation on land use and the aesthetics of this last remaining rural valley in the East Bay will be significant.	X			The EIR will evaluate the potential land use and visual impacts of the proposed N. Livermore Substation and associated overhead power lines.
	B		Move the proposed N. Livermore Substation to Dagnino Rd. and bury the high voltage transmission lines.		X	X	Alternative locations for the N. Livermore Substation and transmission lines will be evaluated in the EIR. See also response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.
4	A	Keith Thomassen, Livermore	The location proposed for the N. Livermore Substation conflicts with the Bing Crosby Estates' homes and golf course to be developed in the same area.		X		The EIR will analyze the potential impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives on land use and the plans and policies of relevant agencies.
	B		Move the proposed N. Livermore Substation to the edge of the valley near the Rod and Gun Club to avoid potential incompatibility with the Bing Crosby Estates; underground the proposed transmission lines to avoid overhead lines running east to west across the valley.		X	X	See response to item 3B in Table 2.4.C.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
5	A	Leland Stanley and family, Livermore	The proposed PG&E Substation and power transmission lines at the intersection of N. Livermore Ave. and May School Rd. would subject my family residence/farm/ranch at 4400 N. Livermore Ave. to the following nuisance impacts Noise from bird cannons at the substation	X			The EIR will analyze the potential noise impacts from the proposed project and its alternatives.
	B		Fires and EMF	X			The EIR will evaluate the potential health and safety risks from fire and EMF related to the proposed project and its alternatives.
	C		Parallel conductance from nearby wire fencing	X			The EIR will consider the potential for parallel electrical conductance from nearby wire fences.
	D		Visual degradation	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	E	which will result in a loss in my property value			X	The EIR, as prescribed by CEQA, will not analyze the potential economic impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives, except insofar as these might have physical effects or might indicate the significance of physical effects such as the preclusion of an allowed land use.
	F		The proposed transmission towers that would cross the ridgelines from east to west would degrade the views and aesthetics of this pristine valley.	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	G		Locate the proposed N. Livermore Substation at N. Livermore Ave. and Manning Rd., west of N. Livermore Ave. to avoid having this substation next to existing homes.			X	See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.
	H		Move the transmission towers to the north side of the ridge lands where they will be out of view; or install as much of the transmission line as possible underground to avoid the negative visual effects that the transmission towers along the ridgeline would create.			X	See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
6	A	Connie and Russ Fulwood, Livermore	When we bought our home in Livermore in 1988, we did so fully understanding that this valley was slated for future development and that the pastoral views we enjoy would gradually change. However, this pristine valley's being scarred by a 5-acre substation, 175-ft. transmission towers and 230kV transmission lines will significantly: (1) degrade our views and (2) decrease our property's value.	X (1)		X (2)	See responses to items 1A and 5E in Table 2.4.C. Note that the maximum height of the transmission towers proposed by PG&E is 150 feet.
	B		The measures needed to make the proposed transmission towers visible to aircraft approaching Livermore Airport (strobe lights and large orange balls) will only be viewed by area residents as additional eyesores.		X		See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	C		Move the proposed N. Livermore Substation to the site located west of Highland Rd. across from US Sprint's property; put the overhead transmission lines underground.			X	See response to item 3B in Table 2.4.C.
7		Patricia E. Curtin, Law Offices of Gagen, McCoy, McMahon & Armstrong, Danville	<i>The commenter is part of the law office that serves as the legal representative for the Gary S. Vandeweghe Trust Property located at the corner of Manning Rd. and N. Livermore Ave. in Livermore:</i>				
	A		The installation of a new 230kV overhead, double-circuit transmission line on the Trust Property adjacent to Manning Rd. and down N. Livermore Ave., and the addition of the N. Livermore Substation on the Trust Property at the intersection of N. Livermore Ave. and May School Rd. means that the EIR must address the following issues/impacts: PG&E's proposed project conflicts with some of the elements of the proposed N. Livermore Specific Plan which includes a development plan for the Vandeweghe Trust Property that consists of approximately 111 single family homes, an inn, winery, 22 estate homes and a golf course. Specifically <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transmission line proposed to be located on the north side of the Trust Property adjacent to Manning Rd. would be located on the golf course and in the vineyard and immediately adjacent to some of the estate homes; 	X	X		See response to item 4A in Table 2.4.C.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
7	A	Patricia E. Curtin (cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transmission line proposed to be located on the east side of the Trust Property adjacent to Livermore Ave. would traverse through or be adjacent to the golf course, vineyard, winery and single family homes; The location proposed for the N. Livermore Substation at the southeast section of the Trust Property, at the intersection of May School Rd. and N. Livermore Ave., would be in the middle of single family homes proposed for the development. 	X	X		See response to item 4A in Table 2.4.C.
	B		The proposed transmission lines and N. Livermore Substation would result in a traumatic decrease in the Trust Property's market value.			X	See response to item 5F in Table 2.4.C.
	C		Analyze the serious environmental impacts and health hazards that PG&E's proposed project would cause to the developed Trust Property.	X			The EIR will evaluate the potential environmental impacts and health risks of the proposed project and its alternatives.
	D		Seriously consider alternative locations for the N. Livermore Substation and the transmission lines along Manning Ave.		X		See response to item 3B in Table 2.4.C.
8	A	Brenda Morris, Livermore	The proposed 150-foot transmission towers would have a negative impact on the aesthetic value of the scenic corridor designated in north Livermore by the specific plan now being developed for that area.	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	B		The potential for grass fires will increase as a result of birds electrocuting themselves on high voltage transmission lines and falling on dry grass. This is a significant concern for landowners in the Livermore Valley.	X			The EIR will evaluate the potential impacts on public safety from fire caused by the proposed project and its alternatives.
	C		I am concerned about the stability of the proposed transmission towers given the unstable soils found in the area such as those around Collier Canyon and on the Quigley Property and in view of the strong winds common in the Livermore Valley.	X	X		The EIR will evaluate the potential geological impacts on the proposed project and its alternatives in the Geology section of the document. The EIR will also evaluate the potential public safety impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
8	D	Brenda Morris (Cont'd)	The proposed N. Livermore Substation will conflict with the land uses (high end golf course, estate homes) proposed in the N. Livermore Specific Plan and will adversely impact the family ranch/home located nearby, possibly causing the residents to move, thereby reducing local agricultural production.	X			See the response to item 4A in Table 2.4.C.
	E		Consider moving the substation to the corner of Dagnino and May School Rds. near the Livermore Rod & Gun Club. The Rod & Gun Club manager has indicated that the substation would likely be viewed as a benign neighbor that could buffer the Club from future development.		X		See response to item 3B in Table 2.4.C.
	F		Consider the following alternative which has been brought to my attention by another citizen: <u>Fully utilize the Tesla-Newark Transmission Line Corridor</u> : This is an underutilized tower line that could be upgraded to fulfill the area's electrical demands. The North Livermore Substation could be located at the Contra Costa-Newark line in the area of the existing City of Livermore Water Storage Tank in the area of Dallon and Ames roads. The Dublin substation could be fed by extra circuits added to the route proposed to feed the Vineyard substation from the Tesla-Newark corridor. These new circuits could be taken from the Vineyard Substation, north through the gravel pit area across I580 through relatively undeveloped land to the proposed Dublin Substation.		X		See response to item 3B in Table 2.4.C.
	G		I recognize that PG&E has a right-of-way in the North Livermore area, however, everything possible should be done to reduce impacts to this area which is zoned for agriculture but which continues to be impacted by urbanization and its requirements. The landowners in this area will not be developing but continue to be significantly impacted without mitigation.	X			The EIR will analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives and will identify mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate those impacts. Also, see Section 3 of this report for alternatives which have been developed to avoid or reduce potential impacts of the proposed project.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
9	A	Robert Schock, Livermore	My wife and I live at the south end of Morgan Territory Rd. in Livermore and have lived in the Tri-Valley area for 32 years, yet we did not hear about the proposed project from PG&E but rather from neighbors.			NA	Your name will be added to the project mailing list because you signed in at the scoping meeting and submitted written comments to the CPUC during scoping. As a result, you will now receive notification by mail to let you know about the availability of EIR study results and future public meetings for this project.
	B		One of the attractive features of the North Livermore Valley has been the absence of high voltage power lines. The proposed power lines running overhead along Manning Rd. will degrade the aesthetic beauty of the surrounding hills and change the area irrevocably.	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	C		Running power lines above ground through areas of higher population density such as Manning Rd. and the N. Livermore Valley is using 20 th century technology to deal with a 21 st century problem. Run the power lines underground. People are willing to pay more for their power to avoid the degrading effects of above-ground power lines. In addition, rapidly advancing technology in the field of high temperature superconductors which will enable the distribution of high voltage electricity at low cost will soon require that transmission lines be placed underground.	X	X		See responses to item 3B in Table 2.4.C.
10	A	Larry and Gail Vardenega, Livermore	The proposed above-ground power lines and five-acre substation will destroy the scenic corridor to be preserved by the Las Positas Valley Plan now being developed by the City of Livermore and Alameda County.	X			The EIR will analyze the visual impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives and their compatibility with the plans and policies of relevant agencies.
	B		We propose the following alternatives/mitigations to the 5acre N. Livermore Substation and above-ground power lines along N. Livermore Ave. and Manning Rd. included in PG&E's proposed project: 1. Put the aboveground power lines underground coming down North Livermore Ave. to avoid impacting the scenic corridor and agricultural qualities of the area.		X		See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C. See also response to item 3B in Table 2.4.C.
		Larry & Gail Vardenega, (cont'd)	2. The time to underground the power lines is at the time of construction, not after.			NA	No change in scope as a result of this suggestion.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
			3. Charge fees to new development in Livermore and other Tri-Valley communities prompting this expansion for the cost of undergrounding power lines. PG&E complains that the cost is too high for them to underground the lines, but the total cost of doing so split amongst the various developments would be minimal for each.			X	The cost of undergrounding is not a CEQA issue, per se, and, as a result, will not be studied in the EIR. However, the CPUC could consider such a suggestion in the General Proceeding. The CPUC's Administrative Law Judge will receive a copy of this Scoping Report and determine if any issues raised herein warrant follow-up in the General Proceeding.
10	C		4. Relocate the 5-acre substation to Dagnino Rd. or near Vasco Rd. The scenic view and agricultural environment are already compromised in those areas and would not be changed significantly. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Putting the substation at Dagnino Rd. would have less impact on the least amount of residents. b. The Gun Club is already a noise contributing facility and the noise from the substation, particularly the gunshot-like sounds used to keep birds off the transformers, would have less impact on the Club than on other area residents. 			X	See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C. Alternatives to the proposed substation site will be considered in the EIR.
11	A	Christopher O'Brien, Livermore	Give special consideration in the EIR to the environmental importance of preserving the scenic corridors of Brushy Peak and Manning Rd. as acknowledged by PG&E.	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	B		Underground as many of the transmission lines as possible to preserve and enhance the scenic quality of the area. Use the guideline established in the 1974 Alameda County Scenic Route Element which states that "new, relocated or existing utility distribution lines should be placed underground wherever feasible."		X		See responses to items 1A and 1B in Table 2.4.C.
	C		Exhaustively study all other potential routes which may not have been considered by PG&E.	X			See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
12	A	Marc Roberts, Community Development Director, City of Livermore	<p><i>(Note: The summary of comments which follows is based on two written submissions from Marc Roberts of the City of Livermore -- one dated 3-17-00, the other 5-22-00. Because the content of these two submissions are similar, they have been consolidated as one comment item for this Scoping Report.)</i></p> <p>It is imperative that the infrastructure involved in PG&E's proposed project not be allowed to detract from the scenic values and agricultural/open space character which the City of Livermore and Alameda County have been working to preserve in the N. Livermore area by the development of the N. Livermore Specific Plan. The 230kV transmission line included in PG&E's proposed project would cut through Zone B, the low density, high value residential area designated in the N. Livermore Specific Plan.</p>	X			See the response to item 10A in Table 2.4.C.
	B		<p>The City of Livermore proposes the following alternatives/ mitigations to minimize the potential visual impact of PG&E's proposed project on the N. Livermore Specific Plan Area: These proposals are based on guidelines and draft policy language now included in the N. Livermore Specific Plan:</p> <p><u>Alternative 1:</u> Locate a properly screened substation on or near the intersection of N. Livermore Ave. and May School Rd., preferably on the northwest corner. Power to the substation would be via underground lines from the proposed 230kV transmission line located to the north of the substation along Manning Road. PG&E representatives have indicated that they view this option to be advantageous in that the substation would be centrally located to all parts of the developed area. Increased costs for installing an underground supply line to the substation would be partially off-set by the efficiency of subsequent connections from a centrally located substation to area homes and businesses.</p>			X	See responses to item 3B in Table 2.4.C.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
12	B	Marc Roberts (cont'd)	<u>Alternative 2</u> Locate a properly screened substation on or near the corner of Dagnino and May School Roads. Power to this substation could be supplied via overhead transmission lines. The advantage of this location is that it is on the edge of the central visual corridor of the valley floor. Overhead power lines leading through Zone B of the N. Livermore Specific Plan Area in this alignment would have a less significant visual impact than lines located in the central part of Zone B as in Alternative 1. However, subsequent connections from this substation on the edge of the developed area to local homes and businesses would be less direct and thus more costly.			X	See response to item 3B in Table 2.4.C.
13	A	Doug Hill, Livermore	I live at the base of the hills located just north and at the end of Dagnino Rd. in Livermore. PG&E's proposed transmission lines and towers may be located parallel to my access road and will significantly degrade my view of the Livermore Valley. When I purchased this property, I was aware of PG&E's existing utility easement, but I assumed that any future expansion would use the traditional power poles that are in my area now.	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	B		I'm opposed to PG&E's using the larger transmission towers, because they will have a negative impact on my property value.			X	See response to item 5F in Table 2.4.C.
	C		Underground the transmission lines throughout the valley to avoid potentially degrading visual impacts.		X		Undergrounding "all" power lines is not economically viable. However, undergrounding is a component of alternatives for study in the EIR. See Section 3 of this report for a summary of the alternatives selected/not selected for study in the EIR and the reasons for these decisions. See also the response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	D		Review the Tesla-Newark Transmission Corridor to reassess the potential for identifying promising route alternatives.		X		See the response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.
14	A	Richard Ward, Livermore	The portion of the proposed 10-mile transmission line that goes from the Contra Costa-Newark 230kV line to the Tesla Substation and crosses the Vasco Rd. Sanitary Landfill along its western-most boundary raises several safety concerns:				<i>[see responses below]</i>

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
		Richard Ward (cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Earthquake</u>: The alignment proposed is within the Greenville Earthquake Fault Zone, an active seismic area which had a major earthquake in 1980. The epicenter for this quake is in the approximate area proposed for the transmission line. 	X			The potential impacts of seismic activity on the proposed project and its alternatives will be analyzed in the Geology section of the EIR.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Methane Gas Hazards</u>: The gas flare assembly which burns the excess methane gas produced by the waste material decomposing at the landfill could weaken the proposed transmission lines, resulting in transmission line and/or tower mechanical or structural failure. In addition, if one of the transmission lines were to fall to the ground, ignition of the methane gas could occur from the line's electrical charge. In addition, ionized gasses from the flare could induce line-to-line arcing, resulting in transmission line mechanical or structural failure. 		X		The EIR will analyze the potential impacts of the proposed project and its alternatives on public health and safety.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Fire Hazards</u>: A fallen transmission line could start a landfill fire. The presence of large amounts of combustible material in the landfill as well as the presence of surrounding grassland create a large potential for fire. The absence of fire fighting personnel, equipment and resources in the vicinity of the landfill add to the fire risk. 		X		The EIR will analyze the potential safety risks, including those from fire, as well as the potential impacts on public services of the proposed project and its alternatives.
14	B		The line of transmission towers proposed by PG&E would add significantly to the visual degradation which already exists for residents near the Vasco Rd. Landfill. Residents who live around the landfill deserve no less consideration regarding visual and aesthetic impacts than any other neighbors of this proposed project.	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
14	C	Richard Ward (cont'd)	<p>Consider the following alternatives to address the landfill route alignment and visual impact concerns I have raised:</p> <p><u>Option 1</u>: From an electrical engineering standpoint, the feed into the Tesla Substation could occur from any point along the existing Contra Costa-Newark transmission line in the general vicinity of the N. Livermore area. A new route should be developed which ties into the existing line at a point significantly north of that proposed, perhaps along the route within the Los Vacqueros watershed north of the proposed route. The tower line could then extend down the eastern boundary of the landfill to a point intersecting with the currently proposed route.</p>			X	See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
			<u>Option 2:</u> Modify Option 1 to have the proposed transmission line travel east from the current Contra Costa/Newark line across the northern boundary of the landfill, down the eastern boundary of the landfill to intersect the currently proposed route at some point.			X	See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C
			<u>Option 3:</u> Place the transmission line underground in the vicinity of the landfill. <i>(Note: The commenter submitted maps attached to his comment letter showing his suggested alternate routes)</i>			X	See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.
15	A	Gene and Patricia Broadman; and Ted Taylor, Livermore	One-half mile of the proposed 230kV overhead transmission line which would go south on N. Livermore Ave. to the proposed substation at May School Rd. would run in front of our property. Even with the minimal mitigation proposed for this overhead transmission line, we would suffer a loss in property value.			X	See response to item 5F in Table 2.4.C.
	B		The route proposed for the 230kV overhead transmission lines on N. Livermore Ave. does not take into consideration the land uses proposed for the properties in this area in the N. Livermore Specific Plan.	X			See response to item 4A in Table 2.4.C.
	C		Simply walling off the proposed N. Livermore Substation will not mitigate its negative visual impact to our area.	X			See response to item 1A in Table 2.4.C.
	D		The best mitigation for the overhead transmission lines would be underground burial.	X	X		See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C. Undergrounding will be evaluated as both a component of alternatives and as potential mitigation.
15	E	Gene and Patricia Broadman; and Ted Taylor, Livermore, cont.	We support the joint City/County proposal to move the proposed substation to a location at May School and Dagnino Roads.			X	See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.

TABLE 2.4.C SCOPING WRITTEN COMMENTS: LIVERMORE, CA

#	C	Commenter Name, Title, Affiliation	Comments/Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
16	A	Raymond Bonetti, Livermore	Existing facilities and corridors should be used to their maximum capacity before new invasive projects are considered. Consider the following alternative: Within the Tesla-Newark Transmission Line Corridor exists a significantly underutilized transmission tower line. It currently has one three-wire circuit, which starts at the Tesla Substation and ends at Greenville Road. From that point west, the towers contain only insulators and no conductors. The underutilized tower line in the Tesla-Newark Corridor should be used to supply the needed energy to the Valley area.		X		See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.
	B		The Contra Costa-Newark line should be upgraded, if required, to a two-conductor-per-line configuration to increase the energy carrying capacity of the line. This line could then be fed from the upgraded line in the Tesla-Newark Corridor.			X	See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.
	C		The needed N. Livermore substation could then be located at the Contra Costa-Newark line near the existing City of Livermore Water Storage Tank in the area of Dalton and Ames Roads.			X	See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.
	D		The Dublin Substation could be fed by extra circuits added to the route proposed to feed the Vineyard substation from the Tesla-Newark corridor. These new circuits could be taken from the Vineyard Substation north through the gravel pit area across I580 through relatively undeveloped land to the proposed Dublin Substation. In this manner, the new tower line across the N. Valley could be eliminated and an existing corridor used. Part of the line would be in the gravel pit area that would not affect residential areas.		X		See response to item 1B in Table 2.4.C.