

I. LANDOWNER COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Based on comments on the Draft EIR, some alternative transmission line routes have been modified in this Final EIR (see Section B). Landowners whose properties may be affected by these changes were notified of these modifications by the CPUC in letters dated April 4, 2001. Table I-1 lists those landowners that provided comments to the April 4th letter. The responses to these comments are presented in Section I.1, and the landowners' comment letters are presented in Section I.2.

Table I-1 Landowner Commenters and Comment Set Numbers

Commenter	Comment Set
Letters from Landowners	
Bhupinder Lehga	124
New Tech Law Group, Inc. (representing Mr. & Mrs. Steven Kalthoff)	125
Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Zone 7	126
Dennis Rooney (4D Ranch)	127
RMC Pacific Materials	128
East Bay Regional Park District	129

I.1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

COMMENT SET 124: BHUPINDER LEHGA

124-1 The suggestion that the transmission line be installed underground along the original S1/S2 Alternative alignment was carefully considered by the CPUC. This route would have required the installation of a half-acre transition station (Phase 1) and a one acre switching station (Phase 2) within Sycamore Grove Regional Park. The visual and recreation impacts of installing these facilities within the Park were determined to be significant. Therefore, the S2A Alternative was created to move the facilities out of the Park.

COMMENT SET 125: NEW TECH LAW GROUP, INC.

125-1 The CPUC appreciates the commenter's desire not to have the PG&E Co. facilities affect his parcel. Several options have been considered (see Final EIR Section B.2) in an effort to minimize impacts on this land. Regarding the potential for locating this route on park land, please see Response to Comment 124-1.

While the Final EIR does determine that the S2A Alternative, as modified and described in Section B.2, is the environmentally superior transmission line route in the South Area, the CPUC has not made a decision regarding which alternative will be approved. The CPUC considers other factors not addressed in the EIR, such as cost, community values, and construction scheduling. The CPUC's decision will likely be made in August 2001.

COMMENT SET 126: ALAMEDA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT ZONE 7

126-1 The CPUC has acknowledged the importance of Zone 7's mission and facilities, and has attempted to design alternatives that avoid impacting these facilities. Zone 7's specific concerns are addressed as follows, using the numbers in its comment letter:

1. As described in Section B.2, no PG&E Co. facilities will be placed within Zone 7's pipeline easements.
2. As also described in Section B.2, the PG&E Co. underground transmission line would not be placed within the roadway, but west/northwest of the roadway. In this manner, there will be no risk of instability.
3. Mitigation Measure S-1 requires PG&E Co. to implement cathodic protection for existing pipelines, if required, after determination of the potential for impacts based on soil conditions.
4. The Draft EIR presents 11 mitigation measures to reduce traffic and transportation impacts, including measures that would ensure continued access to the Zone 7 plant during construction.
5. The subsurface drainage conditions described in this comment were considered in the selection of the S2A modification that is analyzed in the Final EIR (see Section B.2).

COMMENT SET 127: DENNIS ROONEY

127-1 The CPUC acknowledges the commenter's concern about the transition station's proximity to his family home. Given that the home must be within 300 feet of the existing Contra Costa-Newark 230 kV transmission line in order for it to be so close to the transition station, the impact of this small station in the setting of the transmission line would be less than significant. However, the following mitigation measure is presented to define whether it would be possible to increase the distance from the station to the residence.

- L-25** The route of the easternmost 1,000 feet of the P3 Alternative (as modified in the Final EIR, Section B.5) shall be evaluated by PG&E Co. in conjunction with the adjacent landowners and the transition station shall be relocated to at least 500 feet from any residence, if feasible.

COMMENT SET 128: RMC PACIFIC MATERIALS

128-1 The location of the half-acre fenced transition station is illustrated on Final EIR Figure B-4. EIR preparers understand that PG&E Co. has had surveyors determine the location of this station in conjunction with RMC management. With respect to the transmission line and the potential for loss of gravel reserves, that impact is acknowledged in Final EIR Section C.3, but

it is considered to be less than significant since RMC would be compensated for reserves made inaccessible by this project.

COMMENT SET 129: EAST BAY REGIONAL PARKS DISTRICT

129-1 Regarding tower heights, the commenter is correct that the transmission towers would likely be in the 80-100 foot range. However, according to RMC (quarry) management, the existing permanent equipment located east of Shadow Cliffs is 90 feet tall. A detailed assessment of the visual impacts of the S5 Quarry Route Alternative is presented in Final EIR Section C.3. Section B.4 explains that undergrounding through the quarry would be infeasible due to the expectation that quarry activity will continue for as long as 30 years, and the amount of gravel resource that would be made inaccessible with an underground line would be substantial.

I.2 COPIES OF LANDOWNER LETTERS

Following are copies of the comment letters listed in Table I-1.