

1                   **Pacific Gas and Electric Company**  
2                   **Santa Cruz 115-kV Reinforcement Project**

3  
4                   **Pacific Gas and Electric Company**  
5                   **Application No. 12-01-012**

6  
7                   **January 29, 2014**

8  
9                   **at**

10                   **CORRALITOS GRANGE HALL**  
11                   **165 LITTLE CORRAL WAY**  
12                   **CORRALITOS, CALIFORNIA 95076**

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19                   **Reported by:**

20                   **HEATHER L. ROSEMAN**  
21                   **CSR 10820**

-----

22                   **JAN BROWN & ASSOCIATES**  
23                   **WORLDWIDE DEPOSITION & VIDEOGRAPHY SERVICES**  
24                   **701 Battery Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111**  
25                   **(415) 981-3948 or (800) 522-7096**

1 (On the record at 6:07 p.m.)

2 MS. ORSABA: My name is Lisa Orsaba. I'm the  
3 project manager for the California Public Utilities  
4 Commission. California Public Utilities Commission is  
5 the permitting authority for PG&E's Santa Cruz 115-kV  
6 Reinforcement Project.

7 Can you all hear me, first of all? Can you  
8 hear me? Okay. Let me know if you can't. I have a  
9 bit of a cold tonight, so please forgive me and bear  
10 with me.

11 First of all, again, I want to welcome you and  
12 thank you for your interest in this project and for  
13 your involvement in the project so far. I'd like to  
14 begin by letting you know that there are  
15 representatives from Pacific Gas and Electric in the  
16 room. I'd like them to raise their hands to identify  
17 themselves so that you can see. So PG&E is here, but  
18 this is not PG&E's meeting. This is the California  
19 Public Utilities Commission's meeting.

20 I just want to say a few things about the roles  
21 of the various parties here. So PG&E files an  
22 application, and, as you know, in this project, they  
23 filed an application for a permit to do this project.  
24 They can't do the project unless the Public Utilities  
25 Commission grants the permit. Under California

1 Environmental Quality Act law, we can't grant that  
2 permit unless the project complies with CEQA.

3 So what the California Public Utilities  
4 Commission does is we hire consultants; in this case,  
5 it's Panorama Environmental. Tania Treis is the  
6 project manager for Panorama Environmental. And they  
7 conduct the environmental analysis.

8 So you're going to hear a lot about this. And  
9 I just want to briefly tell you that PG&E, when they  
10 file their application, they give us a lot of  
11 information. All of this information, by the way, is  
12 on the website. We take their information. It's a  
13 large document that they file with their application.  
14 And we conduct our own independent analysis. And from  
15 that analysis, we determine, the CPUC, determines what  
16 kind of environmental document should be prepared. We  
17 did that in this proceeding.

18 Part of the requirements of CEQA are that the  
19 public has an opportunity to comment and that we hold  
20 public meetings. You did comment. We reviewed your  
21 comments. And we determined subsequently that an EIR  
22 should be our next step. And that's what we're here to  
23 talk about tonight.

24 Tonight, we have Nicholas Dewar, who's going to  
25 be facilitating the meeting. Tania will be talking

1 about the environmental processes. I'm here also to  
2 answer any questions. We have an agenda and we have a  
3 process. Nicholas will speak to that. So I'm going to  
4 hand it over to Nicholas. And again, thanks all of you  
5 for coming.

6 MR. DEWAR: Thank you, Lisa. So this evening  
7 really -- although you've just had a few minutes of  
8 Lisa talking with you and you'll have a few minutes  
9 next from Tania talking with you -- this is really all  
10 about you talking to the CPUC.

11 Almost all of the meeting is going to be  
12 dedicated to comments from you. We're going to start  
13 with a presentation from Tania about the project, so  
14 you're all on the same base in terms of information.

15 We reckon that the presentation will probably  
16 take less than a half an hour. So by about 20 minutes  
17 of 7:00, we'll be getting to the comments. When we get  
18 into the -- even during the presentation, there will  
19 probably be opportunities for you to ask questions to  
20 make sure you understand what's being told to you.

21 I normally ask you to tell me what kinds of  
22 ground rules you'd like me to help you follow. I don't  
23 know if you have anything where you in your community a  
24 kind of set of ground rules that you're used to  
25 following. Does anybody have any ground rules that

1 you'd like me to help you follow? I'll prompt you to a  
2 few that might help.

3 One of them is, like, one person talks at a  
4 time. Another would be speak respectfully. One of the  
5 things that's going to help, I expect you'll be hearing  
6 from people who have different opinions. So you may  
7 hear somebody making a comment you don't agree with.  
8 I've been at meetings where the group actually said  
9 that they wanted there to be no cheering, which  
10 surprised me. But as the meeting went on, I could see  
11 why. They all disagreed with each other. And if there  
12 was cheering and hissing and booing, before you know  
13 it, the person speaking feels uncomfortable about  
14 saying what they need to say.

15 So these are ideas. I leave it up to you to  
16 decide what you want me -- I'll try to keep the peace,  
17 but I'm not -- I don't have a badge or anything, so I'm  
18 only able to do what you want me to do. Yes, sir?

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You know, be respectful and  
20 one person speak at a time.

21 MR. DEWAR: Speak respectfully.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The last meeting, we were  
23 concerned that our comments and questions were not  
24 recorded. Can we have our comments and questions --

25 MR. DEWAR: Let me explain that. There is a

1 stenographer, Heather. When you make a comment, you're  
2 to come up here. I'll give you a kind of -- yes,  
3 Heather is going to get the whole thing. You're going  
4 to have a transcript. I'm sure it'll go up on a  
5 website somewhere at some time quite soon. At the same  
6 time, Bridget is going to keep a non official record.  
7 This one is not official.

8 Just so you know, you can keep track of what  
9 you're saying and what other people have said. We'll  
10 keep what we call -- we'll rip off a page and put them  
11 on the wall, so that, if we want to, we can refer back.  
12 So that will take care -- that takes care of that.

13 Other ground rules that you'd like me to  
14 follow?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Keep it short and sweet.

16 MR. DEWAR: Keep it short and keep it sweet.  
17 You know, normally, sometimes we have a little light  
18 that comes on at three minutes. We don't have a light  
19 tonight. How many of you are expecting to make a  
20 comment? Just raise your hand. So there's probably  
21 going to be time for us to kind of get through comments  
22 without making you sort of complete it in two minutes  
23 or three minutes. But I think you, at the same time,  
24 want to respect the other people who might have  
25 something to say. If it gets to -- if I feel that

1 you're kind of taking longer than people in the room  
2 might have expected, I'll start walking towards you.  
3 That will be your clue. So if I'm walking towards you,  
4 it means think about maybe wrapping up. Yes, sir?

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can we ask -- during the  
6 comments, can we ask a question and get an answer after  
7 our comment?

8 MR. DEWAR: Generally, it's a good idea to kind  
9 of keep the comments coming. We've got until 9:00  
10 o'clock tonight. So perhaps what we should do, if  
11 you've got questions that you aren't able to address  
12 during the presentation, then we'll have a kind of a  
13 question time at the end. Does that sound okay? So at  
14 about 8:00 o'clock maybe, we'll have an hour to go, and  
15 we'll sort of take stock of things and see if there are  
16 questions. Can we try that? Yes, ma'am?

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So this meeting is different  
18 from last meeting because we can ask questions and they  
19 might get answers?

20 MR. DEWAR: This meeting is different from last  
21 meeting. Questions and answers -- there's going to be  
22 a presentation. The focus of this meeting really is on  
23 getting the best comments that we can get out of --  
24 from all of you. That's what this is all about.

25 During the presentation, we've broken down the

1 presentation into sort of three segments. At the end  
2 of the segment, we'll take a break and take questions  
3 about that piece of the presentation. General  
4 questions, I think, you're going to find are already --  
5 we don't know yet. Certainly, we can -- this is  
6 different from the last meeting. This is a scoping  
7 meeting for an EIR. Tania is going to explain that.

8 In fact, I'm beginning to feel that I'm getting  
9 into Tania's things. Any other ground rules that you  
10 want to help stick to? And then we'll move on. So be  
11 respectful; one person speaks at a time; short and  
12 sweet. And we can add to that if it turns out we need  
13 another rule. It'll be obvious. We'll go on to the  
14 presentation. Tania?

15 MS. TREIS: So I'm Tania Treis. Lisa had  
16 introduced me. I'm with Panorama Environmental. We  
17 are the environmental consultants who are preparing the  
18 EIR. We also worked on the initial study. Many of you  
19 saw me last time at the meeting a couple months ago.

20 So really quickly, I'm going to give a brief  
21 overview of what I'm going to cover in the  
22 presentation. Like Nicholas said, we'll have some  
23 break points for some questions about the material I  
24 just presented.

25 So I've got a brief project history. A little



1 bit of this will be a brief repeat of what Lisa had  
2 just gone over. We'll talk a little bit about CEQA and  
3 the EIR process that we're going to embark on now. And  
4 then we'll give a little break so that you can ask  
5 questions about the process.

6 We'll continue on with an overview of the  
7 proposed project and the alternatives. And I'll talk a  
8 little more about alternatives, because this is  
9 something that's very different from the last time.  
10 I'll introduce you to the environmental topics of an  
11 EIR. And again, this is to give you an introduction to  
12 what the EIR is going to look at and where you can give  
13 input and feedback. And then we'll open it up to the  
14 comment period. Before we open up to the comment  
15 period, I'll pass it back to Nicholas and he'll get us  
16 all set up for how we're going to do the comments and  
17 the comment period.

18 MS. ORSABA: Can I just interrupt? Tania, will  
19 you remind them of the close of the formal comment  
20 period that is February 18th? That's a date to keep in  
21 mind.

22 MS. TREIS: Yes. A date to keep in mind for  
23 the scoping comments is February 18th. We have it a  
24 few times in the presentation as well. That's the  
25 cutoff for submitting your comments. And again, you

1 can submit them via e-mail, via mail, at this meeting.  
2 Again, we'll have a record of comments that are  
3 provided orally at the meeting. We'll reiterate that  
4 again. And we have a final slide that has the date as  
5 well.

6 So a little bit of history. As Lisa had  
7 mentioned, PG&E submitted an application and a  
8 Proponents' Environmental Assessment for this project  
9 in early 2012. CPUC reviewed that application, and it  
10 was deemed complete in about April of 2012.

11 After that point, we had put all the  
12 information up on the CPUC website and we embarked on  
13 an initial study. And initially we thought that a  
14 Mitigated Negative Declaration would be the appropriate  
15 decision document for this project. We circulated that  
16 initial study, the MND, for a 45-day plus review, which  
17 was beyond the CEQA requirement of 30 days, to allow  
18 the public to have a little more time to review and  
19 digest the information. And that occurred in October  
20 and November of 2013. We also did a public meeting in  
21 November of 2013, where we were able to hear a lot more  
22 of your concerns.

23 And again, through early December, we received  
24 many of your concerns over e-mail in the close of the  
25 comment period. We received many, many comments, as

1 I'm sure many of you know. Many of you submitted  
2 comments. And we looked at those comments and decided  
3 that it was appropriate, based on the feedback from the  
4 public and what you guys have said, that we should do  
5 an EIR for this project.

6 And once that decision was made, under CEQA, we  
7 were required to issue a notice of preparation for an  
8 EIR. That's where we are right now. That was issued  
9 on January 17th, for a 30-day public review period.  
10 And the purpose of the NOP is really to get your  
11 feedback again on what your concerns are with this  
12 project, what you want to see in the EIR, what issues  
13 you think are significant, may need mitigation, to give  
14 input, so that we can look at that and make the EIR  
15 address your concerns.

16 So what is an EIR? Environmental Impact  
17 Report. This is an informational document. And its  
18 purpose is to inform the public, as well as the  
19 decision makers, of what a proposed project is and what  
20 are the potential environmental effects. Document  
21 looks at the effects and it looks at and presents ways  
22 where there could be significant effects, ways to  
23 minimize those effects, with mitigation measures.

24 Another purpose of the EIR is to look at a  
25 range of alternatives. And this is one area that is

1 different from the initial study that we had sent out  
2 before. So again, it'll provide some additional  
3 environmental analysis. It'll go beyond what we did in  
4 the initial study. We'll look at the comments received  
5 from the public, during the scoping period, as well as  
6 the comments we received on the draft IS. We'll do  
7 some initial analysis and do some additional analysis  
8 and mitigation in the EIR. We'll include a robust  
9 evaluation for alternatives as required by the CEQA and  
10 many opportunities for public review and input in this  
11 process.

12 So this slide just shows the process. It's a  
13 process flow diagram. What this shows is, on the left  
14 hand side, is the CEQA process. This is what we're  
15 focused on here tonight. At the same time, there's the  
16 administrative process with the CPUC. And as we get  
17 through the CEQA process, the information from the CEQA  
18 process will be provided to the administrative law  
19 judge, who will make a decision on this project.

20 So the EIR will be one piece of information  
21 given to the judge in terms of whether or not to  
22 approve this project. And again, we're early again  
23 here. We're at the scoping and public meeting phase.

24 The next step will be issuing a draft EIR.  
25 That will go out for a 45-day public review period.

1 And we'll look at the comments and respond to comments  
2 and issue a final EIR at the end of that. The next  
3 steps -- again, we're in the scoping period from here  
4 through February 18th.

5 We're going to be collecting comments from the  
6 public based on the Notice of Preparation that many of  
7 you received. It's also available on the website.  
8 We're going to take that input. And over the next  
9 several months, we're going to work on the analysis and  
10 prepare the draft EIR.

11 We anticipate the draft EIR will be out for  
12 public review around June. This is really tentative.  
13 There's a lot of things that can change the schedule.  
14 But that's our target right now for the release of the  
15 draft EIR. June, July, will be the public review  
16 period. And then we expect and will need a couple  
17 months to go through those comments and to prepare  
18 meaningful responses and to adapt or edit the EIR as  
19 appropriate. So we're looking at around maybe October  
20 to have a final EIR.

21 Again, the website will be updated as things  
22 change, as new information comes in. We're constantly  
23 updating the website, so that's a good place to look to  
24 find out where we are on the schedule. You can also  
25 contact us if you have questions about the progress of

1 the project or the schedule on the project.

2 MS. ORSABA: This presentation will be on the  
3 website also this week probably.

4 MS. TREIS: Yes.

5 MR. DEWAR: Questions about the process? This  
6 is one of the three little moments we have to really  
7 ask questions about what we just heard from Tania.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You give all the information  
9 to a judge, one person, who then makes the decision?  
10 And who is that person.

11 MS. ORSABA: There's an administrative law  
12 judge assigned to every proceeding at the California  
13 Public Utilities Commission. This proceeding, by the  
14 way, has a number. It's 12-01 -- anyway, it has an  
15 administrative number, And there's a law judge  
16 assigned. And the law judge takes the information from  
17 those of us who are doing the CEQA review and he makes  
18 the final right to --

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What's his name?

20 MS. ORSABA: His name is Robert Mason.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What jurisdiction is he in?

22 MS. ORSABA: He's an administrative law judge  
23 at the California Public Utilities Commission.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He works for you?

25 MS. ORSABA: He works for the Commission.

1 MR. DEWAR: You in the back, ma'am?

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So going back, Panorama  
3 originally made a study and gave a negative mitigated  
4 declaration to the Public Utilities Commission saying  
5 we don't need an EIR. What changed that? And if  
6 you're doing the study again, it's the same agency that  
7 already said we don't need an Environmental Impact  
8 Report. Why is the PUC still staying with Panorama?

9 MS. TREIS: It's actually a CPUC document.  
10 Panorama is a third party. We're actually considered  
11 one with the CPUC in terms of the preparation for this  
12 document. We work under their guidance. Again, this  
13 is part of the CEQA process.

14 The reason why we're going to an EIR now is  
15 there's a step where the document goes out for public  
16 review, and the public can provide us with input that  
17 maybe we didn't have feedback in terms of your concerns  
18 that we didn't have before that point. You can provide  
19 us with evidence of what you think may be in effect.  
20 And that's what happened in this case. We received a  
21 lot of comments, a lot of concerns about visual  
22 impacts. So under the law, we determined that, based  
23 on that review, there's new evidence and, therefore, we  
24 should prepare an EIR.

25 MR. DEWAR: We have a few questions. I'm

1 hesitant about doing a lot of questioning now. We'll  
2 do --

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a couple really good  
4 questions. Just for clarification. I understand that  
5 number that's linked to this study. I've been on the  
6 CPUC website. The commissioner who's assigned to  
7 monitor this is the head commissioner. And I'm just  
8 clarifying. This Robert Mason, administrative law  
9 judge, is not the same as the head CPUC commissioner,  
10 or is he?

11 MS. ORSABA: I'll answer that question. Can  
12 you hear me? So any proceeding that comes to the  
13 California Public Utilities Commission is assigned to a  
14 commissioner's office. So there are five  
15 commissioners. Any proceeding is assigned to one of  
16 those commissioners.

17 Commissioner Peevey is the president of the  
18 commission. The proceeding is also assigned to an  
19 administrative law judge, and the administrative law  
20 judge writes a proposed decision at the end of this  
21 process. This is true for any proceeding, all  
22 proceedings, all kinds of things.

23 Administrative law judge writes a proposed  
24 decision. And the commission, the full commission,  
25 votes on that decision. They can either adopt the



1 decision that the judge writes, or they can decline to  
2 adopt it.

3 So the commission is the final authority. The  
4 judge writes a decision, making basically a  
5 recommendation, a reasoned decision, as decisions are  
6 supposed to be, and judicial proceedings. And that's  
7 how this, as all other proceedings, make their way  
8 through the California Public Utilities Commission.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just to clarify really  
10 quickly. So who vets the judge? Is there anybody who  
11 vets the judge, or is that the last judge?

12 MS. ORSABA: I don't understand what you mean  
13 vets the judge?

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that the last step? So  
15 once it gets to the administrative law judge, there is  
16 no more room for development? He writes it, and that's  
17 the final document and it goes to the CPUC, right?

18 MS. ORSABA: That's not the final document.  
19 The final document is the final decision, not the  
20 proposed decision. The final decision that is voted on  
21 by the full California Public Utilities Commissioner.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Five commissioners. Who  
23 received the January 17th notice for 30-day public  
24 review? Because I'm kind of surprised. I never knew  
25 about this project until after the first meeting was

1 held. I was never on that list.

2 MS. ORSABA: There are noticing requirements  
3 for all applications of this kind at the CPUC. They're  
4 governed by General Order 131-D. So PG&E has to send  
5 out notices. They did that in compliance with 131-D.  
6 I know that, because I had to find their application  
7 complete. I couldn't have done that if their notices  
8 weren't adequate. They were adequate.

9 In addition, CEQA has notice requirements. And  
10 in both, with the first round of the Initial Study,  
11 Mitigated Negative Declaration, we noticed according to  
12 CEQA. And again, this Notice of Preparation for the  
13 EIR, we again noticed. If you're not within a certain  
14 distance of the proposed distance --

15 MR. DEWAR: Hang on a second.  
16 Go ahead.

17 MS. ORSABA: If you're not a property owner  
18 within 300 feet of those alignments, you're not  
19 required -- we're not required to notice you. This is  
20 also -- this project, as you know, has also received  
21 press attention. I'm sorry if you didn't hear about  
22 it. But I do know that we exceeded the noticing  
23 requirements. This is a big project. Already a lot of  
24 people interested in it. We went to lengths to make  
25 sure that you were adequately noticed.

1 MR. DEWAR: We've got a line here.

2 (Brief pause.)

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are our previous comments  
4 considered, or are we starting all over again?

5 MS. ORSABA: The comments that you've already  
6 submitted were taken into account, getting to this  
7 decision to move forward with an EIR. They will most  
8 certainly be taken into account in our analysis in the  
9 EIR. So you don't have to reiterate them, write them,  
10 resubmit them. If you have anything new, please do  
11 submit those questions. But be assured that the  
12 comments you've already given us, we have. And we have  
13 a record of them. And we heard you.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you go back to slide  
15 two? One more. That one. So in bullet number two and  
16 bullet number three, what's the process for those?  
17 Identifying ways to minimize the effects and also  
18 evaluating the range of alternatives. What's the  
19 process?

20 MS. TREIS: So the -- yeah. The process is,  
21 again, looking at the project as it's proposed, looking  
22 at the requirements under CEQA. CEQA identifies  
23 several environmental parameters to be looked at. And  
24 it identifies what are thresholds of significance in  
25 terms of effects. And then we look at the project --

1 we may have to do some studies, things like visual  
2 simulations. We'd done those in the draft, and I know  
3 there was a lot of concern about them, so those were  
4 revisited, and do biological studies. And we take the  
5 outcome of the studies and we prepare an analysis.

6 And if we find that there is a significant  
7 threshold tripped, then we try to find mitigation to  
8 reduce below that threshold. It varies by parameter.  
9 Sometimes it's a little more subjective. Sometimes  
10 something like air quality, you have strict standards  
11 and you can do an emissions model and look at how much  
12 the project is going to emit and you can say it's less  
13 than the threshold or it's more than it, therefore we  
14 have to do something to make this less than  
15 significant.

16 Sometimes it's a little more subjective and we  
17 use experts to make the call in terms of whether that's  
18 going to be a significant effect or what can be done to  
19 reduce the effect.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So Panorama identifies the  
21 ways to minimize or eliminate the effects?

22 MS. TREIS: Our technical specialists, yes.  
23 These are people who have qualifications and  
24 credentials in this area. For example, we have a  
25 biologist who has good a background in biology, many

1 years of experience. The biologist we have is actually  
2 permitted in the Santa Cruz long-toed salamander. So  
3 he's an expert in the Santa Cruz long-toed salamander  
4 area. He's a recognized expert. He's worked with the  
5 agencies. He's done these surveys before. He's going  
6 to be the person who's going to go through and look at  
7 and say what is this project and what effects could it  
8 have, and, based on his knowledge of the biology, what  
9 can we do to reduce those effects.

10 MR. DEWAR: Ma'am, go ahead. Actually, before  
11 you start, we're getting -- this is longer than we  
12 anticipated. What I propose is we take these three  
13 questions and move on to the next topic.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: My questions touch on the  
15 subjects already discussed. This will be quick. On  
16 the administrative judge's decision, how often is his  
17 decision not abided by by the five commissioners?

18 MS. ORSABA: I couldn't tell you.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do they usually take his  
20 suggestions?

21 MS. ORSABA: I really can't answer that  
22 question. I don't think it's knowable.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sure it's knowable.

24 MS. ORSABA: I don't have statistics on how  
25 often a proposed decision is accepted by the

1 commission. It really depends.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I've had a doctor's  
3 appointment, so I was really late coming in. Are you  
4 with Panorama?

5 MS. ORSABA: I'm with the California Public  
6 Utilities Commission. Just so that you know, the  
7 contract that we have with Panorama requires them to  
8 provide resumes for all of the specialists and all the  
9 various CEQA Appendix G, all those areas. So all of  
10 the people that work for Panorama or the contractors  
11 that we do have to -- we have to hire somebody who  
12 knows about air quality. We see their resumes. We  
13 have to approve them.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: To follow up on, since you  
15 are with the Public Utilities Commission, there are no  
16 statistics, there's no public records showing when the  
17 judge, the administrative judge, gives his decision to  
18 the commissioners? Isn't that part of public record  
19 someplace, all of those decisions?

20 MS. ORSABA: I don't even know if that's been  
21 compiled. It might be, historically.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Let's just say in the last  
23 five years.

24 MS. ORSABA: I'm sure it's something that  
25 someone could --

1           AUDIENCE MEMBER: But you don't have access --

2           MS. ORSABA: I'm not saying I don't have  
3 access.

4           MS. TREIS: Just hasn't been done.

5           AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is it typical, atypical? Is  
6 it typical that the commissioner follows the judge's  
7 report? We have no idea whether it's half the time or  
8 80 percent of the time.

9           MS. ORSABA: I wouldn't want to say.

10          MR. DEWAR: I think that's the most  
11 satisfaction you're going to get. You're not finished?

12          AUDIENCE MEMBER: No. Another issue was the  
13 public notice. I called and spoke with somebody at  
14 Panorama. She was very, very helpful. But I received  
15 the letter last week. I did not realize that it  
16 affected our property -- literally, in front of our  
17 house -- until the neighbor called up and said, "Did  
18 you get the letter?" And so then I called Panorama to  
19 find out what roads specifically were involved and the  
20 various alternative routes, and I was told that wasn't  
21 available, even though the letters had been sent out.

22                 I asked if they could please post it to the  
23 website before this meeting. This was just the end of  
24 last week. I said it seemed like this meeting was  
25 rather premature, since a lot of the people involved

1 did not receive the letter or did not realize it  
2 literally affected their homes.

3 Now, the alternative routes, I've gone through  
4 the last several pages of your document -- I didn't  
5 read it all because there wasn't time -- but I did read  
6 the alternative routes. We're Aptos Ridge Circle in  
7 the Aptos hills. I don't know if we're the southern  
8 route or are we part of the flight road route. It  
9 seems like, if we're having a public meeting, you're  
10 supposed to review and have the public know about it,  
11 and if the public hasn't been informed fully, it seems  
12 like this is going to be a little bit premature. Those  
13 that are going to have their lives dramatically  
14 impacted by this project, a lot of them don't know  
15 about it yet.

16 MS. ORSABA: Thank you for the comment. We've  
17 done the Notice of Preparation, which is required by  
18 CEQA, and went out on January 17th. The comment  
19 period -- this is a CEQA requirement -- is 30 days. We  
20 strive to have a meeting somewhere on the early side,  
21 giving people enough opportunity to look at the  
22 information and then come to the meeting and still have  
23 enough time on the other side of the meeting to provide  
24 comments.

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you post on the website



1 all of the roads for the specific alternative routes,  
2 so that people that are involved --

3 MS. TREIS: We don't necessarily have that  
4 information.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The letters have gone out to  
6 the --

7 MS. TREIS: So, again, this is early in the  
8 process. If you notice, the posters, we call them  
9 preliminary alternatives. It has not been ironed out  
10 what these are to the level of detail of the proposed  
11 project. Part of this meeting is to get your input in  
12 order to help us further develop those. The chance  
13 where you're going to get to see what those  
14 alternatives are will be on the draft EIR. Again,  
15 there's a big comment period on the draft EIR, where  
16 you have more information, you've got the alternatives  
17 fully flushed out, and you can go through it and look  
18 at that and provide feedback and comments.

19 Under CEQA, once the lead agency determines  
20 that an EIR is going to be prepared, they're obligated  
21 to send out the NOP immediately. We actually have a  
22 lot more information than most EIRs have at this phase.  
23 Usually it's a very early step in the process, where  
24 you're just getting feedback and input from the public.

25 MR. DEWAR: I'm kind of anxious to move on.

1 MS. ORSABA: Let me just say one thing. This  
2 is for everyone here, and especially for you. Please  
3 make sure that your name and your e-mail address is on  
4 the list at the door. We have a distribution list,  
5 apart from property owners, and we will make sure that  
6 you are notified of everything going forward. You can  
7 always check the website. But you can get on the list.  
8 Your neighbors can get on the list. People in other  
9 counties can get on the list. Anybody who wants to say  
10 something about this project can do that by getting on  
11 our distribution list, whether or not you have property  
12 in the area. So please make sure your name is on the  
13 list.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I am on the list. But I'm  
15 just curious --

16 MR. DEWAR: Hang on a second. We're going to  
17 make another ground rule.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm curious what roads are  
19 actually involved, and you're saying you don't know at  
20 this point.

21 MR. DEWAR: Please keep quiet so we can hear  
22 the question.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: One of your comments actually  
24 mentions a resident on Bens Way, two residents on White  
25 Road, that would be displaced. Now, in another

1 document --

2 MR. DEWAR: You know what? I want to  
3 interrupt. That's not what we've been discussing. So  
4 let's move on. There's another ground rule that I want  
5 to propose, and it's up to you whether you want it or  
6 not. Just ask one question. And then we come back to  
7 you if there's time for your subsequent questions.  
8 Would anyone object to that?

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Turn off cell phones, please.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can we do a single follow-up  
11 on a question?

12 MR. DEWAR: Any objections? With a single  
13 follow up? Okay. Go ahead. With a single follow-up.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is the judge's decision  
15 appealable by other courts?

16 MS. ORSABA: Decisions -- not the judge. The  
17 judge's decision goes to the full commission. The  
18 commission makes a final decision. The final decisions  
19 at the California Public Utilities Commission and CEQA  
20 can be appealed to the California Supreme Court.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just want to make a  
22 statement that we were not notified, and it's within 26  
23 feet of our home. And our notification was to  
24 occupant.

25 MR. DEWAR: Thank you.

1 MS. ORSABA: I'd like to -- give us your name  
2 after, and we'll try and figure out what happened.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I actually have the same  
4 question as that woman did about whether the  
5 commissioners ever vote against the judge's decision.

6 MS. ORSABA: Oh, yes, they do vote against the  
7 judge's decision. She asked how often and what the  
8 statistics are. And that, I don't know. But yes, they  
9 do vote against them. Often.

10 MR. DEWAR: Thank you, everyone. Let's move  
11 on. We'll come back for questions at the end of the  
12 presentation. Go ahead.

13 MS. TREIS: So this next section is about the  
14 proposed project. Again, a lot of you are probably  
15 aware of what the proposed project was from the  
16 previous meeting and Initial Study.

17 Just to reiterate, the purpose of the project  
18 is to improve the electrical reliability of the system.  
19 The population and demand has increased substantially.  
20 This line was put in in the 1970s and has not been  
21 upgraded since, or has had only minor upgrades since.  
22 The demand has increased 30 to 60 percent. And  
23 therefore, there's regional reliability issues. The  
24 purpose of this project is basically to address those  
25 issues.

1           Now, I will say that we did receive a lot of  
2           comments about the purpose and need that, it was too  
3           brief from the Initial Study. So one of the things  
4           we'll put in the EIR is more information for you on why  
5           this project is needed. That's going to be addressed  
6           with a more robust section on the purpose and need in  
7           the EIR.

8           This graphic just shows the project location.  
9           So the project includes two segments. There's the  
10          Northern Alignment, which follows an existing 115-kV  
11          power line. What that section includes is doing two  
12          circuits where there's one circuit now.

13          MR. DEWAR: I can point. This is the Northern  
14          Alignment.

15          MS. TREIS: This is the Northern Alignment  
16          here. Again, we have some posters up over in the  
17          corner after if you want to take a look. They're more  
18          detailed. The Northern Alignment, like I said, there's  
19          an existing 115-kV single-circuit line. Proposed  
20          project is going to place a second line, a second  
21          115-kV circuit on that line.

22          And then there's the Cox-Freedom Segment, which  
23          is this segment here, which will include a  
24          single-circuit new 115-kV power line that's going to be  
25          installed along an existing distribution line.

1           So just a summary of what I just said. It's  
2 adding a second 115-kV circuit and a single-circuit  
3 along Cox-Freedom into the Rob Roy Substation. The  
4 project elements include the Northern Alignment, the  
5 Cox-Freedom Segment, the Rob Roy Substation  
6 modifications.

7           The Northern Alignment is roughly 7.1 miles  
8 long. As many of you know, this section includes pole  
9 replacement. So existing 60-foot approximately wood  
10 poles are going to be replaced roughly one for one by  
11 90-foot tubular steel poles that will be a rust color.

12           The Cox-Freedom Segment is 1.7 miles long and  
13 roughly 39-foot tall wood poles will be replaced with  
14 transmission poles, 89-foot transmission poles. This  
15 is a large size jump. This is something we know is of  
16 concern to the community. It includes four steel poles  
17 along the alignment; two on the ends and two in the  
18 middle.

19           Rob Roy Substation is some minor modifications  
20 with poles and some equipment there. That's a little  
21 bit less of a concern.

22           So as part of this process, the EIR process,  
23 which was not required under the Initial Study, is to  
24 look at alternatives. We may have some new people in  
25 the room, because we did -- though it's not required

1 under CEQA, we did try and notify people roughly along  
2 the preliminary alternative routes. And CEQA requires  
3 under an EIR that alternatives are looked at. We  
4 looked at alternatives that meet the project objective.

5 Our objective generally here is to improve the  
6 reliability and upgrade the system. Alternatives are  
7 looked at to reduce environmental effects. What other  
8 routes can you use, what other methods can be done to  
9 reduce the effects of the proposed project.

10 Again, under CEQA, we're only required to look  
11 at alternatives that substantially meet the objectives  
12 of the proposed project. You know, putting the  
13 transmission somewhere else, or building a new power  
14 plant, is not necessarily meeting the objectives of the  
15 proposed project and, therefore, doesn't have to be  
16 considered in detail.

17 There's a couple different types of  
18 alternatives. We're obligated to look at the no  
19 project alternative, feasible alternatives -- there's  
20 three different types of alternatives. One is a no  
21 project alternative. This is if the project is not  
22 constructive, what does that look like, what are the  
23 effects, is that possible. We look at alternatives  
24 considered but eliminated. So some alternatives may be  
25 looked at, but they may be determined to be infeasible,

1 for engineering reasons, for various reasons they may  
2 be determined infeasible. We describe those  
3 alternatives, we describe how we came to the conclusion  
4 that they're infeasible, and we present that in a  
5 document. And then we look at feasible alternatives.  
6 So these are carried forward for analysis. These are  
7 ones that meet the objective and reduce the  
8 environmental effects and are feasible.

9 Under CEQA guidelines, we'll be required to  
10 identify what's the environmentally superior  
11 alternative. Again, here are three preliminary  
12 alternatives. As has been noted, these have been  
13 described in the proponent's environmental assessment  
14 by PG&E. They're going to be refined.

15 There may be additional alternatives. This is  
16 area the public may comment. If you think you have an  
17 alternative that will work nicely, you can present that  
18 as a comment during this process to be considered. Or  
19 if there's adjustments in the alternatives, you can  
20 present those in your comments. We're still looking at  
21 it.

22 One of the alternatives we're going to look at  
23 is undergrounding. We're looking at, in particular,  
24 portions of the Cox-Freedom Segment and whether  
25 portions of that segment can be undergrounded.



1 The feasibility is still being evaluated. So we don't  
2 know at this time that it's feasible. PG&E is out  
3 there. I think you're going to see some people out in  
4 the streets doing some studies to try and determine if  
5 this is an option along the alignment and, if it is,  
6 what portions is it feasible. It will require some  
7 wider easements. It will also require some additional  
8 tall steel poles on either end of the underground  
9 segment. So you don't get completely away from the  
10 visual facts. You're going to have some poles to  
11 transition to underground. And just of note is, with  
12 undergrounding, the existing distribution lines would  
13 not be undergrounded.

14 So another alternative is the Valencia Route.  
15 This basically follows the Northern Alignment, but it  
16 shoots down to Green Valley Substation along a  
17 different road. So it crosses that Fern Flat Road, so  
18 that the segment of the new 115-kV is shorter.

19 And then there's the Southern Alignment, which  
20 includes rebuilding the southern and existing 115-kV  
21 line along the south between the substations. So this  
22 one requires new easements, and there's also some  
23 issues with gas lines that are located in that area.

24 So this figure just quickly shows -- this is  
25 the Southern Alignment here. It's a little hard to see

1 without color. It goes between Green Valley and Rob  
2 Roy, and it basically follows an existing 115-kV line  
3 the whole way. But there are some technical issues  
4 with this alignment. And then this is the Valencia  
5 Alternative. It follows the Northern. But instead of  
6 coming down Cox and freedom, it goes a little further  
7 to Fern Flat and goes this way.

8 MR. DEWAR: Okay. So now we'll take questions  
9 on this segment. We're a -- we're quite far behind our  
10 schedule. We'll see how it goes.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm wondering if this is just  
12 one section of a larger project? Because on those  
13 maps, it goes to Rob Roy, but then there's a green line  
14 that goes out to Highway 17.

15 MS. TREIS: That map shows the overall -- the  
16 whole system. This is a contained project in and of  
17 itself, and the purpose is to upgrade between the Green  
18 Valley and the Rob Roy Substation.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just this section needs  
20 upgrading? It's not like, okay, we're gonna do that,  
21 and then we're gonna do that?

22 MS. TREIS: Right now, this is the section  
23 that's proposed.

24 MS. ORSABA: Let me just -- I can answer that  
25 question as well. This is an application for this

1 project. PG&E cannot construct another project without  
2 another application and another round of public  
3 hearings. So this is for this project only.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I used to live right by the  
5 high power lines on Cox Road and moved away from them  
6 after I read this book. And I want this included. The  
7 Great Power-Line Cover-Up; How the Utilities and the  
8 Government Are Trying to Hide the Cancer Hazard Posed  
9 by Electromagnetic Fields, Paul Brodeur's book.

10 MR. DEWAR: Ma'am, this is a comment.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I am making a comment.

12 MR. DEWAR: This is a question and answer  
13 period.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The question is, will you put  
15 this in the record? I want this in the record on the  
16 environmental and health impact.

17 MR. DEWAR: What I'd like you to do, ma'am, so  
18 that we get it in the record, is come up and make a  
19 comment during the comment period and/or do a written  
20 comment. Is that okay?

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And PG&E is not interested.  
22 Think of Erin Brockovich.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How are costs factored into  
24 the decisionmaking process and the alternatives chosen?

25 MS. ORSABA: Under CEQA, which is what we're

1 doing, we don't take into account costs. The  
2 commission may review costs. The judge may review  
3 costs. But that's not what we're doing. Yes, ma'am?

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Gas lines; where are they?

5 MS. ORSABA: I don't know where the gas lines  
6 are. This is something --

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: They're right under the  
8 existing lines.

9 MS. ORSABA: These are all questions that you  
10 can write down and we can ask PG&E.

11 MR. DEWAR: You, sir?

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The question is, the original  
13 Mitigated Negative Declaration was five alternatives,  
14 and we notice in the letter this time around there was  
15 three alternatives. It's interesting that we're kind  
16 of decreasing, rather than looking at more.

17 MS. TREIS: Again, those were preliminary.  
18 We're at the early stage. As we're developing  
19 alternatives, we may add those in. It could be that it  
20 didn't reduce an environmental effect to the degree  
21 that we would need to consider this feasible  
22 alternative. We could add those back in, if you think  
23 one of them should be submitted as a comment. This  
24 just what we presented here are the preliminaries, so  
25 it could give you something to comment on.

1           MR. DEWAR:   Yes, sir?

2           AUDIENCE MEMBER:   Why was the possibility of  
3 the existing lines being put underground not  
4 considered, as long as they're putting the new lines  
5 there?

6           MS. ORSABA:   Are you talking about the  
7 distribution lines?   Let me answer that question,  
8 because it's governed by a CPUC rule.   It's CPUC  
9 Electric Rule 20.   It requires that existing overhead  
10 power lines, they can be underground, but generally --  
11 it's a little confusing, and bear with me.   I  
12 understand it, but it's a little hard to explain.

13                   All new distribution lines are underground.  
14 This isn't a new distribution line, the one at  
15 Cox-Freedom.   It's an existing overhead distribution  
16 line.   So Rule 20 governs that.   And it would  
17 require -- it can be underground, but all of the  
18 facilities on those poles, the cable, the  
19 telecommunications, fiber optics, those have to be  
20 underground, and the companies that own those  
21 facilities also have to underground their facilities.

22                   And the costs are borne by you basically, by  
23 customers.   Your yards would have to be trenched  
24 through, because the line that is now overhead would  
25 have to be underground.   That would be your expense.

1 It's an expense borne by the rate payers of the state  
2 for distribution facilities. I know in some ways you  
3 wonder why PG&E -- should this alternative be adopted,  
4 they're undergrounding 115-kV, why they don't  
5 underground distribution. It's because of the cost  
6 involved. So the cost would be borne by property  
7 owners.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What if the neighborhood  
9 agreed to bear those costs?

10 MS. ORSABA: It can be done.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How would we do that?

12 MS. ORSABA: Look at Rule 20. It's on the  
13 website. It's not on this website. CPUC. Not Google.  
14 Use your search engine to look at CPUC Electric Rule  
15 20.

16 I think localities also -- for instance, a  
17 downtown area, in Santa Cruz, for instance, may decide  
18 that they want to underground the existing overheads.  
19 For instance, in San Francisco, full of ugly overhead  
20 distribution lines, but to underground them is very  
21 expensive. So San Francisco would float a bond to  
22 underground those facilities. So it's a big process.

23 MR. DEWAR: You, ma'am?

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm from Old Adobe Road. I'm  
25 a road secretary. We have 20 homes on that road that

1 are affected. It's an alternative, which I just  
2 learned tonight. I didn't understand that. And the  
3 idea of submitting comments, it's unclear to us what it  
4 is you're planning to do. We do have high-powered gas  
5 lines running alongside the electrical lines.

6 And I'm sure that you that we would have  
7 comments if we understood what it was that maybe you're  
8 going to do. If you can help us out on that, I'm sure  
9 that we can get some comments in to you.

10 MS. TREIS: So, again, as we said earlier,  
11 there's going to be two comment periods. Now, these  
12 alternatives aren't entirely flushed out. We're going  
13 to work on developing them in more detail. You can  
14 submit a comment saying there are high-powered gas  
15 lines, this is a concern to us, please address that in  
16 the EIR.

17 When the draft EIR comes out, there's going to  
18 be more information for you to comment on. Once we  
19 issue the draft EIR, you're going to have an  
20 alternative analysis with more information.

21 That being said, the next part of this slide  
22 show is going to go over the environmental parameters,  
23 things that could be affected that the EIR will  
24 address. That will give you some more guidance on  
25 comments you want to make. For example, that Southern

1 Alignment has more Santa Cruz long-toed salamanders, so  
2 there could be more effect. Biology is a topic covered  
3 in the EIR.

4 MR. DEWAR: Let's switch to this side of the  
5 room.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Some of the stuff in the  
7 letter and in your presentation says different or  
8 larger easements might be required. What sort of  
9 authority and process is used when new easements are  
10 required?

11 MS. ORSABA: If we're talking specifically  
12 about the Cox-Freedom Segment -- because we received a  
13 lot of comments about that segment, most of the  
14 comments were about the Cox-Freedom Segment -- we did  
15 receive a lot of comments asking that underground be  
16 considered. In order for undergrounding to be  
17 considered, it might be the case that PG&E needs  
18 greater easements. We don't know. These questions are  
19 all things that we'll be looking at in the next round  
20 in the analysis. So we don't know now how much larger  
21 easements, if they would need to be enlarged at all.

22 MS. TREIS: That's a good comment to submit,  
23 saying, "Please indicate in the description of the  
24 alternatives of the EIR what additional easements and  
25 what size they may be for undergrounding." That's a



1 great comment to submit at this stage of the process,  
2 so we know to look at it and include it.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: My question was really what  
4 do you do if you think you need different easements,  
5 then what happens? You don't just send us a letter  
6 saying, "We're taking a bigger easement."

7 MS. ORSABA: No, no. The utilities and the  
8 state work with property owners to come to agreements  
9 about extending easements and right-of-ways.  
10 Generally, that's what happens. It's not something  
11 that is under the purview of the CEQA document. We can  
12 get you information in the end, if they need additional  
13 easements. They have to work with property owners.

14 MR. DEWAR: Gentleman in the blue shirt.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: In the beginning, you  
16 mentioned 1970s, this line was installed. That's 40  
17 years ago. Going from three lines to six lines. What  
18 happens in 30 years when the population doubles in  
19 Santa Cruz County, is it going to 12 lines? That's why  
20 people are bringing up the idea of underground. Who  
21 wants to be looking at this 30 years from now, or even  
22 next year, when they start? You see?

23 MS. TREIS: I don't think we really have an  
24 answer to that one. It's noted. And that would be,  
25 again, something you can submit as a comment in terms

1 of addressing what are related actions to this project.

2 MR. DEWAR: The lady in the white hat, and then  
3 the lady with the glasses.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It looked in the Green Valley  
5 section that part of the lines are going -- or are  
6 around Pinto Lake. If that's correct, is the Army  
7 Corps of Engineers involved? And then are the Feds  
8 involved then?

9 MS. TREIS: No. The proposed alignment does  
10 not go through Pinto Lake. It goes through the park,  
11 but it doesn't touch the water. There are a couple  
12 small wetland areas, really small wetland areas.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are the Army Corps of  
14 Engineers involved in that?

15 MS. TREIS: Yes. PG&E will have to obtain a  
16 permit from them for those specific areas.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Does that mean, even if it's  
18 really small, doesn't that mean, under law, that the  
19 National Environmental Policy --

20 MS. TREIS: They'll have to comply with those  
21 permits specifically, but not for the overall project.

22 MR. DEWAR: We're going beyond the follow-up  
23 question rule. Do you want to be really brief?

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Does that mean that the Feds  
25 trump the state act? Should we then be following the

1       **Feds guidelines?**

2               **MS. ORSABA:**     **Actually, no.**

3               **MS. TREIS:**    **That's just specific to the permit**  
4       **for those little wetland areas.**

5               **MR. DEWAR:**    **I want to make sure we move on.**  
6       **Let's take a question from the lady with the glasses,**  
7       **and then the lady with the red shirt.**

8               **AUDIENCE MEMBER:**   **It seems like the focus has**  
9       **really been shifted away from the Northern Alignment.**  
10       **I didn't see any alternatives proposed to that. That's**  
11       **right out here in the apple orchard and the whole**  
12       **Corralitos scenic view corridor. I live right next**  
13       **door to the poles. And I just haven't heard anything**  
14       **about alternatives to that.**

15               **MS. TREIS:**    **So the Southern Alignment is an**  
16       **alternative to it. It doesn't touch the Northern and**  
17       **the Corralitos area at all. The Southern Alignment --**  
18       **you're asking about, is there an alternative to the**  
19       **Northern Alignment, and that is the Southern Alignment.**

20               **AUDIENCE MEMBER:**   **Oh.**

21               **MS. TREIS:**    **The whole thing. There's a map**  
22       **over there after that probably will make it a little**  
23       **more clear. It was a little hard to see on the map.**

24               **MR. DEWAR:**    **Yes, ma'am?**

25               **AUDIENCE MEMBER:**   **Who pays for the EIR? Who**

1 pays Panorama? Who writes the check to Panorama?

2 MS. ORSABA: All of these proceedings are  
3 billed into the rates.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's not an answer. Who  
5 pays?

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Rate payers. Rate payers.

7 MS. TREIS: Our contract is with CPUC.

8 MS. ORSABA: Let me understand the question.  
9 The EIR is paid for the same way that everything else  
10 having to do with the electric system in the state is  
11 paid for. They're paid for through rates. That's how  
12 it's paid for.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Who writes the check?

14 MS. ORSABA: The California -- the State of  
15 California writes a check to our contractors.

16 MS. TREIS: Our contract is with CPUC; not  
17 PG&E. Our obligation is to California Public Utilities  
18 Commission. We're third party contractors to CPUC.  
19 We're contracted with them and --

20 MS. ORSABA: The Department of General  
21 Services. I took the question in a broader way than  
22 you meant it. The State of California pays for that.

23 MR. DEWAR: We're going to move on now to the  
24 next and the last part of the presentation. And we're  
25 about half an hour behind.

1           MS. TREIS: We'll keep this brief. This slide  
2 here just identifies the environmental topics that are  
3 covered in an EIR. And these are according to the CEQA  
4 guidelines Appendix G. We've listed out all the topics  
5 that are covered. Because we did an Initial Study,  
6 some of these topics that have no effects may be worked  
7 out of the EIR, because there's no effects to those  
8 areas. But again, anything that we get feedback from  
9 the public, anything with potential effect, will be  
10 addressed.

11           So this is just a really brief summary based on  
12 what we know now. Again, we're going to do additional  
13 analysis, looking at them in more depth. This is a  
14 brief summary of some of the topics where we found some  
15 potential environmental effects.

16           Aesthetics, everyone knows; agricultural, we  
17 received some comments from the public about potential  
18 organic farms; air quality, both the alternative in the  
19 proposed project, during construction, could release  
20 emissions. And we'll look at that. Biological  
21 resources, there's several potential effects to  
22 biological resources along the proposed routes and the  
23 alternative routes; cultural resources; geology;  
24 hydrology and water quality, again, we received some  
25 comments about water quality and runoff, effects to

1 streams.

2 Noise is an issue. We'll address helicopter  
3 noise. The project does include some use of  
4 helicopters for construction. Transportation and  
5 traffic was another area where we received a lot of  
6 comments. That will be addressed in the EIR in terms  
7 of safety during and after construction. And utilities  
8 will be addressed. The Central Water District lines,  
9 there may be some disruption in service. This is not  
10 an exhaustive list.

11 This is just a summary of some of the potential  
12 impacts of the alternatives for undergrounding.  
13 Trenching would be required, which requires road  
14 closures. Could require more dust, more noise, and a  
15 disruption of emergency access. Obviously, greater  
16 ground disturbance. This obviously needs to be looked  
17 at. Longer construction periods. It takes a longer  
18 time to underground than an overhead line. Need for  
19 additional property and right-of-ways. It also reduces  
20 the visual effects. Valencia Alignment could have a  
21 greater loss of oak woodland vegetation. Also some  
22 additional impacts to robust spineflower. And then the  
23 visual impacts.

24 The Southern Alignment, it would also involve  
25 greater tree removal and woodland and vegetation

1 effects. And the proposed project may, because the  
2 route may have to be moved due to the location, gas  
3 pipelines. There's more Santa Cruz long-toed  
4 salamanders, which is a state and federally endangered  
5 species, so the potential effect on that species may be  
6 higher on the Southern route than the proposed  
7 alignment. It could reduce visual impacts. But again,  
8 we'll do that analysis.

9           Ways to comment. Again, just to reiterate, you  
10 probably already know we're going to take oral comments  
11 right after the presentation. We have the  
12 stenographer, who will record. You're going to state  
13 your name. And all of those comments will go into the  
14 record. You can fill out a comment card in the back of  
15 the room tonight if you don't feel like coming up here  
16 and speaking. You can write your comment down and  
17 deposit it with the ladies in the back. And then you  
18 can also submit your comments by mail, e-mail or fax.  
19 This is the contact information. If you're going to  
20 fax, we've got a fax number, an e-mail address. Most  
21 people e-mailed last time on the draft EIR. You can  
22 also mail as well. And they're due by 5:00 p.m.  
23 on February 18th.

24           So as we move into the scoping comment period,  
25 we have a couple slides here that just help to give you

1 guidance on what are comments that will help us that  
2 can give meaningful impact to how we write the EIR. I  
3 understand that many people have concerns. The idea  
4 here is just to give you some guidance. If you want to  
5 see your comment effectively addressed in the EIR,  
6 here's some guidance on what you can do. This is just  
7 an example of some effective comments that we'd be able  
8 to look at the comment, be able to directly address it  
9 in the EIR.

10 "The EIR should address noise impacts from the  
11 use of the helicopter construction."

12 "I would like the EIR to address traffic safety  
13 hazards during and after project construction." Again,  
14 that's addressing the traffic impact. That's one of  
15 the sections we look at in the EIR.

16 "The EIR should explain and provide support for  
17 why the project is needed." That addresses the  
18 project's purpose and needs.

19 These comments are less effective. What I mean  
20 by less effective is it's just not a comment that's  
21 easy for us to look at and address in the EIR. Again,  
22 if you have a comment for the record, we can't stop you  
23 from making it, but you may not see that addressed  
24 directly in the EIR.

25 "The EIR should examine aesthetic impacts."



1 Too general. It's hard for us to know exactly what you  
2 want. We're obviously going to address aesthetics.  
3 Try and be more specific.

4 "The project should be located somewhere else."  
5 It's hard to address without specific information. We  
6 can understand you may not want it here.

7 "The project is not needed."

8 "I am against the project."

9 "The analysis in the EIR will be biased and  
10 untrustworthy." Again, you are entitled to your  
11 opinion, but it's hard for us to address that  
12 meaningfully in preparing the EIR.

13 Comment guidelines. We have speaker cards.  
14 We'll call people up in order that they submitted the  
15 speaker cards. It's important for you to please state  
16 your name and affiliation, if you want. You're going  
17 to be speaking to the stenographer. So that she can  
18 record you, speak clearly and slowly. Only one speaker  
19 at a time. If someone is at the podium, respect them  
20 and do not speak over them. Keep your input concise.  
21 This is following some of the ground rules that we laid  
22 out earlier. And respect other people's interests and  
23 opinions. We're going to leave this slide up just to  
24 help you out. We'll leave this up so you can state the  
25 category. With that, I would pass it to Nicholas, I

1 guess, if anyone has any questions.

2 MR. DEWAR: Let's do questions.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have questions and maybe  
4 other people do that are beyond the scope of the EIR,  
5 but are relevant to the project. Economic. There  
6 could be other factors. When and where should those  
7 comments be directed and to whom?

8 MS. ORSABA: Well, I'd need to know the  
9 nature --

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Economic. I'm a property  
11 owner. It may affect the property value of my  
12 property. Residents may be concerned about that. They  
13 may be concerned about how long this project -- not  
14 just this piece -- but other pieces that may be  
15 necessary for Santa Cruz to get the power they want.  
16 They go beyond the scope of the EIR, but they're  
17 relevant to the project overall.

18 MS. ORSABA: You can send those to the judge,  
19 Judge Robert Mason.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do we have an address for  
21 him? I don't see contact information for that judge.

22 MS. ORSABA: I'll give you that. It's the  
23 CPUC in San Francisco.

24 MR. DEWAR: Yes, ma'am? Go ahead.

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just have a quick question.

1 I was wondering how the environmental impact of these  
2 various bullet points are evaluated and if there is a  
3 hierarchy between them. In other words, if you would  
4 consider one kind of aesthetics over noise, and, if so,  
5 that would be very important to know. If not, that  
6 would be very important to know.

7 MS. TREIS: So there isn't a hierarchy. Right  
8 now, they're largely listed alphabetically. But there  
9 really is -- we're looking at, along any of these  
10 parameters, is the effect going to be significant or  
11 less than significant. Less than significant. That's  
12 what we're looking at in any of these parameters, is  
13 there a topic that could have a significant  
14 unmitigatable effect.

15 Say you had unmitigatable effect for land use  
16 and cultural resources. We just identified that  
17 there's an effect that can't be mitigated.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's a very interesting  
19 approach, I must say. But I was wondering, for obvious  
20 reasons, there are areas in which people have really  
21 pushed the parameters of the particular area in the  
22 environmental concerns, such as a biological resources.  
23 And if that were proven to be an exceptionally  
24 important thing, it might shut the whole project down.  
25 And do we know about these things?

1 MS. TREIS: I guess I'm not entirely clear on  
2 the question. The EIR is going to address biology.  
3 And that is an area from the IS-MND, there's a lot of  
4 resources. Again, we need to identify where there's  
5 potentially significant effects. So long-toed  
6 salamanders, for example, may need to include  
7 mitigation. If we can include mitigation that reduces  
8 that effect to less than significant levels, then that  
9 is the goal in that particular analysis.

10 MS. ORSABA: I just want to say that the  
11 California Environmental Equality Act is also something  
12 you can use your search engine on. It's a body of law.  
13 It's not something we make up. It's not arbitrary. It  
14 prescribes a lot of things just about what you're  
15 talking about.

16 MR. DEWAR: You raised your hand a while ago.  
17 Go ahead.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there a threshold --

19 MR. DEWAR: I called on you by mistake. I  
20 missed the order. The gentleman over here had his hand  
21 up.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Earlier, you gave a  
23 photograph of the existing 60-foot wood power poles.  
24 Is there a rendering of the proposed 90-foot tower  
25 structures?

1 MS. TREIS: That's in the analysis. We didn't  
2 present it here in the scoping meeting. Again, this is  
3 the scoping period. You'll see that after the analysis  
4 is complete. We're not yet at that stage. There are  
5 some existing simulations from the IS-MND. But again,  
6 everything will be -- they're on the website.

7 MR. DEWAR: Yes, sir?

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there a threshold of  
9 number of unmitigatable areas on the list or a degree  
10 of them, one that shuts the project down?

11 MS. TREIS: If you haven't -- again, this is --  
12 it's a larger complex question. CEQA is a very complex  
13 law. If you find an impact that is potentially  
14 significant and not mitigatable, the decision makers  
15 have to write overriding considerations in order to  
16 approve the project. So they have to say, "We  
17 acknowledge that there's an effect that can't be  
18 mitigated. However, X-Y-Z reasons, it should be  
19 overridden and approved anyway." So that's where you  
20 have less than significant or less than significant and  
21 unavoidable. And there's not a weighing of noise is  
22 more important than aesthetics or biology is more  
23 important than traffic.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What would be an example of  
25 an override?

1           MR. DEWAR: I don't know. It happens.

2           MS. TREIS: It does happen. There could be --  
3 anything, Jeff? There could be a noise threshold that  
4 you just can't mitigate the noise levels down to below,  
5 say, a local jurisdiction's ordinance or standard, but  
6 the project is needed because it serves outages --  
7 depending on what the project is -- the decision is,  
8 even though this project is going to have a significant  
9 unmitigatable effect, it's needed because of this  
10 reason.

11           MR. DEWAR: We'll take a couple more questions.  
12 You, ma'am?

13           AUDIENCE MEMBER: How do you measure  
14 significance or say that something is less than  
15 significant? How is that measured? Who measures it?  
16 Is it opinion? Is it measurable?

17           MS. TREIS: I touched on this briefly earlier.  
18 There are some parameters that are more quantitative.  
19 Like, air quality, where there's a standard. If you  
20 emit more than this amount in a jurisdiction, that's --

21           AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yourself?

22           MS. TREIS: An expert in air quality would look  
23 at equipment used, they look at the emissions amount.  
24 Other parameters are a little more subjective. Again,  
25 you have resource experts, people that have worked in

1 this field and can recognize experts and have a  
2 methodology in order to say whether an impact is  
3 significant or not.

4 MS. ORSABA: The contractors that we use are  
5 contracted by the CPUC.

6 MR. DEWAR: Your question?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just wonder, if there's  
8 going to be a pole going up on Cox road that's 50 feet  
9 higher, how are you going to accommodate that? It's on  
10 a hillside. Are you going to destroy our road and  
11 hillside?

12 MS. TREIS: Again, that's part of the impact  
13 analysis that will be in the EIR. That's not something  
14 that we address right now at this phase in the scoping  
15 phase. Again, that's a type of thing to be addressed  
16 in the EIR.

17 MR. DEWAR: We're going to move on now. You  
18 really want to ask a question.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So are the poles really going  
20 to top out at 90 feet? I read everything, including  
21 the PA, which I found online, and there were a lot of  
22 statements that they were going to be 115-foot poles.  
23 Is it really topping out at 90 feet, or is the pole  
24 itself 90 feet and then a base?

25 MS. TREIS: The project description in the EIR,

1 as well as the one in the IS, identifies the heights.  
2 There's some that are, I think, 101 feet tall.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think I remember 115.

4 MS. TREIS: Then that's what it is, if that's  
5 what you saw.

6 MR. DEWAR: You want to follow up -- go ahead.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just so that everyone has the  
8 same information, PG&E also sent a letter a day before  
9 yours, and it says that, "This is including electrical  
10 service in your area." Where is this line going? Is  
11 it serving our area, or is it serving another area?

12 MS. TREIS: It's part of --

13 MS. ORSABA: The grid is the grid. It goes  
14 through your area.

15 MS. TREIS: It's yours and other areas.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So we are actually getting  
17 electricity from them? We're getting electricity from  
18 this line that crosses up all the way, or the Southern  
19 Alignment? Is it feeding Santa Cruz, or is it feeding  
20 our community here?

21 MS. ORSABA: The grid is interconnected all  
22 over the state, if not the country. I just want to  
23 make one thing clear, so that you know. Before PG&E  
24 submitted this application, they had to have the  
25 approval of the California Independent System Operator,



1 CAISO. It's an independent agency. They're the ones  
2 that say there's outages, yes, you can increase  
3 reliability. Then they come to the CPUC for this  
4 permit. The outages are a record. They're a matter of  
5 fact.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where's the record, Lisa, for  
7 the outages?

8 MS. ORSABA: It's not -- you can ask PG&E. We  
9 can try to find it.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That'd be nice. Thanks.

11 MS. ORSABA: There's a record of the number of  
12 outages in your area.

13 MR. DEWAR: There are a lot more questions, I  
14 think, in the room. We were going to take a break.  
15 What I'd like to propose is that we take a 10-minute  
16 break. So we'll be back in 10 minutes. We need a  
17 break. Sorry. We need a break. During the break, if  
18 some people have questions that you're really burning  
19 to ask, come on up, if we're not in the bathroom.  
20 Wait, wait, wait.

21 When we come back, we're going to start the  
22 comments.

23 (Recess taken.)

24 MR. DEWAR: We're getting going now.

25 MR. KLEVINS: Hi. Good evening, everyone.

1 Richard Klevins, Aptos Ridge Circle.

2 I want to talk about the Southern Alternative  
3 first. It affects our house, literally. It's  
4 approximately 25 feet from our home, not the property,  
5 but the actual physical structure. As far as  
6 upgrading, it was upgraded in approximately 1989. I'm  
7 not sure where your information comes from. That is  
8 shortly after we built the house in 1988. With no  
9 notice that we've received. We had an existing gas  
10 line also running very close to the property underneath  
11 the wires, and we were told that initial easements  
12 would be needed, but given no indication of where you'd  
13 get those easements.

14 As the line passes through our neighborhood  
15 into the next neighborhood and the other ridges, it  
16 comes within 50 feet of our neighbors next to us and  
17 probably under a hundred feet from our neighbors who  
18 are in the next. So if PG&E needs to add a hundred  
19 additional feet next to the existing easement, they're  
20 going to have to go right through our home or through  
21 one of the neighbors' homes. Either that, or they have  
22 to zigzag. They won't be able to go straight.

23 As far as the plans that are shown, it's hard  
24 for us to comment, because, at first, I thought that  
25 you were going to remove all of the smaller poles, in

1 some cases, three or four poles in the same place, and  
2 replace it with a single pole that might have a much  
3 larger span. According to the plans I'm seeing here,  
4 in most cases, you're leaving the original poles and  
5 placing them on top of it.

6 The negatives on our route, other than the  
7 problem with the easement, which is going to be  
8 disastrous, as most of our homeowners, the biggest case  
9 is the environmental issue, which I'm not an expert on.  
10 But I know, when we built the home, it was a major  
11 issue where we could place the home, where wells could  
12 be.

13 There's also a water return area and that I  
14 didn't see here addressed at all. There were areas in  
15 our community excluded from development because they  
16 are water return areas. If lines or poles run through  
17 those -- probably even more important than the  
18 electricity.

19 Also, on our street, which is Aptos Ridge  
20 Circle -- I'm not sure if other communities have  
21 similar problems -- our roads were built with fill, and  
22 quite a bit of it is sliding down the roads now. If  
23 they put foundations for 90-foot poles -- it's hard to  
24 imagine how big that is. The tallest ones in Santa  
25 Cruz are about seven stories. We're talking about 20

1 or 30 feet higher than the buildings in Santa Cruz.  
2 And you're putting them in areas where the ground is  
3 moving continually. We just had the area repaired.  
4 And I was told that the EIR doesn't deal with the  
5 effects of personal values, the value of the property  
6 is not taken into consideration at all.

7 And also, the health issues. The company that  
8 does the EIR told me that they don't consider these  
9 lines to be any sort of health issue because they have  
10 a report dated from 1993 that tells them it's not an  
11 issue, and that it was reviewed in 2006, but they still  
12 have the 1993 information. And I think that really  
13 needs to be brought into the 21st century, using proper  
14 equipment to test the effects.

15 A question. Are we talking about 115,000  
16 volts?

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Kilovolts.

18 MR. KLEVINS: Is it 115,000? Yes. Well,  
19 that's for our local area. And there are probably  
20 other issues. But I'll stop at that.

21 Regarding the notice, we got our notice last  
22 week. Almost everyone I've spoken to has either not  
23 gotten a notice or considered it junk mail because it  
24 is sent in a junk mail format with no addressing on it.  
25 And apparently it doesn't look very official. That

1 should be changed.

2 Also, one person said that you sent them up to  
3 300-foot radius from the lines. Someone else told me  
4 that you made an exception to this project and sent  
5 them out to homes within a thousand feet. I talked to  
6 several of our neighbors who can see the lines, and  
7 they have no notification at all. I think 300 feet,  
8 when you're talking about a nine-story high tower, is a  
9 little shortsighted.

10 When we built our houses up on the hillside, we  
11 were prohibited from using certain colors. We had to  
12 plant trees to block views. I believe those are still  
13 in effect. There's some sort of law having to do with  
14 the view corridor off of Highway 1. And the proposed  
15 line for the Southern Alternative would come right  
16 across the ridges and be very highly visible from the  
17 highway. The new lines would be well above the tree  
18 line. In this case, it would actually be above the  
19 ridge lines, and it'll be the highest spot in that area  
20 in Santa Cruz. Thank you.

21 MS. BENSON: My name is Nancy Benson. I've  
22 lived on Cox Road for over 38 years. They currently do  
23 not have 115-kV lines. Cox Road, Day Valley, and  
24 McDonald Road are very narrow, country roads and were  
25 designed and planned for 22-kV distribution power lines

1 with ten-foot easements, not the 40-foot to 60-foot  
2 easements that accompany the 115-kV lines on the  
3 Northern Alignment or the Southern Alignment.

4 Adding the easements that PG&E will need to  
5 complete this project encompasses placing poles and  
6 115-kV lines dangerously over and near houses that  
7 currently do not have this issue now. This project  
8 will make our rural residential area look like San  
9 Jose, without the infrastructure needed to serve the  
10 residents of the area.

11 Our roads do not have adequate shoulders for  
12 pedestrians, bike lanes, and for bicyclists, and  
13 existing distribution lines and wood power poles are  
14 dangerously located on the edge of the narrow roadways  
15 and many are up against steep banks. There are places  
16 on Cox Road where the northbound and southbound lane is  
17 only nine feet wide. Pedestrians have to jump into a  
18 ditch or onto a steep bank out of the way of oncoming  
19 cars.

20 It's scary. I just walked the road the other  
21 day. I was petrified, I tell 'ya. There have been  
22 three serious car accidents on Cox Road in the proposed  
23 area, numerous car versus bicycle accidents, and two  
24 separate incidences where children were hit and killed  
25 by a car in our neighborhood.

1           Furthermore, the proposed 100-foot wood and  
2 steel poles would prevent future widening and future  
3 improvements of our road. Our country is already  
4 developed. This is not a third world country. PG&E  
5 already has easements and right-of-ways. Why invade an  
6 established neighborhood?

7           I've studied the route on the Southern  
8 Alignment and alternate B and C is routed around  
9 neighborhoods and heavily populated communities, yet  
10 PG&E insists on slicing right through our populated  
11 neighborhood. PG&E employs an army of engineers that  
12 should be figuring out how to use existing easements,  
13 rather than overrunning our neighborhood.

14           With the Southern alignment and the Northern  
15 Alignment, in our little neighborhood, we all have  
16 endangered species. We have all kinds of things. We  
17 have plants, animals. We have the same problems.  
18 Okay? The lines need to be kept in existing easements  
19 and right-of-ways where the project impacts the least  
20 amount of people and traffic.

21           Look at all the alternatives. Look at more new  
22 alternatives. Underground all utilities when needed to  
23 make our neighborhood whole. You know, you're talking  
24 about a neighborhood that doesn't have these lines.  
25 They're putting them in our neighborhood. And it's not

1 like we're not accepting it, but with the  
2 undergrounding, they're not going to put all the lines  
3 underground, and it seems like those rates that keep  
4 everybody in Santa Cruz County pay should be paying to  
5 put all of our poles and everything and utilities  
6 underground.

7           According to CEQA, a hundred more trees are  
8 going to be eradicated in our neighborhood. Cutting a  
9 hundred more trees is not acceptable. We do not want  
10 to see the natural beauty along our roadway further  
11 destroyed by PG&E. The Santa Cruz 115-kV reinforcement  
12 project proposed in the Day Valley corridor will create  
13 a visual blight and will destroy the wooded rural area  
14 that we now enjoy. Don't rape and pillage our  
15 neighborhood and leave us there to suffer the losses of  
16 our beautiful tree-lined country roads.

17           MR. BRACAMONTE: My name is Ralph Bracamonte.  
18 I'm the district manager for Central Water District,  
19 and I'd like to thank CPUC for this forum. It's great  
20 to see some of the people from the forum here.

21           You already have our letter with our main  
22 concerns. I'd just like to go over a few of our  
23 concerns with you. There's three main concerns we  
24 have.

25           One is the utilities are sharing easements, and



1 the new poles that are going in and the setbacks that  
2 are going to be required. The District has World War  
3 II pipes, and they need to be upgraded. The easements  
4 we share are not very large easements. We know that  
5 will be addressed in the draft EIR.

6 Our second concern is the wooden poles that  
7 will be installed have preservatives that are going to  
8 potentially leach into the ground water. And Central  
9 Water District, the five square miles that our district  
10 is in, is a primary ground water recharge. We know  
11 those will be addressed in the EIR.

12 The third issue that we have is -- those are  
13 the three. The three issues is the setbacks, how it's  
14 going to affect those steel pipes we have in the  
15 ground, and then also the contaminants that could be  
16 leeching into the ground water. Thank you very much.

17 MS. GLEATON: Katherine Gleaton, 1703 Cox Road.  
18 We've been there for three or four years. PG&E hired  
19 Panorama Environmental Corporation to write up --

20 MS. ORSABA: Slow down.

21 MS. GLEATON: Oh. Okay. The CPUC, acting as  
22 the lead agency, and based on the initial report's  
23 findings, declared a Mitigated Negative Declaration  
24 with the perception that the projected environmental  
25 impact could be reduced to less than significant levels

1 mitigation measures.

2 Now that the lead agency has changed their  
3 consensus on the findings of the Initial Study in  
4 relation to the significance of the environmental  
5 impact that proposed project would have which is clear  
6 as an Environmental Impact Report is now warranted.

7 My question is, how do we know that the EIR  
8 report as prepared by Panorama will not overlook  
9 significant environmental effects from the project and  
10 it appeared that they fell short during the Initial  
11 Study. And if the contracted company Initial Study is  
12 not to blame, how do we know that the lead agency, the  
13 CPUC, will not overlook the potential significant  
14 impact pact addressed by the public.

15 MR. CASALE: Thank you. I'm Rich Casale. I'm  
16 with the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service.  
17 I'm also president of the Marthas Way Homeowners  
18 Association. The lines go right through our property  
19 in Valencia Valley. The Valencia Alternative will  
20 obviously impact me personally.

21 I'm here as much in my official capacity and  
22 also as a certified professional. And our agency has a  
23 history of working with land owners and with agencies  
24 and helping them control erosion and manage natural  
25 resources on their properties. I'm hoping and inviting

1 the writers of the EIR to contact our agency for soils  
2 information, for erosion control consultation, for  
3 revegetation, or anything that's disturbed for soils  
4 management, for the reduction and possibility and  
5 potential for slip and stability, runoff from soil  
6 compaction and from the decreased amount of vegetative  
7 cover.

8 From what I've read so far, there is some  
9 inappropriate plant choices and mitigation measures.  
10 And I'm just suggesting that the writers and the CPUC  
11 use the professional expertise our agency and other  
12 agencies that can assist and make sure that the  
13 environmental impacts of a project like this are  
14 considered in a scientific way. I'm with the USDA  
15 Natural Resources Conservation Service. It's a federal  
16 agency.

17 MS. KRISTICH: I'm Margaret Kristich. I'm a  
18 resident of 420 Aptos Ridge Circle, Watsonville. I'm a  
19 neighbor of Richard Klevins, who was the first speaker.  
20 And I learned a little bit of information tonight from  
21 his presentation that -- we're the neighbor across the  
22 road that it's going to affect on the alternative on  
23 the Southern Route.

24 What I was hoping to get answers on tonight, I  
25 spoke with the CPUC representative, and she said the

1 questions will be answered in the draft EIR. I will  
2 write those questions.

3 It was mentioned that the resource experts use  
4 a methodology that is acceptable regarding all of the  
5 environmental sensitive areas. In some cases, you  
6 can't use and be a judge strictly intellectually. I  
7 think some of the best resources are those who live in  
8 an environmentally sensitive area.

9 When we built our houses -- you have to know  
10 exactly where our home is from Highway 1. And if you  
11 look up at exactly the right time, you've got a  
12 two-second window to see the house. Yeah, we were told  
13 we had to plant more redwoods, so that they couldn't  
14 view the house from our freeway. Those redwood trees  
15 we planted had no effect. We're in the scenic  
16 corridor. Originally, they weren't allowing houses to  
17 be built on the ridge.

18 When you live in not just a scenic corridor,  
19 but like everybody in this area, we have the natural  
20 habitats and golden eagles. There's the raptors. You  
21 can list one after the other. We live in an  
22 incredible, beautiful area that has a lot of  
23 environmentally sensitive life.

24 And reading -- I haven't had a chance, because  
25 we just got the letter last week -- and the documents

1 are quite lengthy -- but just briefly, what I have gone  
2 over, I have concerns that need to be answered. And  
3 everybody that's involved in one of the alternative  
4 routes or even the original routes -- they've had two  
5 years to have the answers to this, but all of us don't  
6 have the answers.

7 The question about easement was brought up  
8 earlier. Somebody wanted to know what happens with an  
9 easement. Well, on the website that was mentioned  
10 that's their main website, you can go to one of their  
11 pages, and it does deal with easements. This original  
12 White Road Alternative was discarded on the original  
13 plan, so it might be reinstated for this in dealing  
14 with the alternatives.

15 And specifically, in this document, which is  
16 what is really of concern to me, is the easement  
17 expansions which allows for resolution through  
18 negotiation and/or condemnation. Eminent domain. In  
19 the White Road Alternative that is listed, it  
20 specifically says that one residence on Bens Way, two  
21 residences on White Road would be displaced.  
22 Displaced, in my mind, means eminent domain. Then  
23 reading in another document, I found it didn't say  
24 eminent domain, but it did say condemnation.

25 I don't think that any type of project that's

1 going to be done for the betterment of us here should  
2 be done if some of us lose our home. And that's not  
3 being addressed. And I think that is one of the most  
4 essential things.

5 Now, the lady from -- I'm sorry. I came in  
6 late. I don't remember your name. You had mentioned  
7 that the Southern Route had a lot more easements.  
8 Well, in one of the documents, it mentioned that around  
9 the poles they were going to increase the easement 40  
10 feet, 60 feet, to 150 feet on either side. Like  
11 Richard Klevins mentioned, that includes our house. It  
12 includes several houses.

13 We have five and a half acres. But yet we have  
14 high voltage lines right on the corner of our lot. On  
15 a clear day, you can hear the wires just from our  
16 house. This is a big, big concern that I don't feel  
17 that we have had information given to us.

18 Now, when I called and spoke with Susan at  
19 Panorama, she did say that letters had been sent out.  
20 So I had asked -- I thought this was a fair question  
21 and a fair request -- and if somehow you could see to  
22 it, it would be a great, great help and a great service  
23 to everybody here that's involved in it, and not only  
24 us, but those that aren't here -- to know the  
25 alternative routes. They were discarded initially, but

1 now they're being reevaluated. But those alternative  
2 routes, you know which roads are involved in it. So  
3 we, the people that live here, need to know exactly  
4 where those are. And if those could be added to the  
5 website, for everybody's knowledge, so they know how  
6 this is going to impact their lives directly and their  
7 property.

8 I had to cross out a lot of this. A lot of it  
9 isn't relevant. Some of the questions I have concerns  
10 about that I found in one of the documents is regarding  
11 the alternative routes, or, I guess, the original route  
12 as well. And this is going to be the loading zones,  
13 staging area, helicopter loading zones, the noise  
14 threshold. But we didn't talk about how many loading  
15 zones there were going to be for the helicopters, pipe  
16 work areas, pole work areas, pole sites, which are  
17 approximately nine, averaging approximately one and a  
18 third acres each, subsection repair. Then we have the  
19 tree and shrub removal. For us, the shrubs is our  
20 home and the trees. It's not just shrubs. It's  
21 defined as shrubs.

22 Now, what I have a question about is these  
23 items that I just mentioned that are all the loading  
24 zones and PG&E is going to need to have land for that.  
25 Are these what's going to be considered the easements?

1 Are there going to be easements for this? Are they  
2 taking some of the property of the residents? How is  
3 this going to be accomplished?

4 This is such a massive, massive undertaking.  
5 It's going to last 15 to 18 months, conservatively, if  
6 it runs on schedule, six days a week, from 7:30 in the  
7 morning until 4:30 or 5:00 every evening, possibly  
8 Sunday, and possibly going into the night, six days a  
9 week, possibly seven sometimes. So my concern -- and I  
10 don't want to wait until the EIR draft is written up --  
11 but what land is going to be used? Are these easements  
12 concerned with all these loading zones, the helicopter  
13 zones? If you've got a helicopter loading zone next to  
14 you, that's a large easement, plus the noise that's  
15 involved in it. They're going to be destroying all of  
16 the environmentally sensitive areas in those places.

17 Just think of what it was like in the  
18 earthquake. All the animals took off. If you hear  
19 helicopters and massive noises, it's going to be  
20 devastating.

21 Also a concern, since we already have it, is  
22 the EMF and the ELF, the high voltage magnetic fields,  
23 and the easement. Are all of them going to be 150 on  
24 each -- 150 feet on each side, or will there be some  
25 others? Since Panorama already mentioned that the



1 Southern Route does have to have more easements, then  
2 Panorama must know where these easements are. And I  
3 think that this should be posted on the website for the  
4 public information, since it involves all of us  
5 directly.

6 Also, the insulators, which, according to your  
7 document, doesn't conform to the guidelines that are  
8 set. Power line conductors, bird safety. And what are  
9 the feasible alternatives? Those are a few of my  
10 concerns.

11 Also, I think, in 2014, it's tragic that  
12 something that's supposed to be for the improvement of  
13 all of us would result in somebody losing their home.

14 Also, in the 1970s, technology was much  
15 different than it is now. But yet, PG&E is using  
16 antiquated methods with all of the overhang  
17 distribution poles.

18 And I think, instead of adding to the problem,  
19 that they might learn from Europe, since Europe, they  
20 have -- and Ireland -- wind gales, and they are never  
21 without electricity. And here, if a tree falls over or  
22 hits a line, we lose our electricity.

23 Well, this is just a few of my concerns. And I  
24 feel that this has been brought on us really suddenly.  
25 And I hope these questions can be addressed somehow.

1 And I would greatly appreciate if, on the website, it  
2 would list what roads are concerned and alternative  
3 routes and where the easements are, since, evidently,  
4 that information is nowhere.

5 MR. FRIEND: Good evening. My name is Zach  
6 Friend. I'm the county supervisor for this area. I  
7 wanted to first, obviously, thank the 500 people that  
8 sent letters. This really created this process in the  
9 CPUC to take those comments really seriously. We are  
10 here.

11 I think it's pretty self-evident this isn't a  
12 very popular project. That's probably an  
13 understatement of the year. People look to regulatory  
14 agencies to regulate. I think that the Public  
15 Utilities Commission needs to take these comments into  
16 very serious consideration. When you have a project in  
17 an area that undoubtedly would have so many impacts, a  
18 rural area, a mega cultural area, people live there not  
19 to experience these kinds of things. I think we have a  
20 significant responsibility to insure that the  
21 mitigation is taken very seriously.

22 I think a lot of the emotional response is  
23 simply because people are afraid that the life that  
24 they came out here for is being taken apart. I think  
25 there's nothing wrong with improving transmission. You

1 just have to do it within a size and scope and scale  
2 that meets the needs of the communities. I think  
3 things like undergrounding -- if we come through this  
4 process -- and, realistically, nothing is really  
5 proposed that's different -- you can have a lot of  
6 angry villagers out here, and I'm going to be standing  
7 with them, because they deserve to hear more than that.

8 We're both from a governmental agency. We're  
9 from the government. We're here to help. But the  
10 regulatory agencies are the last effort that we turn  
11 to. This is out of my purview completely, as we know.  
12 I appreciate the relationship that you have that you've  
13 been very responsive to my office. The regulatory  
14 agencies are the last thing that this community has to  
15 have their concerns, their way of life, addressed, that  
16 they want to preserve within the context of this whole  
17 situation.

18 So my comment is, quite simply, that the PUC  
19 take it to that level of seriousness that I expect and  
20 know that you will.

21 You may not know my district. But we don't get  
22 a hundred people out to anything. I tell you this. I  
23 can't get a hundred people to agree on anything in my  
24 district. And we had 500 people write letters that all  
25 said the exact same thing that. That actually says a

1 lot, a lot, a lot about how strong people feel about  
2 this and how much they want to make sure that, if  
3 something were to change, from the transmission side,  
4 that the mitigations are true and real and that they  
5 feel that their voices were heard and that process  
6 really happened. So thank you.

7 MR. ADAMSON: I've been licensed by the State  
8 of California as a real estate agent since 1980. I'm  
9 Bruce Adamson. I live on Cox Road. I'm not here to  
10 get any clients. I know that there's a California  
11 Coastal Commission. And I have several points that I  
12 would like to bring out as far as hazards.

13 Are PG&E employees going to be smoking? We're  
14 lacking so much water in our community, And if we're  
15 going to have severe fire dangers, is this electrical  
16 project a safe time to do it in? The hills are ready  
17 to go with a match. So I would like to make that  
18 comment. About a year and a half, you had the whole  
19 community of Aptos dug up, because, over by the post  
20 office, they were putting in lines for Swenson's big  
21 development that he has plans across the street from  
22 the post office. I'm not sure if Mr. Friend, if he's  
23 still here, can check with the Coastal Commission to  
24 see if you're allowed to build so high, 100-foot poles  
25 in the air, when the whole idea of having the Coastal

1 Commission is that they're not putting in high rise  
2 buildings within a coastal area.

3 And my last point is, on Cox Road, when people  
4 are going to work, that they know the lower part of Cox  
5 Road, there's -- it's a very popular bicycle walking  
6 route. And there are a lot of animals, deer, and if  
7 they're gonna get spooked and run out and hit people on  
8 the bicycle by these loud machines, helicopters,  
9 trucks. And on the very rear of Cox Road, you have  
10 these big redwood trees. And, at nighttime, you can  
11 see the headlights, but in the daytime, you can barely  
12 see around the bend. There's a couple times I've gone  
13 too fast and people are walking and I feel like I  
14 should slow down. And at the very top of Cox Road,  
15 there's another blind spot where people are coming  
16 flying around.

17 And it should go on the record that I submitted  
18 an affidavit that PG&E should be held accountable if  
19 this project goes forward if somebody gets hurt on  
20 those points at the end of Cox Road where it leads into  
21 Valencia Road.

22 And the last point I would just make would be  
23 that the real estate owners who are being affected  
24 deserve a fair market value of their property before  
25 and after. That's it.

1 MS. NICHOLS: I'm not used to talking in front  
2 of people. But I want to say there are a lot of things  
3 that can be mitigated and a lot of things that can't.  
4 The one thing that can't be mitigated is the wildlife.  
5 And the one thing that I know is on the Southern Route  
6 is the Santa Cruz salamander.

7 The salamander is on my property. Salamander  
8 cannot be mitigated. It's only in Santa Cruz. It's  
9 only in a small area. And the small area it's in is  
10 mostly populated where the Southern Routes are. There  
11 is a Federal Reserve for the salamander right under the  
12 wires. So I don't know how they're going to deal with  
13 that issue of an endangered species that's only in  
14 Santa Cruz and is right in the path of those wires.  
15 It's on my property just like the wires are. And I  
16 have seen the salamander. So besides the coyotes and  
17 the bobcats and everything else that's through there, I  
18 don't think much can be done to save the salamanders if  
19 that wire goes through.

20 MS. GARRETT: Marilyn Garrett. I see, after  
21 hearing people's comments about eminent domain, this is  
22 like a land grab of people's property. And I am very  
23 aware of PG&E's history, and I feel like PG&E is a  
24 monopoly versus democracy. The people there don't  
25 practice constructive projects, and some of PG&E's

1 history of hazards consists of the recent Smart Meter  
2 force installation that has made people ill, caused  
3 fires, bullied people, they surveillance meters, and  
4 the San Bruno fire happened from PG&E's gas lines. Tom  
5 Ammiano, who I think now is a state senator, said PG&E  
6 murdered those people. They prioritized profit over  
7 safety. And I feel like that's what's happening here.  
8 You know, the Erin Brockovich trial, that was PG&E's  
9 toxics.

10 Also, these high-powered lines get overloaded.  
11 They also have, like, a dozen cell towers put on the  
12 poles in one square mile in the area of Freedom, Day  
13 Valley and McDonald. I'll pass out some fact sheets on  
14 that.

15 This is a real overload. And it doesn't do  
16 well for the carbon footprint, which we're supposed to  
17 be reducing and saving energy. It increases that. I  
18 think of the word regulation, and something a friend of  
19 mine said, that regulation is a system of permitting  
20 and perpetuating corporate harm. In this case, PG&E.  
21 Whereas, prohibition prevents the damage. We need  
22 to -- my feeling is we need to stop this project.

23 A couple of things to enter into this, the  
24 record. This should be in the EIR, because this has to  
25 do with environmental impact very much. The book, The

1 Great Power-Line Cover-Up; How the Utilities and the  
2 Government Are Trying to Hide the Cancer Hazard Posed  
3 by Electromagnetic Fields. This is by Paul Brodeur.  
4 This was a book written 20 years ago. The leukemia  
5 incidences around these lines, the health impacts, are  
6 well documented. I think that needs to be included in  
7 the report. And we don't need upgrades or improvements  
8 that kill people with cancer and degrade our  
9 environment and kill creatures.

10 Another thing to enter into the record is a  
11 recent film by a Canadian filmmaker called Take Back  
12 Your Power; Investigating the Smart Grid. And it's  
13 about the corporate power intrusion into our lives.  
14 The PG&E Smart Meters, we see people interviewed,  
15 people that have pacemakers, who have been damaged by  
16 these pulse modulated frequencies from the Smart Meters  
17 and other technology.

18 I'm sorry. I don't trust PG&E. The history  
19 does not make me feel that you have the best interests  
20 of the public in your policies. To the contrary. So  
21 [takebackyourpower.net](http://takebackyourpower.net). And I have a few extra copies  
22 if someone wants to see any. Very instructive. Thank  
23 you. Let's halt this project.

24 MS. AUDINO: I wanted to thank Panorama, first  
25 of all, and the CPUC, for providing this forum. My



1 husband and I didn't come to the first one. I spoke  
2 with people who were at the other one, and it didn't go  
3 down like this one. I just want to thank you for this  
4 process and the report and everything and the whole  
5 civic democratic approach to it.

6 In the same vein, since the same company is  
7 sort of running the Environmental Impact Report data  
8 collection, I noticed when I read the draft Negative  
9 Impact Declaration that there were a lot of omissions.  
10 And omitting information or omitting whole angles of a  
11 project is one of the most sort of dangerous and  
12 volatile ways that you can skew information.

13 Anecdotally, and also because I'm selfish and  
14 it's my home, we live off of Bollinger Place, off  
15 Amesti. I think it's the north facing side of our  
16 street, all the neighbors there have a direct view of  
17 the lines that will go up across, but none of them were  
18 contacted. So I heard somebody say that it's not 300  
19 feet anymore, it's a thousand feet out that people are  
20 getting contacted. But I do want it to go on record  
21 that I have a grave concern that, if the same small  
22 number of people are contacted to provide comments on  
23 the Environmental Impact Report, how is that going to  
24 really provide the community with a civic possibility  
25 to participate in this? We need to increase the number

1 of people that are getting contacted about this.

2 And also, I want to speak up for our community.  
3 We heard a lot today about the Southern Route and the  
4 Cox Day Valley. But in this community, Amesti and  
5 Corralitos Road are designated by the county as  
6 aesthetic view corridors, and that was never once  
7 addressed by the draft. It was just stated once in the  
8 beginning and then dropped, and they never talked about  
9 it again. No comment at all about it.

10 And I think there are many other -- actually, I  
11 know there are many other omissions like that in the  
12 draft. I'm just pleading, please make a complete  
13 study. Thank you.

14 MR. DEWAR: Thank you very much for your  
15 comments. We, theoretically, have another half hour.  
16 Of course, we don't have to stay here. We do have  
17 everybody here to answer questions and that kind of  
18 thing.

19 First of all, does anybody have any comment  
20 they want to make sure gets into the record orally?  
21 Then are there any questions that you wanted to today  
22 ask but weren't able to ask because we wanted to get on  
23 with the comment process?

24 MS. ORSABA: I just want to say to those of  
25 you who are left, thank you for coming. And there will

1 be more opportunities for comment. We'll keep you  
2 posted. Please remember the website, the CPUC website.  
3 Thanks for coming.

4 (Off the record at 8:25 p.m.)  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I do hereby certify that the foregoing meeting was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said parties was reported by me, a licensed shorthand reporter and a disinterested person, and was, under my supervision, thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

---

**HEATHER ROSEMAN**