



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

Wednesday, January 29, 2003

Name*: JOSE CUAN

Affiliation (if any):* _____

Address*: 1249 LAUREL HILL DR.

City, State, Zip Code*: SAN MATEO, CA 94402

Telephone Number*: 650-341-7617

Email*: josecuan@hotmail.com

We are concerned about the EMF effect on our health. We lived at this place for over 13 years and my wife has been diagnosed with cancer (lung). She is not a smoker and she takes good care of her health. We are afraid that ~~long~~ increasing the voltage on the electric lines will also increase the EMF to a substantially higher level. Which may have a negative effect on the residents that live near the lines. We urge PG and E to put those lines underground or move them further away from the homes next to the lines. The presence of these electric wires and towers also have a negative impact on the value of our house. That's one more reason the 230 KV Transmission Line Project should be done by putting those lines underground.

Jose Cuan

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 27, 2003. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (650) 240-1720 or emailed to jeffmartin@aspenerg.com.



CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (CPUC)

Scoping Comments

Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

Wednesday, January 29, 2003

2/19/03

Name*: REZA MOINI

Affiliation (if any)*: RESIDENT IN THE AREA

Address*: 1291 LAUREL HILL DRIVE

City, State, Zip Code*: SAN MATEO, CA 94402

Telephone Number*: (650) 345-9898

Email*: RMOINI2000@AOL.COM

I strongly urge you to evaluate the numerous effect of this project on the life of residents & their children their environment and the immense impact of such project.

As a registered professional engineer in the state of California and someone that over 35 years spent a lot of time in design and development of huge project I have great doubt about the justification of this project. As we know there is always another way and method to be explored. Thank you, Reza Moini
R. Moini

*Please print. Your name, address, and comments become public information and may be released to interested parties if requested.

Please either deposit this sheet at the sign-in table before you leave today, or fold, stamp, and mail. Insert additional sheets if needed. Comments must be received by February 27, 2003. Comments may also be faxed to the project hotline at (650) 240-1720 or emailed to jeffmartin@aspenerg.com.

Jefferson-Martin Transmission Project

From: joe mahood [cjmahood@speakeasy.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2003 12:03 PM
To: jeffmartin@AspenEG.com
Subject: Please put power lines underground

Per upgrading the electrical systems in the Belmont area, please consider plan "B" seriously. Both for safety and esthetics, having these lines underground is our neighborhood choice!

Thank you.

Carmen and Joseph Mahood

deteriorate or become outdated. Each community should be responsible for bearing the burden of housing power facilities and they should not be able to close an existing and accepted one and add the burden on outer-lying areas.

6. I would accept their plan if they installed the proposed 230kV line underground. It would be great if they could put the current 60kV lines underground at the same time. or
7. They develop an underground/over ground route, with lines underground where they are close to homes and over ground where they are not near homes. Again, I would want the existing 60kV lines near homes be moved underground at the same time, or
8. They move the power lines west of 280 where they cannot negatively impact us, or
9. They cancel this project.

RICHARD COLE
1431 TARRYTOWN STREET
SAN MATEO, CALIFORNIA 94402-3819
650-345-0567

February 19, 2003

Ms. Billie C. Blanchard
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102

Ref.: Comments; Jefferson/Martin EIR Scope

Dear Ms. Blanchard:

At the end of the afternoon hearing on February 4, I told you that I would be sending written comments, amplifying the oral comments I had made there. Here are those comments. **You will note that the major addition has to do with cogeneration.**

My comments concentrate on the No-Project Alternative.

It was my experience as an environmental consultant that too many EIRs contained a No-Project Alternative that read, more or less, as follows:

"If the No-Project Alternative were selected, the project as proposed would not be built, and none of the potential significant adverse environmental impacts discussed in this EIR would occur. However, the applicant has stated that his objectives would not be met if the No-Project Alternative were selected by the decision makers." **OVER AND OUT.**

I know that the PUC plans more than this for the Jefferson/Martin EIR. The question is, "How much more?" In particular, how much of a PUC-evaluated project justification will you include in the No-Project Alternative section? You did say that Loretta Lynch would be preparing/reviewing the justification for the project, on a separate timeline, but not in the context of the EIR. This disturbs me, as the PUC's full evaluation of PG&E's justification for the project may not appear in the EIR. In my judgment, that would make the EIR incomplete, in that the No-Project Alternative itself would be lacking a vital component. It seems to me that Ms. Lynch's evaluation of the justification for the project should be completed in time to appear in the EIR, rather than later, as I suspect the PUC is planning to have happen. To put it another way: The EIR will have Aspen's (Mr. Paul Sherman's) section(s) on project description and need, which may not be compatible with Ms. Lynch's [probably later] evaluation of project justification. This muddies the decision path for the ultimate decisionmakers, which may include the courts.

I turn now to the specifics of project justification. The proposed transmission line will serve the City of San Francisco, plus some parts of northern San Mateo County, but its primary adverse environmental impacts will fall on the citizens of central San Mateo

Ms. Billie C. Blanchard
February 19, 2003
Page Two

County. It seems to me that the PUC must examine PG&E's stated needs for this project very carefully and sensitively, given this context. A transmission line is a fundamentally inefficient mechanism for providing electrical power to a user. Significant losses of energy occur for every mile of transmission. Transmission lines should be used only when they are the only way to deliver power from the source to the user. If, for example, hydroelectric power is very cheap, then one may accept transmission line losses, in order to carry such power to the ultimate user. However, it makes no sense to use transmission lines to carry fossil-fuel-generated power over great distances to the ultimate user.

A better alternative is to generate power close to the user. If the Jefferson/Martin project were not built, a large amount of money would be released to build, or renovate, power plants close to the ultimate user, specifically in San Francisco itself. In this context, it makes little sense to demolish the Potrero or Hunters Point powerplants, local politics aside.

From an energy-efficiency point of view, the best way to provide power for the residents, and the commercial and industrial users, in San Francisco would be to renovate existing fossil-fuel plants there, and to create many new small plants scattered around the City. Without even getting into the area of renewable sources, PG&E should be considering small natural gas plants, with an eye to including cogeneration. It was not so long ago that downtown San Francisco had public steam lines, providing heating energy to buildings. Why not build small natural-gas-turbine plants, producing electricity, and using waste energy to provide steam for circulation to a number of large downtown buildings?

The PUC should include such considerations in a serious No-Project Alternative section. It should not accept PG&E obfuscation to the effect that these ideas would not "pencil out."

I look forward to a real EIR.

Yours very truly,

Richard Cole

P. S. After completing this letter, I read the business pages of this morning's San Francisco Chronicle. Lo and behold! An article about "distributive energy generation!" If individual building owners can do it, why not the City as a whole? THINK BIG.....GER!

R. C.