

PUBLIC SCOPING REPORT

Pacific Gas & Electric Company's Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

**CPCN Application No. 02-09-043
SCH No. 2003012066**



**Lead Agency:
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Contact: Billie Blanchard
Tel: (415) 703-2068**

**Prepared by:
Aspen Environmental Group**

April 2003

PUBLIC SCOPING REPORT

Pacific Gas & Electric Company's Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

CPCN Application No. 02-09-043

SCH No. 2003012066

CONTENTS

1. Overview of Public Scoping Process

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Public Scoping for the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project
- 1.3 Public Notification
- 1.4 Agency Notification
- 1.5 CEQA Process Beyond Scoping
- 1.6 Scoping Report Organization

2. Summary of Public Comments

- 2.1 Human Environment Issues and Concerns
- 2.2 Natural Environment Issues and Concerns
- 2.3 Purpose and Need
- 2.4 Alternatives
- 2.5 Environmental Review and Decision Making Process

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Notification and Scoping Materials

- A-1: Notice of Preparation
- A-2: NOP Mailing List
- A-3: Scoping Meeting Materials

Appendix B – Summary of Scoping Comments

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

Appendix C – Letters Received in Response to NOP

- C-1: Comments from Government Agencies
- C-2: Comments from Private Organizations and Companies
- C-3: Comments from Private Citizens

1. Overview of Public Scoping Process

1.1 Introduction

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) has filed an application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for the proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project. The CPUC has decided that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared to evaluate the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

According to PG&E, the Proposed Project is needed to meet the projected electric demand in the City and County of San Francisco, as well as the Cities of Burlingame, Millbrae, San Bruno, South San Francisco, Brisbane, Colma, and Daly City. New transmission and distribution facilities are needed to serve existing electrical load and projected growth in the San Francisco Bay area. The Proposed Project would include three major components, as described below.

Transmission Line

The major part of the project would be the installation of a new approximately 27-mile 230 kV single-circuit transmission line with overhead and underground segments. The southerly 14.7 miles of the line would be installed overhead on a rebuilt version of PG&E's existing Jefferson-Martin 60 kV double-circuit power line, and the remaining 12.4 miles would be installed in a new underground duct bank. The existing Jefferson-Martin 60 kV double-circuit power line would be converted to a single-circuit line and relocated to the east side of the new towers to operate at 60 kV, and the west sides of the line would be at 230 kV.

Overhead Portion of the Route. The 14.7-mile rebuilt overhead portion of the line would require that approximately 100 existing lattice towers of the 60 kV line be replaced with new towers that would average approximately 25 feet taller. PG&E is proposing to use lattice-type steel towers (similar in style to the existing towers) along most of the route, though in a few locations existing lattice towers would be replaced by tubular steel poles.

With few exceptions, PG&E proposes that the new transmission line towers and poles replace the existing towers and poles near their present locations. The current easement owned by PG&E and used for the existing 60 kV power line is typically 50 feet wide. The new right-of-way would need to be expanded to approximately 100 feet.

The portion of the existing 60 kV line between the proposed transition station and the Sneath Lane Substation would be reconducted and will remain at 60 kV, with a few existing poles raised about five feet.

Underground Portion of the Route. The 12.4-mile underground line would consist of three cross-linked polyethylene insulated solid dielectric copper conductor cables in a buried concrete encased duct bank system. Approximately nine miles of this route would be within streets (in the Cities of San Bruno, Colma, Daly City, and Brisbane) and about three miles would be in the new BART right-of-way (through the Cities of South San Francisco and San Bruno). A trench would be dug for installation of the cables; it would be typically two feet wide and about six feet deep. During construction of the underground line, a temporary construction easement would be required. The width of the workspace within existing roadways would be determined by the encroachment permits to be issued by the local jurisdictions.

Transition Station

The project would require construction of a new transition station near the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and Glenview Drive just east of Skyline Boulevard/Highway 35 to transition from the overhead 230 kV transmission line to the underground line. The transition station would be set back approximately 25 feet from Glenview Drive and about 50 feet from San Bruno Avenue. An eight-foot high masonry wall would surround the station, enclosing an area of approximately 80 by 100 feet.

Substation Modifications

Modification would be required of the existing Jefferson and Martin substations to accommodate the new 230 kV transmission line. Modifications would also be required to the equipment at the existing San Mateo, Ralston, Millbrae, and Monta Vista substations. At the Hillsdale Junction switching station, modifications to accommodate the new 60 kV arrangement would be required.

1.2 Public Scoping for the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

In compliance with CEQA guidelines, a Notice of Preparation was sent to 67 interested agencies and 1,914 members of the public on January 21, 2003. The CEQA scoping process allows government agencies and the public an opportunity to provide comments on the issues and scope of the EIR. The review period on the NOP extended to February 27, 2003, although the CPUC agreed to receive comments from some agencies and organizations through March 2003. Written and oral comments received during the scoping process are part of the project record; they have been reviewed and will be considered by the CPUC in scoping the EIR.

In addition to the written scoping process, the CPUC held four scoping meetings in January and February 2003 to provide the public and governmental agencies information on the CEQA process and to provide an opportunity to identify environmental issues and alternatives for consideration in the EIR. Public scoping meetings were held at the following locations and times:

- January 29 – San Bruno Recreation Center, 7:00 to 9:00 p.m., Crystal Springs Avenue at Oak Road, San Bruno
- February 4 – City Council Chambers, San Mateo City Hall, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m., 330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo
- February 4 – City Council Chambers, San Mateo City Hall, 7:00 to 9:00 p.m., 330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo
- February 6 – Albert Teglia Community Center, 7:00 to 9:00 p.m., 285 Abbot Avenue, Daly City

Approximately 70 members of the public and representatives from organizations and government agencies attended the four scoping meetings. Approximately 230 letters and emails were received during the NOP scoping process from public agencies and private citizens. The input received during the scoping process will assist the CPUC in identifying the range of actions, alternatives, issues, and potential effects associated with the Proposed Project. All issues raised in the scoping meetings will be reviewed by the CPUC to determine the appropriate consideration and level of analysis.

1.3 Public Notification

Public notification about the project and for the scoping meetings included a newspaper announcement and mailing of the NOP. A notice for the public scoping meetings was published in the *San Mateo County Times* on January 22, 2003. In addition, the NOP was mailed to nearly 2,000 stakeholders on the mailing list, including homeowners, residents, private organizations, interest groups, and government agencies. The notification list (provided by PG&E) included all property owners within 300 feet of the project

facilities. Copies of the NOP for review were also placed in public libraries including John D. Daly, Serramonte, Brisbane, Woodside, San Bruno, Redwood City, Cupertino, Millbrae, Grand Avenue, Burlingame, West Orange, and San Mateo public libraries. Appendix A contains copies of the NOP and mailing list.

1.4 Agency Notification

The NOP was sent to potentially affected federal, state, and local trustee and responsible agencies. Distribution of the NOP included four federal agencies, 18 state agencies, four county departments, 22 city departments, and 19 special districts.

The NOP was also available on the CPUC's environmental web site for the project at: http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Environment/info/asp/jefferson_martin/pdf/nop.pdf. The NOP and PG&E's Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) and Application (as well as this Scoping Report) are presently on the Jefferson-Martin CPUC website.

1.5 CEQA Process Beyond Scoping

The scoping process that is documented in this report is the first step of the CEQA process that will culminate with issuance of Draft and Final Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) evaluating the Proposed Project. The Jefferson-Martin CEQA process, and the approximate anticipated schedule for future actions is illustrated in a flow chart in Figure 1-1. Note that this Scoping Report falls under the second item (Public Input/EIR Scoping) in the process flow chart.

1.6 Scoping Report Organization

This public scoping report summarizes the comments and issues identified through the NOP scoping process and public scoping meetings. The remainder of this report is organized as follows:

- **Section 2** provides an overall summary of the comments and issues.
- **Appendix A** provides the scoping meeting and notification materials, including:
 - A-1: Notice of Preparation
 - A-2: NOP Mailing List
 - A-3: Scoping Meeting Materials
- **Appendix B** provides summaries of verbal and written comments
 - B-1: Summary of Written Comments Received from Government Agencies
 - B-2: Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Organizations and Companies
 - B-3: Summary of Written Comments Received from Private Citizens
 - B-4: Summary of Oral Comments Received at Scoping Meetings
 - B-5: Summary of Agency Consultations
- **Appendix C** includes the letters received in response to the NOP
 - C-1: Comments from Government Agencies
 - C-2: Comments from Private Organizations and Companies
 - C-3: Comments from Private Citizens

Figure 1-1: Jefferson-Martin CEQA Process — [CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

2. Summary of Public Comments

This section summarizes the comments raised by the public and agencies during the scoping process for the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project EIR. This summary is based upon both written and oral comments that were received during the NOP review period, which officially extended to February 27, 2003. It also includes comments received through March 2003 and from four scoping meetings held in the project area in January and February 2003.

Approximately 230 letters and emails and 31 oral comments were received during the scoping process from Federal, State, local, and county government agencies, special districts, organizations, and concerned public. Private citizens and homeowners provided the majority of the comments. In addition to private individuals, comments were received from the following organizations:

- Highlands Community Association
- San Mateo County Trail Users Group
- Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society
- Committee for Green Foothills
- 280 Corridor Concern Citizens
- Friends of Edgewood Natural Preserve
- Sequoia Audubon Society
- Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club
- People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area
- National Retail Partners

Comments were also received from the following government agencies:

- City of San Bruno
- City of San Bruno Public Works
- Golden Gate National Recreation Area
- Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
- County of San Mateo
- City of Burlingame
- City of Burlingame Public Works
- Town of Woodside
- South San Francisco Schools
- City of Daly City
- Daly City Public Works
- California Department of Parks and Recreation
- Bayshore Sanitary District
- Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
- Highlands Recreation District
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
- Redwood City Planning and Redevelopment Agency

Appendix B contains a summary of all written and oral comments received.

The specific issues raised during the public scoping process are summarized according to the following major themes:

- Human Environment Issues and Concerns
- Natural Environment Issues and Concerns
- Purpose and Need
- Alternatives
- Environmental Review and Decision Making Process

2.1 Human Environment Issues and Concerns

The majority of public comments focused on the potential effect of the project on the human environment, most often expressing concerns with health risks arising from increased EMF emissions, visual and scenic impacts, and impacts to property values. Other common concerns expressed dealt with safety issues, noise, construction impacts, fire risk, interference with communication and electronic equipment, security, conflicts with planned uses, recreation impacts, and quality of life.

EMF-Related Health and Safety Issues

The majority of comments from members of the public and organizations expressed concern over the health effects of the 230 kV transmission line and the EMF it would generate. Comments, questions, and concerns included the potential impacts to children and the elderly from EMF exposure, and potential for increased incidence of childhood leukemia, brain tumors, miscarriages, and ALS, citing recent studies from the National Institute of Health and the California Department of Health and the book *The Great Power-Line Cover-Up*, by Paul Brodeur. Many of the comments emphasize the sensitive nature of the residential areas adjacent to the overhead segment due to the large number of family homes, children, schools, and elderly in the area. A variety of comments discussed family members or community members that already suffer from chronic or debilitating illnesses and express concern over how increased EMF will affect these individuals. Other comments noted the proximity of Highlands Recreation Facility, Highlands Elementary School, and West School to the Proposed Project route. Comments requested that more research be conducted and be fairly and fully provided in the environmental review. The health impacts associated with potential exposure to EMF generated by the project are a significant community concern.

Visual and Aesthetic Impacts

The potential visual and aesthetic impacts of the Proposed Project are a major public issue. The primary area of concern is the overhead portion of the transmission line passing along the I-280 corridor, particularly through Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve, along the San Francisco watershed, and alongside residential areas in the San Mateo Highlands and Hillsborough. Many of the public comments stated that the existing transmission towers mar scenic vistas and pristine views, and that the larger towers required for the project would significantly diminish or destroy the views of the San Francisco watershed region. Many residents of the San Mateo Highlands and Hillsborough neighborhoods commented that the existing towers nearby their homes detract from their views, and that the neighborhoods, particularly those with many Eichler homes designed with floor-to-ceiling windows, would be particularly sensitive to any reductions in visual and aesthetic quality due to the increased size of the proposed new transmission towers. Diminished views were frequently cited as one of many reasons that the project would reduce property values.

Impacts to Property Values

Many of the comments expressed concern regarding the potential impact of the overhead portion of the project on their property values and businesses. Specific topics mentioned in comments included land values, impacts to homes and people's ability to sell their homes, impacts to the neighborhood housing market, and impacts to the tax base of San Mateo County and the town of Hillsborough. Several comments estimated that homes near the proposed transmission line route have a value of between \$600,000 and \$1,000,000 and that the project would reduce the desirability of homes due to perceptions of health and safety hazards, increased noise from the transmission lines, disruption of electronic equipment due to EMF, and reduced views. Comments stated that the proposed transmission line could diminish housing values by \$100,000 to \$200,000 per home. Several letters proposed that homeowners receive compensation for such devaluations, whether directly by PG&E or through other means of transferring payment from the end users of the electricity to the homeowners affected by the project. Many comments urged PG&E and the CPUC to take these additional costs into consideration when evaluating the total cost of the project.

Safety Issues and Fire Risk

Comments from members of the public, organizations, and government agencies addressed a variety of safety concerns. Several comments asked how earthquakes would affect the underground and overhead portions of the transmission lines, and a variety of comments expressed concern that transmission towers would topple onto neighborhoods during an earthquake or landslide. Other comments stated that underground transmission lines could be dangerous to crews working on buried water lines or could be cut by a fault rupture during an earthquake and cut power to users. A variety of comments expressed concern over the potential for accidents to occur with the proposed transmission lines and cause electrocution, or combine with natural gas pipelines in crowded utility corridors, and cause explosions or fire. The location of overhead transmission towers in fields and hillsides that get very dry during the summer was also a cause for fears of fire risk. Other comments asked about the potential for EMF from the 230 kV line to disrupt communications, particularly to County emergency services communication facilities on Tower Road. A number of individuals stated concern over asbestos in the serpentine rock being spread by blasting. At least one individual noted a concern of hazards associated with snakes potentially being driven out of wild areas to residential areas during construction. Safety risks such as these were frequently cited as one of the reasons property values along the overhead transmission route would decrease.

Operational Noise Impacts

Many oral and written comments stated that the existing 60 kV overhead transmission line in the southern portion of the project route produces a buzzing or crackling noise audible to nearby residents, particularly during periods of fog or precipitation. Residents living near the 60 kV line expressed concerns that the noise from the proposed overhead 230 kV line would be louder and more disturbing than the existing line. Many expressed that the noise from the lines would increase perceptions of risk or danger and reduce the desirability of their property and neighborhood and thus reduce property values. In addition, concerns were also raised about operation noise levels associated with the transition structure and the substations.

Construction Impacts on the Human Environment

Comments from individuals, organizations, and government agencies discussed the impacts that construction of the project would create including traffic, noise, air pollution, aesthetics, utilities, and health and safety. Many of the residents of the San Mateo Highlands and Hillsborough communities stated concerns with the air pollution, dust, and noise that would be generated by helicopters and heavy equipment during construction of the project, particularly on children and schools in the areas. Some believed that the construction would impact their neighborhoods for a period of up to two to three years and would affect the aesthetics of their community and quality of life. Residents in the northern portion of the route and government agencies discussed the importance of traffic accessibility and expressed concerns over traffic congestion and conflicts with underground utilities such as gas pipelines, water mains, and fiber optic lines, as well as with known leaking underground storage tanks.

Interference with Communications and Electronic Equipment

Comments from many individuals and a number of government agencies expressed concerns with the overhead portion of the project disrupting communications or generating interference with communications or electronic equipment. Many individuals worried that the increased EMF generated by the 230

kV line would disrupt their communications and electronic equipment, some pointing out that PG&E is already unable to comply with FCC regulations with regard to EMF emissions. As mentioned previously, the County of San Mateo has questioned how the new lines would affect County communications facilities on Tower Road. Other questions were raised with regard to how the removal of the existing towers along the southern portion of the route would affect contracts with communication companies that have equipment and facilities located on the 60 kV towers.

Security

A number of individuals noted that as the Proposed Project is designed to improve reliability of the power supply to San Francisco, that security of the line is an issue that should be taken into consideration. These individuals commented that by installing the southern portion of the transmission line underground in addition to the northern portion, the security of the line towards vandalism and terrorism would be greatly increased. Some added that the proximity of the proposed overhead transmission lines to residences puts those homes at risk for taking collateral damage if a terrorist attack targeted the overhead lines.

Conflicts with Planned Land Uses

A variety of government agencies have requested evaluations of specific sections of the project to determine potential impacts the project could have on planned land uses. The City of San Bruno expressed concern over possible conflicts the project may have with the San Bruno Avenue Grade Separation Conceptual Plan, the Linden Grade Separation, the South San Francisco New Station Conceptual Plan, and a San Mateo County trailhead parking area, as well as utility and infrastructure Master Plans. The City of Burlingame stated that the Proposed Project may significantly impede access on Trousdale Avenue, and alternative routes could conflict with utilities buried in El Camino Real, plans to rebuild Mills Peninsula Hospital on El Camino Real and Trousdale Drive, and the proposed Harry Tracy Water Distribution Facility's chloramination facility. The County of San Mateo asked if the project would require an amendment to the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan, and requested information on how the project would affect the County's proposed expansion of the Juvenile Justice Facilities.

Recreation Impacts

Many of the comments received about the project from individuals, organizations, and agencies expressed concern over impacts that would impact the use and quality of recreational areas. A number of comments and letters requested careful examination of how the project would affect recreational access to San Bruno Mountain, Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve, and Sawyer Camp Trail. Comments from some government agencies indicated that the project could be an opportunity for PG&E to provide additional recreational opportunities by adding trails or parking for trailheads. While some of the comments addressed the potential for construction impacts on recreational areas, the majority of recreation-related comments focused on the visual and aesthetic impact that the new overhead transmission lines and towers would have on parks and open space.

Quality of Life

A few individuals and agencies expressed concerns in their comments about the proposed underground portion negatively affecting the quality of life of residents and students living and going to school nearby the proposed line. The vast majority of comments addressing the projects impact on quality of

life came from individuals, organizations, and agencies with jurisdiction along the overhead portion of the Proposed Project. These comments stated that the project would significantly alter the character of the communities that residents enjoy. A number of writers stated that the project would disrupt the peace of mind and spirit of the area. Many expressed that the project would impact the quiet character and scenic quality of the area and give neighborhoods a more industrial feel and would significantly and adversely affect the lifestyle of the neighborhoods.

2.2 Natural Environment Issues and Concerns

The majority of comments from organizations, and many comments from individuals and government agencies addressed issues and concerns with the potential impacts that the project would have on the natural environment, particularly impacts to plants, wildlife, and habitats.

Impacts to Plant Species

The Committee for Green Foothills, Friends of Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve, Santa Clara Valley Chapter of the California Native Plant Society, San Mateo County Trail Users Group, Town of Woodside, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the County of San Mateo, along with a number of individuals expressed concern for rare, threatened, endangered, and special status plant species that could be impacted by the project. The California Native Plant Society noted deficiencies in PG&E's assessment of threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant species within the project area, listing an additional 13 special status species with the potential to occur within the transmission line route. The California Native Plant Society, Friends of Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve, and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission expressed particular concern for serpentine endemic special status species found only in the vicinity of Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve. The Friends of Edgewood Natural Preserve and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission emphasized avoidance of plant and soil disturbance and soil compaction during construction to ensure the protection of native plants. A number of comments requested that qualified conservation biologists with knowledge of Edgewood species be retained for evaluation of project impacts.

Impacts to Wildlife

The Committee for Green Foothills, Friends of Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve, San Mateo County Trail Users Group, Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club, People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Sequoia Audubon Society, Santa Clara Audubon Society, Town of Woodside, County of San Mateo, and a number of individuals expressed concern for federal and state protected wildlife species along with avian species that could be impacted by the project. A number of groups and individuals emphasized the need to ensure that the habitats of special status species, such as the Bay Checkerspot Butterfly, Edgewood Blind Harvestman, and the Edgewood Microblind Harvestman are protected from damage or disturbance by project construction. Other comments address the impact that larger transmission towers and transmission lines could have on avian species, particularly expressing concerns over the potential for bird collisions with towers and lines. The Sequoia Audubon Society requested a study comparing the effects of overhead and underground transmission lines on resident and migratory birds. Some comments expressed concern that project construction would displace wildlife into nearby neighborhoods and a number of individuals requested that the environmental review evaluate the impact that increased EMF and noise from the proposed transmission lines would have on wildlife species. A number of comments requested that qualified conservation biologists with knowledge of Edgewood species be retained for evaluation of project impacts.

Impacts to Habitats

The Committee for Green Foothills, Friends of Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve, Santa Clara Valley Chapter of the California Native Plant Society, San Mateo County Trail Users Group, Loma Prieta Chapter of the Sierra Club, People for a Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Sequoia Audubon Society, Santa Clara Audubon Society, a variety of government agencies, and many individuals expressed concern for the protection and maintenance of sensitive habitats that sustain special status species in the project area. The County of San Mateo asked how project construction would impact habitats on San Bruno Mountain and whether or not the project will require an amendment to the park's Habitat Conservation Plan. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission expressed concern over the damage that construction of underground alternatives or alternative routes in Watershed lands would have on habitats. The California Native Plant Society, Friends of Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve, and the Committee for Green Foothills expressed particular concern for the serpentine habitat found only in and adjacent to Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve. As discussed previously, the Friends of Edgewood emphasized avoidance habitat disturbance, the fragility of the serpentine habitat, and its susceptibility to invasion from non-native species. Many groups and individuals mentioned the San Francisco watershed's United Nations designation as an International Biosphere Reserve and stressed the protection of habitats within the watershed from fire risk and safety hazards, and visual, noise, and aesthetic impacts. As previously discussed, many comments requested that qualified conservation biologists with knowledge of Edgewood species be retained for evaluation of project impacts.

2.3 Purpose and Need

The purpose and need for the project was questioned in the majority of comments from individuals. Most comments from members of the public questioned the necessity of the project and expressed feelings that PG&E had not provided adequate justification for the project. The 280 Corridor Concerned Citizens and many other individuals indicated that the future demand for electricity in the Bay Area has been overstated, stating that PG&E's forecast is well above historical average recorded growth in peak loads and citing economic declines reducing energy consumption and artificial energy demand generated by power companies. A number of comments asked if routing the transmission line to the Martin Substation would succeed in fulfilling the stated objective of increasing the reliability of power supply to San Francisco by adding redundancies to the system, as the San Mateo–Martin Corridor also feeds into the Martin Substation. Some individuals asked why San Francisco needs more power, as the city has no more room to grow or develop. Other comments requested that a full justification of the project be prepared and reviewed for inclusion in the EIR. Many residents from the San Mateo Highlands and Hillsborough neighborhoods questioned whether the need for electricity in San Francisco is outweighed by the quality of life needs for residents affected by the project.

2.4 Alternatives

Many comments from individuals and organizations and a number of government agencies suggested a variety of alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, local generation/distributed generation, demand reduction, alternative tower designs, and alternative routes. Section 2.4.1 presents a summary of alternatives suggested, and Section 2.4.2 lists the alternatives suggested by each commenter.

2.4.1 Summary of Alternatives Issues

The following text summarizes comments on alternatives. Section 2.4.2 presents all the comments on alternatives that were submitted during scoping.

No Project Alternative

A large number of individuals asked for the No Project Alternative to receive careful consideration. Many felt that the near-term growth in demand is likely to be less than recent historical trends and significantly less than PG&E's forecasts, and as such, questioned the necessity of the project. Individuals have questioned the schedule of an evaluation of the project justification and have requested that it be completed in time to be reviewed and incorporated into the EIR.

Local Generation/Distributed Generation

The 280 Corridor Concerned Citizens, along with many other individuals, suggested the consideration of increased local generation as an alternative to the Proposed Project. A variety of generation locations and methods were proposed, including San Francisco's use of four 50 MW turbines acquired as a settlement with Williams, licensing and operation of Mirant's proposed 540 MW Potrero Power Plant Unit 7 Project, and the retrofit and repowering of the Hunter's Point Power Plant. In addition, renewable energy sources such as solar photovoltaic and wind projects were suggested, as were small, natural gas-powered generating facilities distributed through neighborhoods in the city.

Demand Reduction

A number of comments, including those of the 280 Corridor Concerned Citizens, suggested programs to reduce demand. The 280 Corridor Concerned Citizens cited authorization of funds in San Francisco for the implementation of energy-efficiency projects and PG&E findings that approximately 13 percent of peak demand could be reduced on a cost-effective basis. Comments noted that other programs are being developed in San Francisco to increase energy efficiency.

Alternative Tower Designs

Comments from the Redwood City Planning and Redevelopment Agency suggested that the project examine alternative tower designs to reduce visual and aesthetic impacts on the environment, encouraging the use of tubular steel poles over steel lattice towers. The agency also proposed a metal treatment for the towers that creates a self-rusting surface, which allows the poles to blend in with their rural surroundings.

Alternative Routes

Many comments from government agencies and almost all comments from organizations and individuals expressed preferences for alternative routes, of which the most frequently discussed was an all underground route, a partial underground route, and an overhead or underground route to the west of I-280. Suggestions for alternative routes are detailed in Section 2.4.2.

2.4.2 Alternatives Suggested

Following are all written, oral, and agency consultation comments that suggested an alternative, along with a statement of each suggestion.

Government Agency Suggestions

National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area

- Underground both the 60 kV and the 230 kV transmission lines in a new utility corridor under Cañada Road.
- EIR should also include Alternative 1B, undergrounding only the 230 kV line along Cañada Road.
- Does not support undergrounding the new 230 kV line in the existing corridor.
- Include alternatives in the EIR that would not constitute an unreasonable interference with GGNRA's easements.

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

Prefers alternatives that do not involve the placement of the transmission line underground through sensitive areas of the Watershed.

Redwood City, Planning and Redevelopment

Use different tower designs that would create less of a visual impact than the conventional steel lattice towers being proposed. One example of an alternative design is the Collierville-Bellota transmission line, owned by the Northern California Power Agency. The poles have a dark reddish-brown color, the result of a special metal treatment that creates a self-rusting surface. In addition, the pole and crossarm configuration of the towers themselves create a simple profile.

City of San Bruno, Public Works – Administration

Several alternatives were suggested by the City:

- Relocate the Transition Station site to the west side of the Skyline Boulevard away from the residential areas. The 230 kV underground construction should then cross Skyline Boulevard underground.
- Beginning at a Transition Station on the west side of Skyline Boulevard; then crossing Skyline and proceeding down San Bruno Avenue to the edge of the open space west of MP 15; then traversing to the northeast through undeveloped land connecting into Sneath Lane near I-280; then continuing east on Sneath to Huntington Avenue near the BART parking garage; and then proceeding north along the BART R/W as indicated in segment 2B of PG&E's Environmental Assessment. [Note that the Mayor's letter of March 25, 2003, summarized below, subsequently removed this alternative from their recommendations.]
- Beginning at a Transition Station on the west side of Skyline Boulevard; then crossing Skyline and proceeding down San Bruno Avenue to the exit/entrance ramp of I-280; then along the northbound ramp north to Sneath Lane (Although the ramp is part of the freeway, it is significantly separated from the freeway, and there appears to be ample space for construction of the 230 kV line. Caltrans may grant a variance for this alignment); then continuing east on Sneath to Huntington Avenue near the BART parking garage; and then proceeding north along the BART R/W as indicated in segment 2B of PG&E's Environmental Assessment.
- Beginning at a Transition Station on the west side of Skyline Boulevard; then crossing Skyline and proceeding down San Bruno Avenue to Cherry Avenue; then north on Cherry to Sneath Lane; then continuing east on Sneath to Huntington Avenue near the BART parking garage; and then proceeding north along the BART R/W as indicated in segment 2B of PG&E's Environmental Assessment, or
- Co-locating the Transition Station adjacent to the Sneath Substation farther to the north along Skyline Boulevard. Routes for the underground segment should also be expanded to include Skyline Boulevard and Sneath Lane, commencing at this alternative location for the Transition Station. [This is the preferred alternative to the other alternatives discussed above.]
- Consider alternative with segment parallel to I-280 or I-380. PG&E's gas pipelines are in this ROW.
- Consider alternatives to use of San Bruno Avenue, including Millbrae Avenue to BART ROW, Skyline to Sneath Lane, and Sneath to BART ROW.
- Consider putting the Option 1B underground segment in the Caltrain ROW and not in El Camino Real. (Caltrans will be re-paving El Camino from Burlingame to South San Francisco.)

City of San Bruno – Mayor Larry Franzella

- Place the entire project underground in order to avoid a considerable impact and burden on any one city;
- Place a transition station at some earlier point in the route (for example, at Trousdale in Burlingame);
- To place the transition station adjacent to the existing PG&E substation on the west side of Skyline Boulevard at Sneath Lane where the impact will be less dramatic; or
- Place a transition station in a less conspicuous place on the west side of Skyline Boulevard.
- Remove from consideration a previously suggested City of San Bruno alternative between San Bruno Avenue and Sneath Lane through Crestmoor Canyon.

City of Daly City

PG&E currently owns in fee and has an adjacent easement directly from Guadalupe Canyon Parkway down to the Martin Substation. The city would like this direct alternative reconsidered both environmentally and part of the CPCN process, however with the existing overhead lines [within Guadalupe Canyon Parkway – Segment 5] included as part of the undergrounding. Currently there is an unrelated amendment to the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan under consideration by the Plan Operators. The city proposes this combined undergrounding alternative become part of the current HCP amendment.

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

- Pursue a project alternative that would re-locate the 100 existing overhead towers closer to the built environment and away from protected open space.
- Pursue a project alternative that would not impact or encroach upon dedicated park and open space lands (including land owned/managed by Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, San Mateo County, and SFPUC)

Town of Hillsborough

- Consider installing the lines underground or on the west side of I-280.
- Suggest retrofitting San Francisco power plants.
- Look at transmission to San Francisco from the East Bay.
- Relocate the I-280 crossing from north of Carolands Substation to south of Carolands; OK to use city's water tank property.
- Research co-generation in San Francisco – use of methane for power generation.
- Minimize the number of I-280 crossing; keep towers from MP 9 to 11 on west side of freeway.
- From MP 7 to 11, install underground or on west side of freeway.

Town of Colma

- Consider use of A Street since it will be paved soon anyway.
- Consider use of Junipero Serra as a north-south route.
- Consider use of SFPUC water line through Colma; there is a 60-foot ROW easement and CCSF fee title.

County of San Mateo

- Underground in Cañada Road would be improvement to proposed route.
- Consider installing the whole project underground, avoiding sensitive habitat and features.
- Consider tower designs that improve aesthetics (including architectural design and color) and consider all types of tower designs for TSPs.

Private Organization and Company Suggestions

San Mateo County Trail Users Group

PG&E's Alternative 1B – Underground the proposed new transmission lines under Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard.

Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society

PG&E's Alternative 1B – Make the southern portion of the proposed 27-mile transmission line also underground.

Highlands Community Association

Segment 1B alternative along Cañada Road underground. The existing transmission lines should also be combined with any additional lines in the same undergrounding.

Highlands Recreation District

Place [the lines] west of 280 or on the west side of the lake. Or better still, find a way to bury them where the terrorists cannot easily disturb or destroy them

Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter

Alternative 1B in the EIR/EIS (undergrounding of the southern 14-mile segment of the route through the San Francisco Watershed). The new lines should — at a minimum — be undergrounded from the Edgewood Substation under Cañada Road to at least the 2.0 milepost. As part of this project, the existing 60 kV lines in this section should also be undergrounded, and the towers removed by helicopter (note that leaving the existing foundations in place may be preferable, as this would avoid any disturbance to the sensitive habitats there). The area that would have high priority for undergrounding from an environmental, habitat and visual resource perspective is the segment between approximately Milepost 4 and Milepost 7.

People For a Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Alternative 1B – Underground the 230 kV transmission line for its entire length, rather than replacing 100 towers with even higher towers than exist today. The existing towers should be removed.

Friends of Edgewood Natural Preserve

Remove the existing 60 kV line that runs within Edgewood's perimeter, and underground it, along with the proposed new 230 kV line beneath the Cañada Road right of way.

280 Corridor Concerned Citizens Group

- Increasing distributed and self-generation projects in San Francisco area, combined with larger local generation projects as well as demand reduction efforts.
- Modified Underground/Overhead Route Along Or Near the Existing 60 kV Line ROW. This alternative route would locate the new line overhead along Segment 1A from the Jefferson Substation to the Ralston Substation then underground to the Hillsdale Substation (approximately MP 6.4; just north of Bunker Hill). A Hillsdale Substation, the line would continue overhead across the canyon to approximately MP 6.9 and then underground to Carolands Substation (approximately MP 8.6; Skyline Boulevard just north of Black Mountain Road). From the Carolands Substation, the line would go overhead to approximately MP 9.9. At approximately MP 9.9, the route for the line would then deviate from Segment 1A and move west of I-280 to approximately 10.9 where the line would then continue along Segment 1A to San Bruno Avenue. The underground segments would include the existing 60 kV line and would be located a sufficient distance west of the existing ROW or the furthest western point in the future 230 kV ROW to mitigate potential health impacts.
- Underground to Trousdale Drive. This route would locate the line underground from the Jefferson Substation along Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard to Trousdale Drive. Although this route deviates from the existing 60 kV ROW, moving the existing 60 kV line underground with the proposed 230 kV line should be considered. From Trousdale Drive at least 2 alternatives would exist:
- At or near Trousdale Drive, the line would go overhead west of I-280 along Segment 1A to San Bruno Avenue.
- At Trousdale Drive, the line would continue north underground along Skyline Boulevard until San Bruno Avenue. At two points (Trousdale to Millbrae Avenue and Larkspur Road to the Pacifica Exit) the line would need to parallel I-280.

- Underground to the Carolands Substation. This alternative route would locate the line underground from the Jefferson Substation along Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard to the Carolands Substation. From the Carolands Substation, the line would go overhead to approximately MP 9.9 along Segment 1A. At approximately MP 9.9, the route for the line would move west of Highway 280 to approximately MP 10.9 where the line would then continue along Segment 1A to San Bruno Avenue.
- Underground to MP 2. This alternative route would locate the line underground along Segment 1B from the Jefferson Substation to approximately MP 2, then overhead along Segment 1A to the Ralston Substation. From the Ralston Substation, the line would then go underground west under I-280 and continue underground along Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard to Trousdale Drive. At Trousdale Drive, both of the alternatives noted above in the Underground to the Carolands Substation alternative would exist.
- Move the Line West of Existing 60 kV ROW. This alternative route would locate the line west of the existing 60 kV ROW. There are a number of variations of this alternative including, (i) moving the line west of I-280; or (ii) moving the line west of the existing 60 kV ROW but staying east of I-280 (except where Segment 1A is located west of I-280). To the extent portions of the line are located east of I-280, the line should be located underground near residential areas.
- Moraga Substation to Potrero Substation. This alternative route consists of constructing a 230 kV line connecting the Moraga and Potrero Substation. The line would cross from Oakland to San Francisco either (i) along the BART transbay tube (ii) along the Bay Bridge; (iii) underwater cable, or (iv) a combination of the Bay Bridge and underwater cable.

California Native Plant Society, Santa Clara Valley Chapter

Alternative Segment 1B – Underground Route Alternative putting the power lines under current existing roadbeds (Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard).

International Medical Foundation, Inc.

Move the project to west of 280.

Committee for Green Foothills

Alternative 1B (Undergrounding of the southern 14.7-mile segment through the Peninsula Watershed Lands. In addition, it is requested that consideration be given to undergrounding at least a portion (from Edgewood Substation to at least the Milepost 2 area) of the existing 60 kV transmission lines as mitigation for constructing a portion of the proposed new lines above ground. Where tap or distribution lines exist, there could be a transition from underground to above ground in order to avoid excavating within the watershed lands to provide service to these facilities.

Hillside Homeowners Improvement Association

New transmission lines should be put underground in the area of Hoffman Street and Orange Street as it travels through the Hillside neighborhood within the boundaries of Daly City.

Private Citizen Suggestions

David Goncharoff

- Put the entire segment underground.
- Move the lines to the other side of 280 and cross the freeway near the area that is scheduled to be underground.

Marilyn and Steve Ladas

- Underground lines
- Move lines west of 280
- No lines.

Kathleen Means

Underground the southern segment under Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard.

Robert Caletti; Ronald C. Wilson; Jerry Hearn; Leslee Hamilton; Marilyn J. Walter; Jane L. Johnson; Jane T. Johnson; John H. Johnson; Kris Carey

Alternative 1B. Also underground the existing 60 kV Transmission lines as part of the project and remove the existing towers.

Jerry Hearn

See previous comment. In addition, a generation facility nearer to the points of use and reduction of demand, especially of the concept of highly increased fees for usages significantly above the true needs of entities being supplied with electricity, should be considered.

Spencer Lowe

Place the lines underground.

Jeff Smith

Put the lines farther west.

Elly Hess

Put the utilities underground along Cañada Road. Remove the towers by helicopter and leave the cement footings in place leaving the least amount of damage.

Bob and Dorothy Young

Underground the project. Also underground the existing 60 kV transmission lines as part of the project, and, after the removal of the lines, remove the existing towers, especially from Edgewood Park and Natural Preserve.

Drew

Alternative 1B, which would eliminate the towers and move all the lines underground (as is being done with a related 12-mile segment of the project north of San Bruno. The route for Alternative 1B would be along Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard, rather than along the existing overhead easement (tower removal in sensitive areas would be done by helicopters).

Michael and Betsy Nelson

Alternative 1B – put the lines underground

Betty Oen

Underground them in our neighborhood or place them on the west side of Highway 280.

Jose Cuan

Put the lines underground or move them further away from the homes next to the lines.

Joseph Mahood

Please consider plan “B” [PG&E’s Route Option 1B] seriously.

Michael & Laura Nagle

- Install the proposed 230 kV line underground. It would be great if they could put the current 60 kV lines underground at the same time, or:
- Develop an underground or an underground/overground route, with lines underground where they are close to homes and overground where they are not near homes and move existing 60 kV lines near homes underground at same time, or
- Move power lines west of 280 where they cannot negatively impact us.

Richard Cole

No Project Alternative should include should consider the renovation existing fossil-fuel plants in San Francisco, and to create many new small natural gas plants scattered around the city, with an eye on including cogeneration.

Mr. and Mrs. Silvano G. Mazloum and Family

Install the proposed 230 kV power line underground or move the proposed power line further west and away from our homes, ideally west of Highway 280.

Heather and Chris Cordes

Run the lines underground or west of 280 away from families, homes, and schools.

Rita Seamans

Go west of 280.

Peggy Dean

Move the power lines west away from highlands, ideally west of 280.

Jon Janoska

Build local power plants

Shirley McKinnie, Carla and Sani Jadallah

Put the line underground or at least further away from our homes

Kevin McGowan

Put the line underground or at least west of the 280 freeway

Milton and Sunee Jines

Move the lines west of Hwy 280 along the watershed property. Or, the lines could be buried underground.

Tony and Judy Kwee

Properly bury the lines as far from residences and schools as possible.

Mary Jean King

Create more local electricity generation within the cities where the electricity is needed.

William H. Mahncke

Move the lines to the west at least ¼ mile or more even if they are placed underground.

Drs. Pamela Kaiser and Barry Fleisher

Move the power lines west of 280 where there are no homes, and place them underground.

Noreen Hui

Relocate the project away from residential areas and away from schools.

Pak Ho and household

Place the lines underground.

Louis and Theresa Burton

Install underground or away from the currently populated area.

William Glen

All power towers should be moved far from dwellings or the lines run underground.

Ralph and Doris Voice

Underground or overhead west of Highway 280.

Donald L. McFarland

Build a new or rebuild power-generating plant in or near San Francisco.

Dena Fisher

Power lines and towers should be located west of 280. Where the lines are near homes, they should be located underground to minimize the effects on neighborhoods.

Susanne & Edward Li

Move this power line away from residence area, west of 280 or install the 230 kV line underground.

Noelle Tan

Do not install the power lines so close to the houses.

Lauren and John Black

Put the lines underground, preferably west of 280.

Lynn & John Chakel

- Explore local generation (in San Francisco).
- Develop an underground/overground system.
- Move towers and lines west between reservoir and HMB neighborhoods.

Frank Toth

Bury the line.

Charles Lebo, Mahnaz Roshan

Have the proposed lines installed underground, and at the same time install the current 60 kV lines underground.

Raymond and Charlene Weiss and Family

Locate powerlines west of the 280 Freeway.

Donald Coyne

Underground the lines.

Howard McDonell

Underground if possible and cost were not astronomical. If new towers have to go in, push them west towards 280 and keep them as low profile as possible. Possibly install on west side of "280".

Ruth M. Anderson, Joanne Hong

Install the proposed 230 kV line underground and put the current 60 kV line underground at the same time.

Betty W. Jue and Victor Tan

Move the tower and power line away from the homes, west of 280.

Sherry & Dan Nolan

Center the development nearby at the undeveloped land and property off Skyline Boulevard away from existing homes.

Rose Yee

Move the power lines away from this area, ideally to the less densely populated areas west of Highway 280.

Bettina and Stephen Holquist

It would be ideal if there was an increase in local generation of power within San Francisco. Otherwise, move the power lines west of 280 and preferably underground.

Hugo Miranda

Go underground.

Dennis Tom, MD

Jefferson Substation – underground along Cañada Road to Edgewood Road. Then underground combined 60 kV/230 kV lines parallel and adjacent (along side) to current towers to MP 4. Lines would then somehow need to cross over 280/92 junction (? Underground or overhead across freeways). From MP 5 – Hillsdale Substation, continue underground alongside current towers. Lines would then run overhead across Crystal Springs Road to MP 7 in Hillsborough (this would avoid undergrounding at San Mateo Creek/Crystal Springs Dam areas). MP 7–MP 8 continue underground to Carolands Substation – begin overhead directly across to West side of 280 along existing rights of way (access roads all the way to MP 15 (San Bruno)/keep lines on west side of 280 between MP 10–MP 11.

Teresa Tom

Use an alternative path west of the Crystal Springs Reservoir.

Kurt and Marcena May

Put all lines underground.

Ivan and Erika Crockett

- Install the proposed 230 kV line underground and include the 60 kV line as well along PG&E's alternate route 1B (along Cañada Road south of 92, then along El Camino through Millbrae to San Bruno Avenue). Underground from the Ralston substation (near juvenile Hall, just north of 92) to the Hillsdale substation (just north of Bunker Hill) mostly along route 1A but sufficiently far away from the residences, then going overhead across the big canyon, then underground again in Hillsborough along route 1A until the Carolands substation (on Skyline just north of Black Mountain Road in Hillsborough), then cross west of 280 and continue overground, staying west of 280 from then on.
- Move the 230 kV line and the 60 kV line west of I-280.
- Develop more local (i.e., within San Francisco) power generation for increased reliability.

Karen, Andrew, and Granger Brenneman

Place the lines underground as it passes through the Crystal Springs area. The existing 60 kV line could be buried and no towers would be required at all.

Scott D. S. Young, Elisebeth Eros, Charles Kuanz, James Dawes, Sarah Le Forge, Karen Meredith, Michael Yantos, Alan Fernandez, Carolyn Dorsch, Andy Butcher, John Steiner

Undergrounding Alternative 1B for the southern portion of the project.

Perla C. Schmidt

- Move the power lines west away from our houses, west of 280 freeway.
- Put the power lines under Cañada Road and Skyline Boulevard.

Ronald Small

The route in populated areas should either be underground or on the west side of Interstate 280.

Kay Blickley Schilling

Install the proposed 230 kV lines underground, and at the same time install the current 60 kV lines underground.

Lawrence A. Smith

Put the line over on the west side of 280.

Drew Donovan

Put the new line underground or use an alternative route along the Highway 280 easement away from the homes.

Lester D. and Ruthild Candee

Retrofit Hunter's Point, using the Williams agreement generators. Or have the proposed 230 kV line put underground, away from homes, ideally west of 280.

Bruce Eimon

San Francisco should build their own power plant, or put the line underground.

Daniel

Relocate the towers to west of 280 or underground them.

Don M. Wong

Move the power line as far away from populated areas as possible. I.e., underground from the Ralston Substation (near Juvenile Hall, just north of 92) to the Hillsdale substation (just north of Bunker Hill) mostly along route 1A until the Carolands substation (on Skyline just north of Black Mountain Road in Hillsborough), and then cross west of 280 from then on.

Drew Shell

Alternative 1B would move all current and future transmission lines from the present overhead alignment to an underground alignment along Cañada Road

Frank Mak

Build the power lines underground or at the very minimum, they should be moved to the west side of Interstate 280, away from the existing homes and schools.

Gregory Stein

- Local electricity generation within the immediate San Francisco area, or
- Alternative transmission that does not result in such unsightly and potentially noise-polluting effects.

Mel and Sherie Friedman

Move the wires west of Crystal Springs or place them underground.

Min Eimon

Install an underground route or build a power plant in San Francisco.

Yuen Ling Tam, Owen Cheung

Move the power lines away from our houses or put in underground lines instead.

Yen Lee

Put the lines underground or west of the 280.

Jay Roshan

Underground all facilities.

John Minkel

Underground or relocate next to 280 or west of I280.

Dr. Paul Hsiao and Dr. Pi Ling Fan

Move the project to the west of 280.

Judy C. Kwee, Jackie Chan, Noreen Hui, Sherrie Friedman, Gail Oshima, Alejandra Virgen, Isabel Marquez, Alex Howard, Eunice Sherer, Collen M. Sullivan, Derek Vroom, Linda Vercelli, Ana Lopez, Maria Sandoval, Aurel Nagle, Donald Nagle, Anton McBurnie, Pat Garcia Luna, J. J. Garcia Luna, Lee Anne Mau, Denise Haas, Karen Li, Grace Kim, Brigitte S. Shearer, Debbie Cooper, Steve Hamaguchi, Adele C. Runcke, Emiko Fujii, Florence Yuen, Shannon Dobbs, Carolee Fucigna, Bonnie Halpern-Relsher, Connie Hamaguchi, Pam Barasch, Kandace Torreano, Julie Lord, Meire Bremer, Diane Prentiss, Janet Fuller

- Generate the power locally, in San Francisco.
- Properly underground the lines, so that the magnetic fields will be significantly reduced.

Race J. Chen

Partially bury the line, relocated to west of 280.

Ed and Elsie Carlson

We want the line undergrounded.

Mrs. Kwan Yee Liu

- The underground alternative, or
- Move the towers to the uninhabited side of 280.

Kristina Klausen

- Move the power lines west away from our houses, ideally west of 280.
- Install the proposed 230 kV line underground with proper shielding to reduce EMFs near houses. Ideally put the current 60 kV lines underground at the same time to enhance the beauty of the watershed and our community, or
- Develop an underground/overground route, with the lines underground where they are close to homes and overground where they are not near homes.

R. Nuri Otus

Move the power lines underground wherever possible.

Pamela Merkadeau

Relocate the towers or underground the power lines.

Arline Dixon

Underground part of lines close to homes.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert J. Traube

- An alternative means of delivering the power to San Francisco. For example, an underwater cable system in the Bay, or
- Construct a power generation facility within the geographic confines of San Francisco itself.

Karen M. Heaney Hook

Move these lines underground.

Janet Paslin

Put the lines underground or closer to the freeway.

George Beck

Let it be built in San Francisco or in the San Francisco area and not in Hillsborough.

Marjorie H. Palmer

Urge that all lines go underground.

James F. Mahon

The obvious solution is underground.

Sharon and Herbert Hwang

Another site would be much more appropriate (e.g. west of Highway 280).

Rita Castello

- Look for more local alternatives, or
- Make the power lines west, further away from the Highlands residential area and the Highlands School and Recreation Center, or
- Put the lines underground, or at least where they are close to the houses.

Karen Olson Stern

- Local electricity generation, which is more reliable than transmission line electricity.
- Town of Hillsborough – introduced underground/overground route.
- Move the power lines west, away from residences, preferably west of Highway 280.

Steve Shannon

If you can't bury the lines, there is a lot of land on the other side of the freeway. In fact, these same set of lines travel much of the way on the other side of the freeway already.

Patricia J. Doolittle

- Consider a second high voltage along the same existing line down by the Bay. If the point is to have a back up, the second line could be that back up. If more power is needed, the second line moving along the same towers as the first line near the Bay could be installed for that reason as well.
- If the power substations need to be updated to be more reliable or to deliver more power, then expand the substation near the line that runs along the Bay. Put the substation in a large building, if people near the substation object to the larger substation.
- New power plants and substation could be placed underground so people do not have to look at them.
- Suggestions presented by people objecting to the current plan for a new line along the 280 corridor.

Scott Buschman

Alternative routes, such as going down Hickey or Westborough, not San Bruno Avenue, and with the transition station at Highway 92. Or maybe along Highway 101 via Highway 92. Maybe have the alignment follow Highway 1 down near Serramonte Boulevard and tie in at a Daly City station.

Michelle Nemschoff

Consider using local generation. If new transmission lines must be added, the alignment should be underground as in Alternative 1B.

Paul Grech

Suggest moving the towers to the west side of I-280 or run the lines underground for aesthetic purposes.

Cathryn Carlin

Take this historic opportunity to underground the existing line.

Lennie Roberts

In favor of undergrounding along Cañada Road/Skyline Boulevard and underground the existing 60 kV in roads as well.

Lenny Low

Solution is to underground the line to eliminate EMF and aesthetic concerns.

2.5 Environmental Review and Decision Making Process

A number of suggestions and comments were made regarding the adequacy of the environmental review and decision-making process. Individuals and agencies addressed the following issues:

- A number of comments expressed concern that they had not received the NOP or any information on the project prior to hearing about the project from other individuals and wanted to make sure they could contribute to the scoping of the environmental review.¹
- Some individuals pointed out that CEQA requires that the environmental review document contain an accurate description of the entire project and that the complete scope of the project's environmental impacts cannot be determined unless the whole of the project is described. They suggested that possible future expansion of the Proposed Project to include a second 230 kV circuit should be included to ensure that the whole of the potential project is evaluated.
- Many individuals felt that the NOP failed to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project.
- A number of individuals and organizations stated that in addition to an EIR for the project, an EIS should also be prepared under NEPA for the project, as the proposed project area includes federal easements administered by the National Park Service.
- Comments were made questioning the efficacy of the CPUC's review and the environmental review process in general.
- Other comments stated that without a full evaluation of the justification for the project to be included in the discussion of the No Project Alternative, the EIR would be incomplete.

¹ All parties that submitted comments or signed the sign-in sheet at a scoping meeting have been added to the project mailing list.