B. PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES DESCRIPTION

This section describes the Proposed Project and alternatives that were evaluated in the Draft EIR (Section B.1), and then presents modifications to those alternatives that resulted from comments received on the Draft EIR. Appendix 2 presents copies of all comment letters and Section H presents responses to all comments. The impacts of the modified alternatives are evaluated in Final EIR Section C.

B.1 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DRAFT EIR

The Draft EIR (Section B) presented a detailed description of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E Co.) Proposed Project in the Tri-Valley area. It would consist of approximately 20.7 miles of 230 kV overhead double-circuit transmission line, approximately 2.7 miles of 230 kV underground double-circuit transmission line, two new distribution substations, modifications to an existing substation, and an underground/overhead transition station. Section B.1.1 below provides an overview of the Proposed Project (a more detailed description of the Proposed Project is presented in Section B.2 of the Draft EIR). As summarized in Section B.1.2 below, the Draft EIR analyzed several alternatives to the Proposed Project, including other 230 kV transmission routes and other substation sites.

B.1.1 PROPOSED PROJECT

The Tri-Valley 2002 Capacity Increase Project is proposed by PG&E Co. to serve the projected electric demand in the Cities of Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton, and San Ramon, and in portions of unincorporated Alameda and Contra Costa Counties adjacent to these cities (see Figure B-1).

The components of the Proposed Project are presented in four sections, one for each of the three major geographic areas of the project (Pleasanton, Dublin/San Ramon, and North Livermore), and one for the second phase of PG&E Co.'s Proposed Project (Phase 2), which is not immediately needed. Areas within the project region are also referenced as the "South Area" (Pleasanton) and "North Area" (North Livermore, Dublin/San Ramon, and Proposed Phase 2). The major elements of the Proposed Project include:

Pleasanton Area:

- Modification of the existing Vineyard Substation (in Pleasanton) to include a 230 kV transmission interconnection.
- Installation of 2.8 miles of new 230 kV overhead double-circuit transmission line and 2.7 miles of 230 kV underground double-circuit transmission line to serve the Vineyard Substation, and a transition structure to convert the 230 kV overhead transmission line to an underground cable system.

North Livermore Area:

- Construction of a proposed North Livermore Substation, located three miles north of Interstate 580, just west of the intersection of May School Road and North Livermore Avenue.

Dublin/San Ramon Area:

- Construction of a proposed Dublin Substation, located three miles north of Interstate 580 and one mile east of Tassajara Road in Contra Costa County.

North Livermore and Dublin/San Ramon Areas:

- Installation of 7.9 miles of new 230 kV overhead double-circuit transmission line in PG&E Co.'s existing vacant easement to serve the Dublin and North Livermore substations.

Phase 2 (North Livermore to Tesla):

- Construction of approximately 10 miles of new 230 kV double-circuit transmission line in PG&E Co.'s existing vacant easement from the Contra Costa-Newark 230 kV line southeast to the Tesla Substation. This would connect the Dublin and North Livermore Substations directly to the Tesla Substation but would not be required until the Phase 1 connection to the Contra-Costa Newark 230 kV line becomes overloaded.

B.1.2 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Draft EIR evaluated a set of alternatives to the proposed transmission line routes and substation sites originally proposed by PG&E Co. All of these alternatives are briefly described below and illustrated on Figure B-2. See Section B.6 of the Draft EIR for more detailed description of each alternative.

As a part of the alternatives evaluation process completed during preparation of the Draft EIR, 27 potential alternative routes or methods of providing the required increase in electricity to the region were evaluated (see Draft EIR Section B.5). Of these, 14 alternatives were eliminated because they did not offer significant environmental advantages over the Proposed Project or because they were not feasible. The 13 remaining alternatives are divided into four categories because of the geographic spread of this project: Pleasanton, Dublin/San Ramon, North Livermore, and Tesla Connection (Phase 2). The Draft EIR included analysis of four alternatives for the Pleasanton Area, two alternatives for the Dublin/San Ramon Area, three alternatives for the North Livermore Area, three alternatives to the Tesla Connection (Phase 2), as well as the No Project Alternative. In addition to these alternatives, the Draft EIR considered three modifications to alternatives that were designed to eliminate specific impacts: the S2A Alternative and the P3 Alternative.

Pleasanton Area Alternatives

- ***S1 (Vineyard-Isabel-Stanley) Alternative:*** In this alternative, the Contra Costa-Newark (CC-N) line would be tapped in the Tesla-Newark Corridor adjacent to Sycamore Grove Regional Park. The transmission line would be installed overhead from the Tesla-Newark corridor to the southwest corner of Highway 84 and Vineyard Avenue. The new 230kV line would follow the existing 60kV route. The overhead/underground transition point would be located about 100 feet southwest of the corner of Highway 84 continuing straight north to the point where it meets Vineyard Avenue. The underground line would continue on the south side of Vineyard to Isabel. It would be installed overhead along the west side of Isabel to Stanley Blvd., then turn west and be installed overhead along the north side of Stanley. It would cross Stanley Boulevard into Vineyard Substation, just before Bernal Avenue. This alternative is about 6.6 miles long with 1.1 miles underground (versus the 5.5 mile long Proposed route with 2.7 miles underground).

Figure B-1, Proposed Transmission Line Routes and Substations

Figure B-1, page 2 of 2

Figure B-2, Proposed Project and All Alternatives

Figure B-2, page 2 of 2

- ***S2 (Vineyard Avenue) Alternative:*** As with the S1 Alternative, this line would tap the CC-N line adjacent to Sycamore Grove Regional Park and be installed as an overhead 230 kV line to Highway 84. At the junction of Highway 84 and Vineyard, the S2 route would to underground along Vineyard to Bernal. Where Vineyard meets Bernal Avenue, the line would turn north on Bernal (still underground), and into the Vineyard Substation as it would in the proposed route. This alternative would be about 5.5 miles long; the first 1.5 miles would be installed overhead and the remainder underground. Note that in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the relocation of S2 (or S4) is now considered; see Section B.3.
- ***S2A (All Underground) Alternative:*** This route was developed to eliminate the significant visual and recreation impacts of the S1/S2 Alternatives in the Sycamore Grove Regional Park. It would be installed completely underground, except for an overhead-to-underground transition station adjacent to the Tesla-Newark corridor near the Del Valle Water Treatment Plant. Note that in response to comments on the Draft EIR, Alternative S2A has been revised; see Section B.2.
- ***S4 (Eastern Open Space) Alternative:*** This alternative would follow the proposed route's overhead transmission line from a tap in the Tesla-Newark Corridor, 2.2 miles to a point where S4 would turn northeasterly away from the proposed route. The route would continue northeasterly and overhead for 1.5 miles, then transition to underground for the last 0.7 mile north to Vineyard Avenue. At this point, the S4 route would turn west on Vineyard, still underground, and follow the S2 route along the south side of Vineyard Avenue and Bernal into the Vineyard Substation. The total length of this alternative (from the Tesla-Newark tap to the Vineyard Substation) would be about 6.6 miles.
- ***LG (Local Generation) Alternative:*** At the time of Draft EIR preparation, there were three potential generation projects in the Tri-Valley area, two in Pleasanton and one in Livermore. Each would involve construction of an under-50 MW natural gas turbine power plant. If constructed by mid-2002, the Pleasanton projects could defer the Vineyard Substation upgrade and associated transmission upgrade for one to two years, depending on demand growth. The impact assessment for the LG Alternative is summarized in Section C.13 of the Draft EIR.

Dublin/San Ramon Area Alternatives

- ***D1 (South Dublin) Alternative:*** The South Dublin Substation would be located between Fallon and Tassajara Roads, north of the I-580. It would be about 2,600 feet west of Fallon Road, about 1,000 feet north of the I-580 and immediately south of (and adjacent to) the future extension of Dublin Boulevard. The 230kV transmission line connection would be from the Vineyard Substation in the south. Starting at the Vineyard Substation, the transmission line would go north across Stanley until it reached the north side of the paved east-west roadway into the gravel area. Then it turns east for 0.25 miles to the corner, then it turns north for 0.35 miles. At this point, the route follows El Charro Road through the gravel quarries and continues to the south side of the I-580 interchange. At this point, the line would transition to underground, turning west to follow the south side of the Caltrans ROW, turning north and crossing the freeway one half mile west of Fallon Road.
- ***D2 (Dublin-San Ramon) Alternative:*** PG&E Co.'s proposed Dublin Substation would be fed from the west (from PG&E Co.'s existing San Ramon Substation). The 230kV line from Dublin to San Ramon would follow PG&E Co.'s vacant ROW. Approximately one mile of the westernmost part of the route (from the ridgeline into PG&E Co.'s existing San Ramon Substation) would be installed underground. In addition, the San Ramon-Pittsburg line (a single circuit 230kV line) would need to be reconductored along its entire length (approximately 20 miles) along with some minor upgrades to the San Ramon Substation to increase power into the substation.

North Livermore Area Alternatives

- ***P1 (Variant on the Proposed Project):*** This alternative is identical to the Proposed Project, except that the one mile of north-south 230 kV transmission line along North Livermore Road would be installed underground. Two overhead/underground transition stations (one for each circuit) would be located just southwest of the corner of North Livermore Road and Manning Road.

- ***P2 (Variant on the Proposed Project):*** This alternative follows the route of the Proposed Project, but would require underground installation of two components: (a) the 230 kV transmission line between the CC-N line (at its tap near Milepost B10.4) and approximately Milepost B13.2 (about 2.8 miles across north valley), and (b) the north-south 230 kV transmission line just west of North Livermore Road (about one mile).
- ***P3 (May School Road):*** This underground route would be 2.4 miles long and would follow May School Road, east from the Proposed Livermore Substation to the Contra Costa-Newark transmission line (where a transition station would be installed). Note that in response to comments, modifications to this alternative have been made; see Section B.5.
- ***L1 (Raymond Road) Alternative:*** It would start at a tap to the CC-N line at the northeast corner of Ames Street and Raymond Road. A transition structure would take the line underground at that corner, and the line would run underground to the west for 1 mile to the corner of Raymond Road and Lorraine Road. The North Livermore Substation would be located just northeast of this corner, immediately east of the farm/barn property that is just north of the Raymond/Lorraine Road corner.
- ***L2 (Hartman Road) Alternative:*** The 230kV transmission line route would be the same as for S1 above, but rather than turning west on Stanley Boulevard, the line would continue north for an additional 1.7 miles along the Highway 84 corridor to the I-580 junction. Between Stanley Boulevard and Jack London Boulevard, the line would be installed overhead and then from Jack London Boulevard north it would be underground. The underground line would turn west to a location just west of the Water Reclamation Plant and east of the end of the airport runways, cross Airway Boulevard at an angle to the northeast, then turn north again along Kitty Hawk. The line continues across I-580 and would continue underground approximately one to 1.3 miles north of I-580 to a North Livermore substation study zone in the southwest corner of the North Livermore development area, near Las Positas College. The whole study zone is adjacent to and immediately southeast of the future Hartman Road. The substation would occupy a five-acre site in the study zone.

Tesla Connection (Phase 2)

- ***Brushy Peak Alternative Segment:*** Based on input from the East Bay Regional Parks District, an alternative to a portion of the proposed Phase 2 route south of Brushy Peak Preserve was proposed to reduce visual impacts at the entrance of the park. However, as discussed in Section B.6, this alternative has been eliminated from consideration due to the Park District's acquisition of additional land south of the Preserve.
- ***T1/Stanislaus Corridor Alternative:*** A new 230 kV double circuit line would be constructed from Tesla Substation to the tap point of the selected alternative (either at about Milepost V17 for the proposed route or S4 alternative or near Milepost V14 for the S1 or S2 alternatives). This route would be about 14.2 miles long (if combined with the S1 or S2 alternatives) or 17.3 miles long (if combined with the proposed route or the S4 alternative). The Stanislaus Corridor is currently occupied by two parallel lattice tower lines that would be replaced with one set of tubular steel towers. At Tesla Junction, where the Stanislaus towers continue east across the Valley, the new line would turn northeast, for 2.1 miles into the Tesla Substation, paralleling an existing 115kV lattice line. This alternative would replace the 10 miles of PG&E Co.'s new Phase 2 Northern Corridor.
- ***T2/Switching Station Alternative****:* This alternative would involve construction of a switching station to allow direct connection of the new 230 kV transmission lines (proposed or alternative routes) that originate in the south adjacent to the existing Tesla-Newark Corridor to the existing Tesla-Newark 230 kV transmission line. The existing Tesla-Newark line, while also a 230 kV line, is rated at approximately 1000 MVA[1], which is much higher than the Proposed Project's amperage. This existing line has bundled conductors had has ratings of 988 MVA in normal conditions and 1216 MVA in emergencies. Power flow modeling has been completed by the California ISO to ensure that this line is capable of supplying the switching station and the Vineyard

[1] MVA: megavoltamperes, is defined as the apparent power of the line. MVA is composed of both real power (measured in megawatts or MW) and reactive power (measured in megavoltamperes reactive or MVAR). The cable circuit rating (expressed in MVA) is the apparent power rating. In comparison, the proposed 230 kV line could carry 400 MVA per circuit in underground segments.

Substation without overloading during contingencies. The impact assessment for this alternative is summarized in Section C.13 of the Draft EIR.

In addition to the alternatives described above, the **No Project Alternative** was evaluated for impacts of the actions that would occur if the Proposed Project were not constructed. The demand for electrical service in the Tri-Valley area would still grow and either the electricity would be supplied by other means (e.g., reconductoring of any available lines or local generation plants) or electrical service quality would quickly decline.

B.1.3 ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF SECTION B

The remainder of this section describes potential changes to alternatives that resulted from comments on the Draft EIR. The environmental analysis of these changes is presented in Section C of this Final EIR.

- **Section B.2** addresses a modification of the S2A Alternative in the vicinity of the Del Valle Water Treatment Plant.
- **Section B.3** addresses the suggested modification of either the S2 or S4 Alternatives to use a portion of "New Vineyard Avenue" that will be relocated in the near future.
- **Section B.4** addresses an alternative called the S5 (Quarry Route) Alternative that would follow the existing 60 kV line to the Iuka Substation from New Vineyard Avenue, and then continue north to Stanley Boulevard. This route could be used in combination with either the S2 or S4 Alternatives.
- **Section B.5** describes a modification to the P3 Alternative in North Livermore.
- **Section B.6** addresses the Brushy Peak Alternative, an alternative to the Proposed Project's Phase 2 transmission line route.
- **Section B.7** describes the potential removal of an existing 60 kV line along Vineyard Avenue; this would be a benefit of certain alternatives that could be considered for implementation by the Commission.

B.2 MODIFIED S2A ALTERNATIVE

The S2A Alternative was developed in response to the identification of significant and unavoidable impacts for the S1/S2 Alternatives in Sycamore Grove Regional Park. These impacts were identified in the land use and visual resources sections of the Draft EIR (Sections C.7.3.2 and C.12.3.2.2, respectively). As evaluated in Draft EIR Section C.13.3.2, the S2A Alternative would have moved the new 230 kV transmission line about one half mile to the west, from the center of Sycamore Grove Regional Park to land adjacent to and within the Del Valle Water Treatment Plant. This reroute would have been entirely underground (after the initial one-half acre overhead-to-underground transition station). In Phase 1, there would have been a transition station where the overhead Contra Costa-Newark line would be taken underground (immediately southeast of the water plant), then an underground transmission line from that point to the north where the route would meet the original S1/S2 Alternative route. In Phase 2, there could be a one-acre switching station (as identified and evaluated in Draft EIR Section C.13.1.2) near this site, where power from the Tesla-Newark transmission line would have been converted to the appropriate amperage.

Comments on the Draft EIR pointed out that the land southeast of the Del Valle Water Treatment Plant had been acquired by the Livermore Area Regional Parks District and is now part of Sycamore Grove Regional Park, as illustrated on Figure B-3. As a result, the overhead-to-underground transition station (Phase 1) and the switching station (Phase 2) would have been located on LARPD land. In addition, the Del Valle Treatment Plant, which previously had agreed to consider use of its land for the underground transmission line, stated in its Draft EIR comment letter that such use was no longer acceptable. As a result, the S2A Alternative segment has been modified, as illustrated in Figure B-3.

As illustrated in Figure B-3, the S2A Alternative would begin at the existing Contra Costa-Newark transmission line southwest of the water plant, on private property. It would require an approximately 1-mile long transmission line to reach the S1/S2 route adjacent to Sycamore Grove Regional Park. Three possible transmission line options were considered for the modified S2A Alternative (see descriptions below), but all three options would be the same in the northernmost 0.6 miles. In that northern area, the transmission line would be installed underground, west/northwest of Foley Road and outside of the roadway right-of-way. In this manner, the line would not conflict with Zone 7's existing or future pipelines, nor would the stability of any portion of the road be jeopardized. The three options for installation of the southern 0.4 miles are the following:

1. **Underground Within Foley Road.** Based on a desire to minimize impacts on adjacent landowners (the Zone 7 water plant on the east and the two privately-owned parcels to the west), the initial approach was to construct the underground transmission line within the roadway right-of-way for the southernmost 0.4 miles. However, upon PG&E Co.'s investigation of existing utilities within the road, it was determined that an underground line in this area would conflict with an existing subsurface drainage and water collection system operated by Zone 7. Therefore, underground transmission line construction within the road was determined to be infeasible.

2. **Overhead West of Foley Road**. The most effective way to avoid disturbing the subsurface drainage system adjacent to the road and west of the Zone 7 plant would be to install an overhead 230 kV transmission line to a point north of the subsurface drains. In this option, the Contra Costa-Newark transmission line would be tapped at the same location shown on Figure B-3 for the overhead-underground transition station. The overhead line would be installed on 2 or 3 tubular steel towers (each up about 80-100 feet tall) immediately west of the road right-of-way, terminating at an overhead-underground transition station located about 1,000 feet north of the Contra Costa-Newark transmission line. This location for the transition station was selected to minimize the visibility of the station from the surrounding area.

3. **Underground West of Foley Road.** The third option for constructing the transmission line through this area (illustrated on the enlarged inset on Figure B-3) is to install the underground line immediately west of the road, within the two private property parcels. The line would be installed within the currently disturbed and vacant unvegetated area along the eastern property lines of Parcels 10 and 12, where a 40-foot wide easement would be required by PG&E to

Figure B-3, Modified S2A Alternative

Figure B-3, page 2

protect the transmission line from future encroachment. While this option would encumber this portion of the private property, there would be no visible strictures on the private land and the current (agricultural) land uses would be unaffected. This portion of these parcels cannot be developed or used for any purposes other than agriculture due to land use restrictions. Therefore, no loss of use would be incurred by the landowners, and they would be compensated for the value of the easement required by PG&E Co.

The impacts of the modified S2A Alternative are evaluated in Final EIR Section C.1.

B.3 RELOCATION OF S2 OR S4 ALTERNATIVES TO "NEW VINEYARD AVENUE"

The Draft EIR's environmentally superior alternative in the Southern Area was the S2 Alternative with the S2A segment, resulting in an all-underground route that would essentially follow Vineyard Avenue. Comments on the Draft EIR pointed out that Vineyard Corridor Specific Plan, approved by the City of Pleasanton, included proposed development of residential areas along Vineyard Avenue and construction of a new elementary school (Neal Elementary) in the same corridor. In conjunction with this construction, 1.5 miles of Vineyard Avenue will be relocated to the northeast, so it runs immediately adjacent to Arroyo Del Valle Creek. Along the southwest side of "New Vineyard Avenue" there would be an open space buffer of approximately 200 to 400 feet where no residences would be constructed. Because of the greater distance to residences and to the proposed Neal Elementary School buildings (which are proposed to be located closer to "Old Vineyard Avenue"), commenters suggested that the S2 Alternative transmission line route be moved to "New Vineyard Avenue." Figure B-4 illustrates the location of New and Old Vineyard Avenues and the location of Neal Elementary School.

In this same area, the description of a portion of the S2 Alternative was incorrectly described in the Draft EIR. The correct description follows (from Draft EIR Section B.6.1.2; second bullet indicates correction):

- From Highway 84, the underground route would be located in the firebreak road south of Vineyard, past Isabel Avenue (where a bored crossing beneath the roadway would likely be required) to the western boundary of the Ruby Hill property (where the fire station is located).
- From the fire station, where the road narrows to the west, the transmission line would be installed to the north of the roadway, at the base of the slope adjacent to the roadway (the Draft EIR incorrectly stated this segment as being south of the road).

Where (Old) Vineyard becomes a divided roadway, the transmission line would be installed within the roadway (with the actual final location to be determined in consultation with the City of Pleasanton as required in Mitigation Measure S-1). While the Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan was considered in the Draft EIR, based on the comments received on the Draft EIR regarding the Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan development, two modifications to the S2 Alternative are evaluated in this Final EIR: (1) the use of "New Vineyard Avenue" rather than "Old Vineyard" for the S2 and S4 routes, and (2) the relocation of the original S2 (and S4) route from outside of the Old Vineyard Avenue roadway to within the roadway (which will become a limited-access roadway with recreational

and local access uses), to minimize disturbance and loss of land affecting the landowners adjacent to the roadway. The Vineyard Avenue Corridor Specific Plan area also includes the location where the S4 Alternative would join Vineyard Avenue, so the "New Vineyard" corridor is also evaluated for the relevant segment of the S4 Alternative (as illustrated in Figure B-4). These issues are evaluated in Section C.2.

B.4 S5 QUARRY ALTERNATIVE

Draft EIR Section B.5.4.1.5 explains that a suggested alternative route through the gravel quarries was eliminated from consideration due to quarry operations, visual impacts, and potential land instability. Based on comments on the Draft EIR, this route has been reconsidered, and is illustrated on Figure B-4. A route and tower locations have been developed in conjunction with the quarry operator to minimize impacts on quarry operations. This route is further east than the route considered in the Draft EIR, so there is no risk to the line from the potentially unstable cliff along the east end of Shadow Cliffs' Lake. Visual impacts have been evaluated in detail and are addressed in Section C.3 of this Final EIR.

The S5 Quarry Route would start from either the S2 or S4 Alternatives along New Vineyard Avenue, turning north at the location where the existing 60 kV line crosses Del Valle Creek. The line would be installed underground at the creek crossing by means of an open-trenched crossing which would end at a transition station located on quarry land where the line would be brought to overhead towers. From the transition station (a half-acre fenced site), three tubular steel transmission poles would be required on quarry land (approximate pole locations are illustrated on Figure B-4), with the fourth pole north of Stanley Boulevard. The line would continue overhead on the north side of Stanley Boulevard (following the S1 Alternative route), crossing back to the south into the Vineyard Substation.

In comparison to the S2/S4 Alternatives which would continue underground on Vineyard Avenue, this route would eliminate about 1.7 miles of underground line (along Vineyard and Bernal Avenues and into the substation), replacing that segment with approximately 0.2 miles of underground (the crossing below Del Valle Creek) and 1.8 miles of overhead line.

Draft EIR comments also suggested that a quarry route be installed underground. Due to the active quarry work that will be ongoing in this area for many years, an underground route would not be feasible.

The potential impacts of the S5 Quarry Route are presented in Section C.3.

B.5 MODIFICATION OF P3 ALTERNATIVE

Draft EIR Section C.13.3.1 evaluated the P3 Alternative, an all-underground route that would generally follow May School Road east from the Proposed Livermore Substation. Comments on the Draft EIR pointed out landslide concerns at the easternmost point of this route, so the route has been modified

Figure B-4, S5 Alternative and Vineyard Avenue Alternative Realignments

Figure B-4, page 2

slightly by moving the easternmost part slightly to the north and utilizing more stable and less steep terrain. Figure B-5 illustrates the original and modified P3 Alternative routes.

B.6 BRUSHY PEAK ALTERNATIVE

The Brushy Peak Alternative, as described in Draft EIR Section B.6.4.1, was created in order to remove PG&E Co.'s Proposed Phase 2 transmission line route from the East Bay Regional Park District's Brushy Peak Preserve. The route was developed in conjunction with park planners. However, according to Draft EIR comment letters, subsequent to developing this alternative, the Brushy Peak Preserve acquired additional land that would result in the Brushy Peak Alternative being located within Preserve boundaries. Therefore, this alternative can no longer serve the purpose for which it was created (to remove the Phase 2 transmission line from the Preserve). Because the Draft EIR considers two Phase 2 alternatives that would not affect Brushy Peak Preserve at all (the T1/Stanislaus Corridor Alternative and the T2/Switching Station alternative), the Brushy Peak Alternative has been eliminated from consideration.

B.7 POTENTIAL REMOVAL OF 60 KV LINE ALONG VINEYARD AVENUE

Parts of the S1, S2, and S4 Alternatives would parallel an existing 60 kV powerline that runs from the Tesla-Newark Corridor in Sycamore Grove Regional Park to the Vineyard Substation, primarily along Vineyard Avenue. This 60 kV power line is 5.6 miles long between the park and the Vineyard Substation, and is shown on Draft EIR Figure A-2 (Existing Tri-Valley Power Lines and Substations). Along much of its length, the poles supporting the 60 kV line also support 21 kV distribution lines (the distribution circuit is on the lower position and the 60 kV circuit on the top of the poles). The 60 kV line along Vineyard Avenue would no longer be required to serve the Vineyard Substation after the Proposed Project (or an alternative) is operational. The 21 kV distribution line would still be needed, but the approximately 1.3 mile long portion adjacent to the Vineyard Corridor Specific Plan would be moved underground by the developer of that area.

PG&E Co. has offered to remove the entire 5.6-mile long 60 kV line if the CPUC adopts the S4/S5 Alternatives described in Section B.4 above. However, because the 21 kV distribution circuit is on the same poles, removal of the 60 kV line would not result in elimination of all of the poles. The poles would remain along 4.3 miles of this route; in these areas, the 60 kV line would be removed from the top of the poles and the poles would be "topped" (the part above the supports for the distribution lines would be cut off). The visual impact of the shorter poles would be somewhat reduced. However, in the 1.3-mile long area of the Vineyard Corridor Specific Plan, the poles would be completely removed and the lines moved underground by the developer.

The 60 kV line is addressed herein for two reasons:

(1) The 60 kV line passes both south and west of the proposed Neal Elementary School site. Because the line makes a turn to the north at the southwest corner of the school site, it follows two sides of the school lot. State law requires a 100-foot setback from a 60 kV power line on school property, so the existence of this line

means that the School District would lose the use of one acre of their approximately 13-acre parcel. The elimination of the 60 kV line around the school would allow full use of the school parcel.

(2) The 60 kV line passes adjacent to and in places, directly through, the housing development and mobile home park north of Vineyard Avenue and east of Bernal Avenue.

This potential removal of the 60 kV line for 5.6 miles (and the complete removal of poles and distribution circuits for 1.3 miles) is a project benefit that will be considered by the CPUC. However, because the suggestion for line removal did not result from environmental impact analysis or the need for mitigation of identified impacts (the EIR alternatives along Vineyard Avenue are all underground), line removal is not specifically required in this EIR. The potential benefit of line removal may be considered by the CPUC in its Decision on the Tri-Valley project, as this removal could be considered a contribution to enhancement of "community values" which are within the CPUC's jurisdiction for the General Proceeding.

Insert Figure B-5, Modified P3 Alternative and Other North Livermore Alternatives, page 1 of 2

Figure B-5, Modified P3 Alternative, page 2 of 2