APPENDIX A

Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project

Addendum to Final Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for:

California Public Utilities Commission

Prepared by:

Aspen Environmental Group
235 Montgomery Street, Suite 935
San Francisco, California 94104

August 19, 2004

A. Introduction

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed an application (Application Number A.02-09-043) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) on September 30, 2002, for the 27-mile Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project (Proposed Project). The Proposed Project involves rebuilding PG&E's existing Jefferson Substation to Martin Substation 60 kV double circuit power line. The new 60 kV/230 kV lines were proposed be overhead along I-280 from Jefferson Substation to San Bruno Avenue, and then underground to the Martin Substation.

The CPUC is the State lead agency, responsible for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The CEQA process for the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project began with the CPUC's issuance of the Notice of Preparation of an EIR on January 20, 2003, along with an extensive scoping process. In April 2003, a comprehensive Scoping Report was issued that summarized issues and concerns received from the public and various agencies and presenting copies of all written comments received. A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared by the CPUC in compliance with CEQA Guidelines and published in July 2003, with a 45-day comment period that ended on August 28, 2003.

The Final EIR, which documents the evaluation of approximately 38 alternatives, including the EIR's Environmentally Superior Alternative, was released in November 2003. The Environmentally Superior Alternative included PG&E's Route Option 1B in the southern segment and either of two Northern Segment alternatives (the Proposed Project and the Modified Underground Existing 230 kV Collocation Alternative).

B. CEQA Information

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, the purpose of this Addendum is to document changes to mitigation measures that have occurred subsequent to the release of the Final EIR. The changes that have been made to the mitigation measures are in response to concerns raised by PG&E and the City of Burlingame. The changes to the measures are only to clarify or add specificity to the text of the measures, and to ensure that the measures are feasible and can be implemented. The changes to the mitigation measures are not substantial and the impact levels presented in the Final EIR remain unchanged. As a result, no subsequent analysis or documentation is warranted. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the preparation of an Addendum pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15164 is appropriate.

C. Changes to Mitigation Measures

Changes to FEIR mitigation measures are indicated with underline or ~~strikeout~~ and a line in the margin.

Mitigation Measure Changes Requested by PG&E

Mitigation Measure G-8a. PG&E asked that Mitigation Measure G-8a be revised to state that the measure applies only to the crossing of an active trace of the San Andreas Fault. Because Mitigation Measure G-8a was intended to require the double-vault design only for the San Andreas Fault, the text

of this language has been clarified in Mitigation Measure G-8a to note that the double-vault design is specifically for the San Andreas Fault (see below). The measure has further been clarified with an additional sentence addressing the Serra Fault crossing that allows flexibility in the design than at the San Andreas Fault, but requires PG&E to take new fault analysis on the Serra Fault into consideration (see below).

G-8a **Minimize Project Structures Within Active Fault Zone.** Any crossing of an active fault (overhead or underground) shall be made as close to perpendicular to the fault as possible to make the segment cross the shortest distance within an active fault zone. For crossings of active faults with overhead transmission lines, the towers shall be placed as far as feasible outside the area of mapped fault traces.

For underground crossings of active or potentially active fault traces, the cable vaults on either side of the San Andreas Fault shall be oversized, leaving as much slack as possible in the cables (ideally enough slack to allow for 20 feet of offset ~~on the San Andreas Fault~~). If 20 feet of offset cannot be accommodated, the underground cable should be installed in the shortest feasible segments, with splice vaults located as close as possible outside of the fault zone in order to minimize the area where post-earthquake repairs may be required. Adequate supplies of spare cable sections shall be maintained by PG&E for rapid repair after an earthquake-caused failure. Vault and conduit design for an underground crossing of the Serra Fault should be based on fault parameters and expected displacement as determined from new analysis and approved by the CPUC prior to construction.

For aboveground installations such as transition stations, PG&E shall follow standard design codes for facilities in seismic zones. Compliance with this measure shall be documented to the CPUC in a report submitted for review and approval at least 60 days prior to the start of construction.

Mitigation Measure L-7a. PG&E requests that the Commission modify the FEIR's Mitigation Measure L-7a, aimed at mitigating disrupted access to businesses and residences. Mitigation Measure L-7a would require PG&E to "provide at all times the ability to quickly lay a temporary steel plate trench bridge upon request to ensure driveway access to businesses and residences, and shall provide continuous access to properties when not actively constructing the underground cable alignment." PG&E is concerned that the requirement to provide access "at all times" by "quickly" laying a temporary steel bridge over the trench may not be feasible and would affect construction schedule and project cost. PG&E maintains that compliance, to the extent feasible, may be counterproductive and could create, in certain situations, more significant adverse impact to traffic and create unsafe situations. PG&E recommends that the first clause of Mitigation Measure L-7a be deleted. As illustrated below, Mitigation Measure L-7a has been modified to still minimize access disruption to residences and businesses along the construction right-of-way, but to allow more flexibility in the construction process and to allow construction to proceed as quickly as possible.

L-7a **Provide Continuous Access to Properties.** PG&E or its construction contractor shall develop construction plans defining in detail how driveway access restrictions will be minimized. This plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval at least 30 days before construction. PG&E shall provide notification to all residents or occupants regarding anticipated access blockage at least 48 hours before any blockage occurs. ~~provide at all times the ability to quickly lay a temporary steel plate trench bridge upon request to ensure driveway access to businesses and residences, and shall provide continuous access to properties when not~~

~~actively constructing the underground cable alignment.~~ In the event that trench stability could be compromised by the laying of a temporary steel plate bridge during an early phase of trench construction, the construction contractor may defer a request for access to the soonest possible time until the stability of the trench has been assured, provided PG&E has provided 48-hour advance notification of the potential for disrupted access to any business or residence that may experience such delayed access. The notification shall include information on restoring access and the estimated amount of time that access may be blocked. ~~In addition, PG&E shall develop construction plans that will minimize driveways blocked during the workday.~~

Mitigation Measures B-5a and B-8a. PG&E requested that Mitigation Measures B-5a and B-8a be modified to include the option to obtain a permit from USFWS to remove and relocate wildlife to a wildlife shelter if other portions of the measures cannot be implemented. To add flexibility to Mitigation Measures B-5a and B-8a, the following sentence has been added to the end of the first bullet of Mitigation Measure B-5a and after the second sentence of the first paragraph of Mitigation Measure B-8a:

> If there are no feasible alternatives, the USFWS and CDFG shall be consulted and a permit obtained to relocate disturbed wildlife to a wildlife rehabilitation facility or other location specified by these agencies.

Mitigation Measure B-8b. PG&E recommended that Mitigation Measure B-8b be modified to require PG&E to recommend to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish & Game that San Mateo County be involved in any FESA Section 7 or CEAS 2080 Consultation regarding any Project-related construction that will occur in Edgewood Park or San Bruno Mountain Park. The Commission has no objections to this recommendation and has therefore incorporated the following modification to Mitigation Measure B-8b.

B-8b **Consultation with Resource Agencies.** If, after applying Mitigation Measures B-1a through B-8a, the CPUC-approved Project Biologist determines that all impacts on special status plant and wildlife species cannot be avoided, PG&E shall initiate FESA Section 7 Consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for federally listed species and/or CESA 2080 Consultation will be initiated with the California Department of Fish and Game for State-listed species. These consultations shall determine requirements for obtaining a (FWS) Biological Opinion and/or (CDFG) Incidental Take Permit. PG&E shall obtain any such required Biological Opinion or Incidental Take Permit and, in that process, shall work cooperatively with the appropriate agency or agencies to develop appropriate mitigation measures to offset impacts to the affected species. PG&E shall thereafter implement all mitigation recommendations of the FWS and/or CDFG that result from these consultations and shall provide evidence of implementation to the CPUC. In addition, if the approved project involves construction within Edgewood County Park and Preserve or San Bruno Mountain, PG&E shall recommend to the USFWS that the County of San Mateo ~~shall~~ be involved in consultation for these areas.

Mitigation Measure Changes Requested by the City of Burlingame

The City of Burlingame recommended construction noise mitigation measures. However, APM 15.1 and the Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b (land use notification) in the FEIR are sufficient to minimize the construction noise impacts to all communities, including Burlingame. Due to the problematic nature of demonstrating compliance with the suggested 85 dBA thresholds (which do not appear in the Burlingame Municipal Code), an additional mitigation measure has been developed for

Impact N-1. This measure is presented as mitigation for a Class III impact (less than significant) given that the FEIR concludes that impacts are already mitigated. However, because of the specific concerns of the City of Burlingame and the Commission's sensitivity to the community values in the affected areas, the new Mitigation Measure N-1a is as follows:

N-1a PG&E shall minimize construction noise within the City of Burlingame with the following techniques:

- All construction activity occurring within Burlingame's city limits shall not commence earlier than 7:00 a.m. and conclude no later than 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday unless otherwise approved by the City. On Saturdays such construction activity shall not commence earlier than 8:00 a.m. and conclude no later than 6:00 p.m. No construction activities shall occur on Sundays or legal holidays. These time limitations shall be adhered to at all times, except in the case of urgent necessity in the interest of public health and safety.
- PG&E shall demonstrate within Burlingame's city limits: (i) No individual piece of equipment shall produce a noise level exceeding 85 dBA at a distance of 25 feet, unless granted specific permission from the City of Burlingame City Engineer.
- PG&E shall not use pile drivers for any purposes for construction within Burlingame's city limits, unless granted specific permission from the City of Burlingame City Engineer.

Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b. The City of Burlingame also requested that additional measures be included in Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b in order to reduce the degree of impact that the project would have on the residents of Burlingame. Mitigation Measures L-4a and L-4b are considered to be adequate for mitigation of impacts, but the following additional measures have been added to Mitigation Measure L-4a in response to the City of Burlingame's specific concerns.

L-4a **Provide Construction Notification and Minimize Construction Disturbance**. PG&E or its construction contractor shall provide advance notice, between two and four weeks prior to construction, by mail to all residents or property owners within 300 feet of the alignment. The announcement shall state specifically where and when construction will occur in the area. If construction delays of more than 7 days occur, an additional notice shall be made, either in person or by mail. Notices shall provide tips on reducing noise intrusion, for example, by closing windows facing the planned construction. PG&E shall also publish a notice of impending construction in local newspapers, stating when and where construction will occur. Prior to construction, copies of all notices shall be submitted to the CPUC.

PG&E shall construct during the night in areas where a local jurisdiction requests such timing to reduce construction disruption, if it can be demonstrated that significant noise impacts would not occur. Whether requested by either PG&E or the local jurisdiction, PG&E shall provide written evidence of local jurisdiction approval to the CPUC prior to the start of any night work. PG&E shall also provide analysis of noise impacts and proposed mitigation measures for any residents or other sensitive land uses that would be affected by nighttime construction.

At least 90 days before the commencement of any construction activity within the City of Burlingame, PG&E shall hold a minimum of two public meetings, at locations to be designated by the City, in order to provide residents, businesses, and property owners with information on the construction schedule and the impacts of construction, e.g., lane/road closures, access

blockage. At such meetings, PG&E shall have available claim forms and associated information packets and shall provide such to any attendee who so requests.

No less than a week prior to the scheduled public information meetings, an announcement of such meetings shall be published, by way of a notice of not less than one quarter of the page in size, in the following publications: San Mateo County Times, Burlingame Daily News, the Independent, and the San Mateo Daily Journal.

No less than ten days prior to the commencement of construction along each residential block of Trousdale Drive and Skyline Boulevard, PG&E shall place a "door hanger" notice at each residence which provides information on the date that construction will commence, the anticipated duration of that construction, and the name and phone number of the PG&E employee to contact if the resident has any questions.

(END OF APPENDIX A)