

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

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

TRANS BAY CABLE

DRAFT EIR MEETING

City Council Chambers of City Hall

65 Civic Avenue

Pittsburg, California

June 14, 2006

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, SHORTHAND REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING

2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MEETING PRESENTERS

2 Joan Lamphier, Project Planner

3 Garrett Evans, Manager, Pittsburg Power Company

4 Robert Ray, EIR Project Manager, URS

5 Randy Jerome, Planning Consultant

6 ---oOo---

7 EXHIBITS

8 Speaker slips for:

9 Greg Feere

10 David Fierberg

11 Mike Lengyel

12 Kristina Lawson

13

14 Power Point Presentation

15 ---oOo---

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. JEROME: Good evening. I'd like to
3 welcome you all to the Trans Bay Cable Project Draft
4 Environmental Impact Report public comment meeting.

5 My name is Randy Jerome. I'm the former Planning
6 and Building Director for the City of Pittsburg. I'm
7 now under contract with the City since I've been
8 working on this Project for the last two years. And I
9 kept on through the planning process to help assist the
10 City on the technical portion of that.

11 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive
12 comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for
13 uses by our consultant, who will then take those
14 comments and respond to them which will then be used
15 for the Final Environment Impact Report.

16 We've had a number of meetings relative to this
17 project. Because this project runs from Pittsburg to
18 San Francisco with cable in the Bay, we've held a
19 number of meetings over in San Francisco. In fact,
20 last week we held a very similar meeting on comments
21 over at the Potrero Hills section of San Francisco.
22 And this is the duplicate meeting here in Pittsburg to
23 receive those comments.

24 The comment period will end on June 26th.
25 Tonight's meeting primarily is to hear verbal comments,

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 but you are also allowed to later then provide written
2 comments on the document itself.

3 With that introduction -- and by the way, the City
4 of Pittsburg is what's called the lead agency for the
5 Environmental Impact Report process under the
6 California Environmental Quality Act. As such, we are
7 the primary agency that has discretionary permitting
8 approval.

9 There are a number of other agencies that require
10 permits for this, but since Pittsburg is with the
11 proponent for the land use approvals here in the city
12 of Pittsburg, we are responsible then for the
13 preparation of the environmental document. The
14 document will then have to be certified by the
15 Pittsburg City Council and will be used by the other
16 agency, what's called a responsible agency.

17 With that, I'd like to introduce Garrett Evans.
18 He is the general manager of the Pittsburg Power
19 Company and he'll explain Pittsburg Power Company's
20 role.

21 MR. EVANS: Thank you, Randy. As he said, my
22 name is Garrett Evans. I'm the general manager of the
23 Pittsburg Power Company. Welcome to Pittsburg and our
24 city hall.

25 The Pittsburg Power Company is a municipal utility

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 that has operations in Pittsburg and Mare Island and
2 Vallejo. We started in 1996 and have grown quite a bit
3 since.

4 The Power Company's involvement with the Trans Bay
5 Cable Project started two and a half years ago. And
6 approximately two years ago the City of Pittsburg, in a
7 different capacity -- the Power Company's different
8 entity -- was, as Randy said, the lead agency.

9 The deliberate environmental review process
10 started with a Notice of Preparation. Joan Lamphier
11 will touch on that in a moment.

12 The Power Company itself, why are we here? Why
13 are we doing this? We really view this Trans Bay Cable
14 Project as an excellent opportunity to address
15 transmission congestion in the Bay Area. It also
16 offers a wonderful opportunity because we are so close
17 to a great point here. I know that's going to be
18 touched on as well.

19 So thank you again for coming and Randy, you're
20 up.

21 MR. JEROME: Thank you, Garrett. Next we're
22 going to go into the presentation of the summary of the
23 Environmental Impact Report, the Draft EIR. I'd like
24 to introduce Robert Ray from the URS Corporation.

25 Mr. Ray is the project manager for the preparation

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 of this document and he is essentially responsible for
2 the City of Pittsburg for this preparation. So he is
3 the consultant that has prepared this document.
4 Robert.

5 MR. RAY: Thank you, Randy. Good evening.
6 Again, I'm Robert Ray. I'm with URS Corporation and
7 I'm the project manager for preparation of the
8 Environmental Impact Report for the Trans Bay Cable
9 Project working on behalf of the city of Pittsburg as
10 the lead agency for CEQA compliance.

11 The Draft EIR was prepared for the City of
12 Pittsburg, as I said, in accordance with the Notice of
13 Preparation, which was issued in August of 2004. And
14 also we've considered the comments that were received
15 on the Notice of Preparation, and we also considered
16 input from various federal state and local agencies
17 that were informally consulted with and coordinated
18 with back when we were scoping the EIR.

19 The Draft EIR assesses construction and operation
20 of the proposed project and alternatives in Pittsburg
21 and San Francisco, including a converter station site
22 on each end for multiple converter station sites. But
23 it would ultimately, if the project were approved, be
24 one converter station in Pittsburg and one in San
25 Francisco. You can kind of think of a converter

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 station being similar to an electrical substation.

2 The other alternatives considered include onshore
3 electrical cable routes and temporary construction
4 laydown areas. The EIR also considers the proposed
5 approximately 56-mile long submarine high voltage
6 direct current cable route between Pittsburg and San
7 Francisco, the vast majority of which would be buried
8 in the bottom of the Bay in connecting waterways.

9 Project alternatives addressed include alternate
10 converter station sites, onshore AC/DC cable routes,
11 and temporary construction laydown areas.

12 In summary, the proposed Project as defined by
13 Trans Bay Cable LLC is an approximately 56-mile-long
14 400 megawatt high voltage direct current submarine
15 cable in San Francisco Bay in connecting waterways
16 between the terminus near the City of Pittsburg and a
17 terminus in San Francisco in the vicinity of Potrero
18 Point.

19 The proposed Project would transmit electrical
20 power from a converter station in Pittsburg to a
21 converter station in San Francisco providing a
22 dedicated connection between the PG&E Pittsburg
23 substation, which is fed by sufficient generating and
24 transmission capacity, and the PG&E Potrero substation
25 in San Francisco.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 I'm now going to talk about Project need and
2 objectives. The electrical power that would be
3 delivered would help meet San Francisco's projected
4 electrical demand for 2012 for at least projected 40
5 years or more.

6 The proposed Project is designed to be a
7 cost-effective, energy-efficient solution to address
8 San Francisco's need for additional transmission
9 capacity while improving transmission reliability and
10 load serving capability.

11 The proposed Trans Bay Cable Project is one of
12 three transmission system reinforcements identified by
13 the California Independent System Operator, also known
14 as CAISO, to meet the long term reliable load serving
15 plan in Northern San Mateo County in San Francisco.
16 The other two Projects are the Jefferson Martin
17 Transmission Line and the San Francisco Electric
18 Reliability Project. The CAISO has determined that all
19 three projects are needed.

20 The primary goal of the project is to deliver
21 electricity to San Francisco to meet projected demand.
22 The proposed Project would be expected to meet the
23 CAISO Planning and Reliability Standards, decrease
24 transmission grid congestion in the East Bay, reduce
25 transmission losses, and increase the overall security

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 and reliability of the electrical system and also to
2 provide potential savings to ratepayers.

3 I'm now going to talk about the key Project
4 components. The proposed Project is made up of the
5 following primary components; installation of an
6 approximately 57-mile long new high voltage direct
7 current cable system, of which about 56 miles is
8 submarine in the Bay and connecting waterways and about
9 approximately 1 mile on shore, depending on what
10 alternative you look at.

11 It would involve construction of two new converter
12 stations as I said; one in San Francisco and one in
13 Pittsburg. The proposed Project would include
14 installation of approximately 0.3 mile of underground
15 double-circuit 115 kV -- kilovolt, that's kV -- AC
16 transmission cable and/or overhead transmission line in
17 San Francisco; installation of approximately 4.2 miles
18 of new submarine and 1.3 miles of
19 underground/aboveground single-circuit 230 kV high
20 voltage alternating current transmission cable line in
21 Pittsburg.

22 It would also involve construction of a new access
23 road for the proposed Standard Oil converter station
24 and site in Pittsburg which would connect the proposed
25 converter station site to the Pittsburg-Antioch Highway

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 to the south and would also involve temporary use of
2 one or more construction laydown areas on previously
3 disturbed sites in San Francisco and Pittsburg.

4 I'm now going to talk about the contents and give
5 you a summary of the contents and the organization of
6 the Draft EIR.

7 The Draft EIR is presented in two volumes due to
8 its size and the amount of material that needs to be
9 covered. Volume 1 includes Sections 1 through 11 as
10 well as Appendix A, which is the detailed project
11 description. If you want to just get a quick summary
12 and an overview of what the Project is and what the
13 impact findings are and a discussion of the
14 environmentally superior alternative etc. I would
15 recommend if you haven't done so already that you look
16 at Section 1 which is the executive summary which gives
17 you a good overview. There's a brief summary project
18 description presented in Section 3, and again if you
19 want more detail you should refer to Appendix A.

20 Fee sections for the impact assessment in Chapter
21 4 addresses the impact assessment, including baseline
22 conditions; impact findings, including proposed
23 mitigation measures in Chapter 4. The impact
24 assessments for the project alternatives is presented
25 in Section 5, and a comparison of all alternatives, the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 proposed Project, the alternatives considered and the
2 No Project Alternative are presented in Chapter 6. And
3 you can see there are various other sections but I
4 think those are the key sections.

5 Okay. Volume 2 includes Technical Appendices B
6 through K beginning with B as a copy of the Notice of
7 Preparation, the responses that were received to the
8 Notice of Preparation and a summary of the scoping
9 meetings, the comments that were received at the
10 scoping meetings.

11 Appendix C includes key CAISO documents. Appendix
12 D includes air quality emission calculations. Appendix
13 E is the sediment characterization report for the
14 submarine cable route in the Bay for the specific study
15 that was done for this project to obtain samples to be
16 analyzed as to their constituents.

17 Appendix F presents supplemental biological
18 information. Appendix G presents a cultural resources
19 technical report. It actually includes two reports.
20 One deals with archeological resources and the other
21 one deals with historic resources.

22 Appendix H presents the noise studies that were
23 conducted for the converter stations, including
24 alternatives. Appendix I includes a litany of
25 potentially applicable hazardous material regulations

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 for the project. Appendix J presents a paleontological
2 resources technical report. Appendix K, the final
3 appendix in the Draft EIR, presents information on
4 electrical and magnetic fields.

5 Okay. The Draft EIR addresses the following
6 environmental resource topics: Air quality, geologic
7 resources and soils, water resources and quality,
8 terrestrial biological resources, marine biological
9 resources, cultural resources, land use and recreation,
10 marine transportation and commercial fishing, traffic
11 and transportation, noise and vibration, public
12 services and utilities, visual resources, hazardous
13 materials and waste management and finally
14 paleontological resources.

15 I'm now going to summarize the impact findings
16 that are presented in the Draft EIR. Numerous
17 potentially significant environmental impacts are
18 identified in the Draft EIR for construction and/or
19 operation of the proposed Project and alternatives,
20 including converter stations and the submarine cable
21 route.

22 With implementation of the proposed mitigation
23 measures, all but one of the identified potentially
24 significant impacts for the proposed Project would be
25 reduced to less-than-significant levels.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 With implementation of the proposed mitigation
2 measures, almost all of the identified potentially
3 significant impacts for the Project alternatives would
4 also be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

5 I'm now going to talk about the findings in the
6 EIR regarding unavoidable adverse significant impacts
7 for the proposed Project.

8 Construction of the proposed HWC converter station
9 in San Francisco would require the demolition of two
10 warehouses that are eligible for listing as historic
11 resources. And they are associated with the
12 once-present Western Sugar Refinery that dates back to
13 the 1920s.

14 The proposed Project would also potentially
15 require demolition of some portion of the Station A
16 Complex on the adjacent Mirant property to the north of
17 the HWC site for the routing of the cable from the
18 converter station to the PG&E Potrero substation.
19 Demolition of these structures would constitute a
20 significant impact.

21 Construction of the proposed Pittsburg Standard
22 Oil converter station would not result in any
23 identified unavoidable adverse significant impacts, but
24 it would require dredging at two locations in New York
25 Slough and would involve more biological impacts than

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the other alternatives considered in Pittsburgh.

2 Construction and operation of the proposed
3 submarine cable system would not result in any
4 identified unavoidable adverse significant impacts.

5 Now I'm going to talk about unavoidable adverse
6 significant impact findings for the Project
7 alternatives that are considered in the EIR.

8 Construction of the alternative San Francisco
9 Mirant converter station would require demolition of
10 the Station A Complex as part of the Project -- that's
11 what I spoke about previously for the cable route from
12 the proposed HWC site. The same Station A Complex
13 would be impacted and would need to be demolished were
14 any of the three layouts on the Mirant San Francisco
15 property selected.

16 Mirant already has plans to demolish these
17 buildings. They've been told that they need to either
18 seismic retrofit or demolish the buildings, and they're
19 in the process I believe of trying to get approvals.
20 But for the purposes of this EIR, we've assumed that
21 the Trans Bay Cable Project would need to demolish
22 those buildings. That's kind of a worse-case scenario.

23 Again, the Station A Complex is considered
24 historic by the City and County of San Francisco and
25 demolition of these structures similar to the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 warehouses on the HWC property would constitute a
2 significant impact.

3 Construction and operation of the alternative San
4 Francisco Sheedy converter station would not result in
5 any identified unavoidable adverse significant impacts.

6 Construction and operation of the alternative
7 Pittsburg West 10th Street Alternative 1 which is
8 oriented east/west and the Pittsburg Mirant converter
9 stations would not result in any identified unavoidable
10 adverse significant impacts.

11 Construction of the alternative Pittsburg West
12 Tenth Street Alternative 2 -- which is oriented
13 north/south -- converter station would result in an
14 unavoidable adverse noise impact to the residents south
15 of West 10th Street, and that would be due to
16 pile-driving activities which would occur during the
17 construction phase over an estimated approximately
18 three-month period for the Pittsburg sites.

19 Operation of the alternative Pittsburg West 10th
20 Street Alternative 2 converter station would also
21 result in an unavoidable adverse visual impact due
22 primarily to its proximity to West 10th Street and the
23 residences to the south of West Tenth Street.

24 Now I'm going to talk about the findings in the
25 EIR regarding the environmentally superior alternative.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 The No Project Alternative would result in the
2 fewest environmental impacts but it is incapable of
3 meeting the project objectives including those of the
4 CAISO.

5 The Trans Bay Cable Project is considered by the
6 City of Pittsburg to be the only feasible alternative
7 for meeting the project and CAISO objectives at this
8 point in time. It is difficult to determine which of
9 the Trans Bay Cable Project converter site alternatives
10 in San Francisco and Pittsburg is the environmentally
11 superior alternative due to their similar environmental
12 impacts.

13 I'm now going to talk about the pros and cons for
14 the San Francisco converter station sites.

15 The Sheedy site avoids significant impacts to
16 historic architectural resources associated with the
17 proposed HWC and alternative Mirant sites in San
18 Francisco. However, the required electrical connection
19 to the PG&E Potrero substation is problematic due to
20 buried utilities that exist in Illinois street.

21 The Project proponent only has site control at the
22 HWC site. Locating a converter station on the San
23 Francisco Mirant site would consolidate electrical
24 station facilities at one location which would be
25 considered to be a positive, and that would be

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 desirable.

2 The Draft EIR concludes that no one site in San
3 Francisco is clearly environmentally superior to
4 another.

5 I'm now going to talk about the pros and cons for
6 the Pittsburg converter station sites. Due to the
7 unavoidable significant noise and visual impacts
8 identified for the Pittsburg West Tenth Street
9 Alternative 2 site, this alternative is considered to
10 the be the least preferable from an environmental
11 standpoint.

12 The Pittsburg West Tenth Street Alternative 1 and
13 Pittsburg Mirant sites are considered to be
14 environmentally superior to the proposed Pittsburg
15 Standard Oil sites since both sites would avoid the
16 need to dredge two locations in New York Slough, and
17 they would also avoid potential impacts to sensitive
18 biological resources and habitat associated with the
19 onshore cable route between New York Slough and the
20 Standard Oil site, as well as the bridge that would
21 need to constructed over Kirker Creek associated with
22 the proposed new access road

23 The Draft EIR concludes that the Pittsburg West
24 Tenth Street Alternative 1 and Mirant Pittsburg sites
25 are the environmentally superior sites in Pittsburg.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 The Final EIR will consider comments received on
2 the Draft EIR, including any pertinent comments on the
3 alternatives considered.

4 And that concludes my portion of the presentation.
5 I'm going to turn it back over to Randy. Thank you.

6 MR. JEROME: Thank you Robert. Next before
7 we get into the formal comments from the public, I'd
8 like to introduce Joan Lamphier of Lamphier
9 Associates -- Gregory Associates --

10 MS. LAMPHIER: It used to be Lamphier and
11 Associates.

12 MR. JEROME: Right. Now it's
13 Lamphier-Gregory Of Oakland. City of Pittsburg hired
14 Joan to be the project planner and the environmental
15 coordinator for this process, and she will explain a
16 little bit about how this process works before we get
17 into the comment period. Joan.

18 MS. LAMPHIER: The firm used to be Lamphier
19 and Associates and now we're Lamphier-Gregory. Randy
20 knows us as Lamphier and Associates.

21 Anyway, the purpose of our meeting this evening is
22 to give the members of the public the opportunity to
23 comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. And
24 basically you have two modes of comment. You can
25 either comment verbally (we have a speaker slip for you

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 to fill out) or you can provide a written comment and
2 give that to the court reporter over here and that will
3 become part of the record.

4 The intent of the comments is to address the
5 adequacy of the environmental analysis in the document,
6 to address any additional mitigation measures that
7 might further reduce potentially significant
8 environmental impacts or to provide alternatives that
9 also would reduce potential environmental impacts.

10 Just so that you know, copies of the document are
11 available on the city website. We have CDs available
12 for anybody who doesn't have a copy available this
13 evening, and all notices of the public hearings and of
14 the environmental process are also available on the
15 city's website.

16 So as is noted on the slide here, the
17 environmental review comment period ends on June 26th.
18 If you choose not to speak this evening you still have
19 the opportunity to provide written comments to Ken
20 Strelo. And then once the environmental comment period
21 ends, all written verbal comments will be incorporated
22 into the Final EIR, and the consultant team will
23 respond to each comment.

24 The anticipated day for release of the Final EIR
25 is sometime in August, depending on the extent of

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 comment of course, and then we would anticipate
2 bringing the project and the Final EIR to the Planning
3 Commission first for review and then ultimately to the
4 Pittsburg City Council and Pittsburg Power Company.

5 So with that I will open up the meeting. Randy.
6 And I would ask that people fill out a speaker slip so
7 that we can track how many people would like to
8 comment. Thank you.

9 MR. JEROME: Thank you Joan. All right. I
10 have so far three speaker slips. And if anybody else
11 would like to comment on this document I'd like to ask
12 you to fill out one of these speaker slips so we can
13 formally enter it into the record.

14 As I mentioned, we do have a court reporter so it
15 is a formal part of this meeting. So I would ask you
16 to come up to the podium and speak, or if you want to
17 stay back there we do have a microphone. And if you
18 could keep your comments to three minutes.

19 The first speaker slip I have is from Greg Feere.

20 MR. FEERE: Good evening. My name is Greg
21 Feere. I represent the Contra Costa Building and
22 Construction Trades Council right here in Contra Costa.
23 We have 30 construction trade unions and about 30,000
24 members.

25 we met a number of months ago to review the

PM2:1-1

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 project and go over it in detail and looked at the
2 complexity of what was going to transpire here in the
3 City of Pittsburg. I happen to live in Antioch so this
4 was a very important project.

5 I think the biggest issue that we reviewed in the
6 project was the placement of the cable. And a lot of
7 people are concerned about putting it right in the
8 pathway of the shipping lane. And that has been
9 addressed.

PM2:1-1

10 The complexity of the other part is when the cable
11 moves throughout the Bay, we were concerned about
12 having this cable going over the BART tube and how
13 exactly that was going to be addressed and how it was
14 actually going to be set in place.

PM2:1-2

15 While we have a lot of discussion -- and we
16 represent divers as well -- and so they were pretty
17 confident about building I guess a kind of an insulated
18 bridge over the BART tube. So we were pretty satisfied
19 in how that was going to be transpired.

20 Overall we looked at the project in great detail.
21 We coordinated with the San Francisco Building and
22 Construction Trades Council. And partnering together
23 we successfully worked out an agreement that is going
24 to impact not only San Francisco but right here in
25 Contra Costa.

PM2:1-3

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 So in reviewing it we think not only that it's
2 going to be a positive return for local jobs and local
3 people, we also think this project is going to bring
4 back a positive social economic return to the City of
5 Pittsburg and San Francisco.

PM2:1-3

6 One thing that I think with the trades we pride
7 ourselves on building projects on schedule and on
8 budget, and I think we'll be able to successfully build
9 this project with the least amount of impact to the
10 citizens of Pittsburg. Thank you very much.

11 MR. JEROME: Next I have David Fierberg.

12 MR. FIERBERG: Good evening. My name is Dave
13 Fierberg. I'm a resident of San Francisco. I live not
14 far from where the conversion site is slated to be
15 built.

16 I'm also here with San Francisco Community Power.
17 San Francisco Community Power is a community-based
18 organization working in San Francisco on energy
19 efficiency and environmental issues.

PM2:2-1

20 I'd like to congratulate the City of Pittsburg for
21 having us out here. Unlike in San Francisco where the
22 consultants outnumbered the residents probably five to
23 one, it looks like there is some interest out here by
24 the residents of Pittsburg. So I congratulate you for
25 doing that.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 We're here to let you know that we're opposed to
2 this project for a number of reasons. The first is
3 that this project is just fundamentally not needed.
4 CAISO in their analysis calls for this as a means of
5 insuring redundancy not power. It would be much more
6 effective if what you wanted to do was insure the
7 electric grid of San Francisco rather than building one
8 gigantic electric cord as it were from Pittsburg to San
9 Francisco, rather to have a number of different energy
10 generations in the City and County of San Francisco.
11 And so that \$300 million that they're talking about
12 spending on this cable we think would be much better
13 spent on more sustainable energy generation types of
14 activities.

PM2:2-1

15 We're of course very concerned about the
16 destruction of the two historic sites in the Dog Patch
17 neighborhood. That's a neighborhood that's right next
18 to my neighborhood. And that although -- just as a
19 point of clarification -- although Mirant has requested
20 demolition of these two properties, they have not gone
21 through any of the formal EIR processes or any of the
22 other processes that would require this. And so it's
23 not even close to actually being destroyed.

PM2:2-2

24 The \$300 estimate as I mentioned that this cable
25 is supposed to cost, it's important to understand that

PM2:2-3

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

PM2:2-3

1 that's going to have to be paid for by somebody whether
2 or not this cable is used. Our concern is that this is
3 going to be passed on to the ratepayers. It will
4 certainly be passed on to the ratepayers in San
5 Francisco, and I would encourage everybody in Pittsburg
6 to make sure that if Pittsburg Power is the one that's
7 holding this note and if you guys are the ones that is
8 underwriting this if this cable is not used, that the
9 residents of Pittsburg might also then be on the hook
10 to pay off this cable.

11 We're concerned about this project. As I
12 mentioned, we don't think that this is the right
13 project. We don't think that this is the right time to
14 build this project. We're going to be following this
15 process as we have for the past two years. And we
16 imagine that we'll see you guys in future meetings.
17 And I want to thank you very much for letting me speak.

18 MR. JEROME: Thank you. Next speaker slip is
19 from Mike Lengyel.

PM2:3-1

20 MR. LENGYEL: Thank you for putting that
21 Draft EIR on the City website. I'm Mike Lengyel from
22 Pittsburg and I attempted to look at it. It threw me
23 for a loop. So I had some earlier questions. I don't
24 know if they were answered or not.

25 The tendency is to pretend that this is something

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 that's happening in isolation, but this is actually an
2 integral part of the power plant structure in
3 Pittsburg, and this facility offers an ideal mode to
4 establish a health fund to deal with the impacts of
5 air-pollution-related illness of which there have been
6 some studies.

7 The New York Journal of Medicine reported that
8 in 2000 that the level of fine particulate air
9 pollution was associated with the rates of death in 20
10 US cities, including San Jose and Oakland. So the more
11 particulates there were in the air the higher the death
12 rate.

13 ABT Associates in October 2000 did a nationwide
14 study -- which I think was a marvelous study -- found
15 that 259 deaths each year in California are
16 attributable to power plant particulates, and that
17 power plants make the largest contribution to ambient
18 particulate matter and associated health risks.

19 So I'm asking you as a mitigation to place a
20 surcharge on this Trans Bay Project. It's kind of a
21 son of Enron there.

22 I see Sam Wayne back there and I think Dave
23 Parkett has a great role in this. So these folks did a
24 number on California. I'm not saying they didn't do a
25 great service to the City of Pittsburg by providing

PM2:3-1

PM2:3-2

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

PM2:3-2

1 more than \$15 million for the Enron Project that's now
 2 known as the Los Medanos Energy Center, but I think
 3 there is an obligation to step back and look at this a
 4 little bit broader and look at the people who are
 5 bearing the brunt of the pollution from the power
 6 plants, of which this is part, and to add as a
 7 mitigation some sort of charge on that that's collected
 8 that goes into a health fund to lesson the problem.

9 So thank you very much. I will leave some written
 10 comments that I left for Governor Davis which he
 11 ignored for some reason in 2001 when he was here.
 12 Thank you very much.

13 MR. JEROME: Thank you. The next slip I have
 14 is from Kristina Lawson.

15 MS. LAWSON: Good evening. Kristina Lawson
 16 with Miller, Starr and Regalia out of Walnut Creek.
 17 I'm here tonight on behalf of property owners on West
 18 Tenth Street.

PM2:4-1

19 I'm appearing in support of the project. And I'm
 20 here specifically to comment on the location of the
 21 Pittsburg converter station and to urge Pittsburg to
 22 actually select the West Tenth Street Alternative 1 as
 23 the location for the converter station.

24 This location, as the gentleman presented earlier
 25 tonight and as is set forth the EIR in some detail, is

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 certainly one of the environmentally superior
2 alternatives and will be less environmentally damaging
3 than construction of the converter station, the
4 Standard Oil site and the other locations.

5 Like I said, the alternative section does an
6 excellent job of explaining why the West Tenth Street
7 alternative 1 is the preferred alternative. It will
8 eliminate the need for the submarine cable installation
9 in the Bay and would reduce -- not in the entire Bay
10 but part of the Bay -- would reduce the length of the
11 high voltage direct current transmission cable
12 installation by approximately 4 miles.

13 Because the cable installation is not going to be
14 needed in the channel between Winter Island and Browns
15 Island, dredging will not be needed to cross that
16 channel.

17 Because of its close proximity to the PG&E
18 substation, it will avoid potential local impacts to
19 commercial marine transportation and commercial fishing
20 vessel operations in the area.

21 The West Tenth Street Alternative 1 does not
22 require an access road be constructed and would avoid
23 the disturbance of at least 11 natural communities and
24 numerous species as identified in the EIR.

25 As also set forth in the alternative section of

PM2:4-1

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the EIR, no impacts to natural communities, wetlands or
2 special-status species would be expected from the West
3 Tenth Street Alternative 1.

4 It is our understanding that the reason the West
5 Tenth Street Alternative 1 may not have been fully
6 analyzed as the Project in the EIR was because the
7 Project -- that location had not yet been tied up by
8 the Project proponent. We understand now that it's
9 been tied up and that it is an available site. It's
10 not only possible to have the converter site there but
11 it's environmentally preferable.

PM2:4-1

12 One of the purposes as you know of CEQA is to
13 prevent avoidable environmental damage. This site
14 would allow you to do just that and we would urge you
15 to select it as the alternative. Thank you.

16 MR. JEROME: That's the last comment slip I
17 have. Would anybody else like to comment? Okay.

18 If not, than this is the end of the formal comment
19 period for the public meeting tonight. We do have an
20 opportunity to provide written comments until the
21 comment period which ends on June 22nd (sic) and we
22 urge you to do so.

23 Again, if you haven't looked at the document
24 itself, we do have CDs out there. It's also on the
25 City's website that was mentioned previously. Joan?

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MS. LAMPHIER: Can we introduce Ken?

2 MR. JEROME: Ken Strelo -- stand up there
3 Ken. He's the planner that's coordinating the Project
4 with the City. And comments will come in directly
5 through him through the document you have. He then
6 will distribute it to -- make sure that Robert Ray and
7 his subconsultants get it for comment.

8 So again, how the process works now, this is the
9 Draft EIR that we've been talking about. Comments then
10 will be received. The consultant URS will respond to
11 those comments. Those will be bundled together to
12 become part of the Final Environmental Impact Report
13 which will then be used by the City of Pittsburg City
14 Council for certification as required under the
15 California Environmental Quality Act.

16 Okay. Well, with that, I thank you all for
17 coming. Again, you still have 'til June 26th to
18 provide us with written comments which will go into Ken
19 Strelo.

20 We have displays out in the back and we have a lot
21 of the subconsultants here as well as the proponent
22 himself and you can ask questions of him.

23 Thank you again.

24 (Whereupon, the meeting ended at 7:20 p.m.)

25 ---oOo---

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3 I, JUDITH L. LARRABEE, a Hearing Shorthand
4 Reporter in the State of California, duly authorized to
5 administer oaths, hereby certify:

6

7 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
8 foregoing meeting was reported by me in shorthand, and
9 thereafter transcribed by means of computer-aided
10 transcription.

11

12 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
13 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, nor in
14 any way interested in the outcome of said examination.

15

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have thereunto set my hand
17 on this 23rd day of June, 2006.

18

19

20

21 _____
22 Judith L. Larrabee, Hearing Reporter

23

24

25

26

