

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

Potrero Hill Neighborhood House  
953 DeHaro Street  
San Francisco, California

June 8, 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 Michael Thériault

10 Steven Moss

11 David Fierberg

12 Mark Klaiman

13 Joe Boss

14

15 Power Point Presentation

16 ---oOo---

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 Potrero Hill Center for the Trans  
4 Bay Cable Draft Environmental Impact Report meeting.

5 First of all, my name is Randy Jerome, and I am  
6 the former planning and building director for the City  
7 of Pittsburg. I started the Project -- I worked on the  
8 project with the applicant Trans Bay Cable back two  
9 years ago. So it's been going on quite a time.

10 I left the city a year ago, but because of my  
11 involvement with the Project in terms of the planning  
12 environmental function for the City of Pittsburg I've  
13 continued on under contract and continued to work with  
14 the Project.

15 One thing you might ask is why is the City of  
16 Pittsburg over here in San Francisco dealing with this  
17 project? Under the California Environmental Quality  
18 Act which is the statutes that govern the Environmental  
19 Review for projects within California, there must be  
20 what's called a lead agency, and the City of Pittsburg  
21 is the lead agency for this particular Project. We're  
22 the lead agency because the Project is required to have  
23 discretionary actions in the City of Pittsburg such as  
24 a design review and there's some other development  
25 agreements and so forth that require approval by

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1     Pittsburg's City Council.

2             This Project is an electrical cable in the Bay,  
3     about 57 miles. It runs from a power plant in  
4     Pittsburg over to the Potrero plant in San Francisco  
5     here, and it's to provide a better movement of the  
6     electrical power from the East Bay over here to San  
7     Francisco and the peninsula.

8             As I mentioned, all projects like this are  
9     required to go through an environmental review process;  
10    in this case an EIR is required. This document right  
11    here in front of Ian is a result of that.

12            we do have these available for public review, and  
13    we do have discs available if you would like to receive  
14    those.

15            The purpose of this meeting is to receive comments  
16    on this Draft EIR both either verbally or in writing  
17    that you can put in until the comment period which ends  
18    on June 26th I believe it is.

19            So this is a formal meeting to elicit those  
20    comments from people over on this side of the Bay. We  
21    will have a meeting similar to this over in Pittsburg  
22    next week.

23            We have actually had a meeting in this very  
24    location back in November -- it was called a scoping  
25    session -- which was to elicit comments from citizens

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 and other agencies on what should be put in the  
2 particular document. So that was again last year in  
3 this very location.

4 So with that what I'd like to do is introduce  
5 Garrett Evans who is the general manager of the  
6 Pittsburg Power Company which in the City of Pittsburg.

7 MR. EVANS: Thank you, Randy. Good evening.  
8 As Randy said, I'm Garrett Evans, General Manager of  
9 the Pittsburg Power Company.

10 The Pittsburg Power Company is a municipal utility  
11 that has operations in Pittsburg and Mare Island in  
12 Vallejo where we run the electrical gas distribution  
13 system.

14 Pittsburg Power Company's involvement with the  
15 Trans Bay Cable Project started two and a half years  
16 ago. The City of Pittsburg, as Randy said, is the lead  
17 agency. The deliberate environmental review process  
18 started nearly two years ago with a Notice of  
19 Preparation in August of 2004.

20 Being very brief here so you can get more to the  
21 document and to the Power Point presentation, the  
22 Pittsburg Power Company really looks at the Trans Bay  
23 Cable Project as an excellent opportunity to address  
24 transmission congestion throughout the Bay Area. Again  
25 thank you for coming. Randy.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1           MR. JEROME: Thank you, Garrett. Now we're  
2 going to go into the kind of formal part of this  
3 meeting. I'd like to introduce Robert Ray of the URS  
4 Corporation. URS was contracted to prepare the  
5 Environmental Impact Report, and he is here with some  
6 of his staff and other subconsultants to explain the  
7 project itself.

8           MR. RAY: Thank you, Randy. Again, my name is  
9 Robert Ray, and I'm with the URS Corporation and I'm  
10 the project manager for the preparation of the EIR.  
11 There is quite a few task leaders that helped prepare  
12 the EIR here tonight. Their names and their  
13 disciplines are on the board over there, and I think  
14 some of you have had an opportunity to ask some  
15 questions tonight, which is great. Next slide please.

16           I'm going to go ahead and give an overview of  
17 what's in the Environmental Impact Report in terms of  
18 how it's organized, a brief description of what the  
19 proposed projects and the alternatives are, scope of  
20 the environmental analysis and then a summary of the  
21 EIR findings.

22           The Draft EIR was prepared for the City of  
23 Pittsburg in accordance with the Notice of Preparation  
24 which was issued in August of 2004. Comments were  
25 received on the Notice of Preparation from the public

## CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 and also informal agency consultation was conducted.

2 The Draft EIR assesses construction and operation  
3 of the proposed Project and alternatives in Pittsburg  
4 and San Francisco; includes the converter station  
5 sites, one in Pittsburg, one in San Francisco; the  
6 onshore electrical cable routes, and temporary  
7 construction laydown areas as well as the approximately  
8 56-mile-long submarine high voltage direct current  
9 cable that will be buried in the bottom of the Bay. It  
10 also includes about 1 mile of onshore cable for a total  
11 length of about 57 miles depending on which alternative  
12 you're looking at.

13 I would like to clarify that the Project goes from  
14 the PG&E Pittsburg substation which is located in the  
15 interior of the Mirant Pittsburg Power Plant property.  
16 It does not go from the power plant itself. It goes  
17 from the PG&E substation to the converter station and  
18 then in the submarine cable which runs down the Bay to  
19 San Francisco to the converter station, which would  
20 convert the power back to AC and connect into the PG&E  
21 Potrero substation.

22 The Project alternatives that are addressed in the  
23 EIR include alternate converter station sites, onshore  
24 AC/DC cable routes, and temporary construction laydown  
25 areas.

## CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1           In summary, the proposed Project as defined by the  
2           applicant (Trans Bay Cable LLC) is an approximately  
3           56-mile long, 400 megawatt high voltage direct current  
4           submarine cable in San Francisco Bay and connecting  
5           waterways between a terminus near the City of Pittsburg  
6           and a terminus in San Francisco in the vicinity of  
7           Potrero Point.

8           The proposed Project would transmit electrical  
9           power from a converter station in Pittsburg to a  
10          converter station in San Francisco providing a  
11          dedicated connection between the PG&E Pittsburg  
12          substation, which is fed by sufficient generating and  
13          transmission capacity and the PG&E Potrero substation  
14          in San Francisco.

15          The electrical power that would be delivered to  
16          San Francisco by the cable would help meet San  
17          Francisco's projected electrical demand for 2012 and  
18          beyond, and it's projected that it would be operational  
19          for at least 40 years.

20          The proposed project is designed to be a  
21          cost-effective, energy-efficient solution to address  
22          San Francisco's need for additional transmission  
23          capacity while improving transmission reliability and  
24          load serving capability.

25          The proposed Project is one of three transmission

## CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 system reinforcements identified by the California  
2 Independent System Operator to meet the long term  
3 reliable load serving plan in Northern San Mateo County  
4 in San Francisco.

5 The other two Projects are the Jefferson Martin  
6 Transmission Line which was recently approved and the  
7 San Francisco Electric Reliability Project which is  
8 currently in the CEC licensing process and nearing the  
9 end of that process. The CAISO determined that all  
10 three Projects, including the Trans Bay Cable Project,  
11 are needed.

12 The primary goal of the Project is to deliver  
13 electricity to San Francisco to meet projected demand.  
14 The proposed Project would be expected to meet the  
15 CAISO Planning and Reliability Standards; decrease  
16 transmission grid congestion in the East Bay; reduce  
17 transmission losses; increase the overall security and  
18 reliability of the electrical system and provide  
19 potential savings to ratepayers.

20 The proposed Project is made up of the following  
21 primary components: installation of an approximately  
22 57-mile long new high voltage direct current cable  
23 system, which I stated previously is 56 miles  
24 submarine, approximately one mile onshore; construction  
25 of two new converter stations, one in San Francisco and

## CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 one in Pittsburgh; installation of approximately 0.3  
2 mile of underground double circuit 115 kV AC  
3 transmission cable and/or overhead transmission line in  
4 San Francisco; installation of approximately 4.2 miles  
5 of new submarine and 1.3 miles of  
6 underground/aboveground single-circuit 230 kV high  
7 voltage alternating current transmission cable/line in  
8 Pittsburgh.

9 There is also involved construction of a new  
10 access road to the proposed Standard Oil Converter  
11 Station site in Pittsburgh, and temporary use of one or  
12 more construction laydown areas on previously disturbed  
13 sites in San Francisco and Pittsburgh.

14 The contents and organization of the Draft EIR.  
15 It's organized in two volumes due to its size. Volume  
16 1 includes the sections that you can see on the screen.  
17 I'm not going to read through all of them. And it also  
18 includes Appendix A, the Detailed Project Description.

19 one thing I would like to point out is that the  
20 proposed project is addressed in Section 4 and the  
21 project alternatives are addressed in Chapter 5 and  
22 Section 6. The comparison of alternatives compares all  
23 the alternatives, including the proposed Project and  
24 the No Project alternative.

25 Volume 2 includes primary technical appendices,

## CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 including the NOP, the Responses, and the Scoping  
2 Meetings through Appendix K which presents information  
3 on electric and magnetic fields.

4 The Draft EIR addresses the following  
5 environmental resource topics. This is the order that  
6 they're presented in: Air quality, geologic resources  
7 and soil, water resources and quality, terrestrial  
8 biological resources, marine biological resources,  
9 cultural resources, land use and recreation, marine  
10 transportation and commercial fishing, traffic and  
11 transportation, noise and vibration, public services  
12 and utilities, visual resources, hazardous materials  
13 and waste management, and paleontological resources.

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

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

25 With implementation of the proposed mitigation

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

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

4       The unavoidable adverse significant impact  
5 findings that are presented in the EIR for the Proposed  
6 Project are as follows: construction of the proposed  
7 HWC converter station in San Francisco would require  
8 the demolition of two warehouses eligible for listing  
9 as historic structures associated with the once-present  
10 Western Sugar Refinery complex that date from the  
11 1920s.

12       The proposed Project would also potentially  
13 require demolition of some portion of the Station A  
14 Complex on the Mirant Power Plant property that is  
15 adjacent to the north of the HWC site, and that would  
16 be associated with the routing of the proposed  
17 underground cable to the PG&E Potrero substation.  
18 Demolition of These structures would constitute a  
19 significant impact.

20       I would point out that there's substantial  
21 mitigation that's proposed in the EIR related to  
22 impacts to these structures; however, by definition, if  
23 you need to demolish them, under CEQA it's typically  
24 considered to be an unavoidable adverse significant  
25 impact.

## CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1           Construction of the proposed Pittsburg Standard  
2 Oil converter station would not result in any  
3 identified unavoidable adverse significant impacts, but  
4 it would require dredging in two locations in New York  
5 Slough and involve more biological impacts than the  
6 other alternatives in Pittsburg that are considered.

7           Construction and operation of the proposed  
8 submarine cable system would not result in any  
9 identified unavoidable adverse significant impacts.

10           Now I'm going to summarize the unavoidable  
11 significant impact findings for the Project  
12 alternatives.

13           Construction of the alternative San Francisco  
14 Mirant converter station would require demolition of  
15 the Station A Complex -- which I mentioned previously  
16 -- for the proposed cable route associated with the HWC  
17 site as part of the project, unless Mirant demolishes  
18 these buildings in advance of the TBC private  
19 construction. And the reason I mention that is that  
20 Mirant has quite a while ago submitted a demolition  
21 permit application to the City and County of San;  
22 Francisco and I believe is actively pursuing the  
23 demolition of those structures due to seismic concerns  
24 and their deteriorating conditions.

25           The Station A Complex as I mentioned is considered

## CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 historic by the City and County of San Francisco.  
2 Demolition of these structures would constitute a  
3 significant impact.

4 Construction and operation of the alternative San  
5 Francisco Sheedy converter station would not result in  
6 any identified unavoidable significant impacts.  
7 However, the routing of the cable, the AC cable, from  
8 the Sheedy Converter Station site to the PG&E Potrero  
9 substation is problematic and it has some questions  
10 regarding the feasibility of being able to do that due  
11 to the location of existing buried utilities along the  
12 route.

13 Construction and operation of the alternative  
14 Pittsburg West Tenth Street Alternative 1, also  
15 referred to as East/West based on its layout, and the  
16 Pittsburg Mirant converter stations would not result in  
17 any identified unavoidable adverse significant impacts.

18 Construction of the Alternative Pittsburg West  
19 Tenth Street Alternative 2 North/South converter  
20 station would result in an unavoidable adverse noise  
21 impact to the residences south of West 10th Street due  
22 to pile-driving activities over an estimated 3- to  
23 4-month period.

24 Operation of the alternative Pittsburg West Tenth  
25 Street Alternative 2 converter station would result in

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 an unavoidable adverse visual impact due primarily to  
2 its proximity to West Tenth Street and the residences  
3 to the south of West Tenth Street.

4 I'm now going to talk about the findings in the  
5 EIR regarding the environmentally superior alternative.

6 The No Project Alternative (i.e. don't build the  
7 project; do nothing) would result in the fewest  
8 environmental impacts but it is incapable of meeting  
9 the Project objectives, including those of the  
10 California Independent System Operator.

11 the proposed Trans Bay Cable Project is considered  
12 by the City of Pittsburg to be the only feasible  
13 alternative for meeting the Project and CAISO  
14 objectives at this point in time.

15 It is difficult to determine which of the Trans  
16 Bay Cable Project converter site alternatives in San  
17 Francisco and Pittsburg is the environmentally superior  
18 alternative due to their similar environmental impacts.

19 I'm now going to talk about the pros and cons for  
20 the San Francisco converter station sites. The Sheedy  
21 site avoids significant impacts to historic  
22 architectural resources associated with the proposed  
23 HWC and alternate Mirant sites. However, the required  
24 electrical connection to the PG&E Potrero substation is  
25 problematic due to buried utilities in Illinois Street.

## CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1           The Project proponent currently only has site  
2 control of the HWC site. Locating the converter  
3 station on the San Francisco Mirant site would  
4 consolidate electrical station facilities at one  
5 location which is considered to be desirable.

6           The Draft EIR concludes that no one site in San  
7 Francisco is clearly environmentally superior to  
8 another.

9           Now I'm going to discuss the pros and cons for the  
10 Pittsburg converter station sites. Due to unavoidable  
11 significant noise and visual impacts identified for the  
12 Pittsburg West Tenth Street Alternate 2, this  
13 alternative is the least preferable from an  
14 environmental perspective.

15           The Pittsburg West Tenth Street Alternative 1 and  
16 Pittsburg Mirant sites are considered to be  
17 environmentally superior to the proposed Pittsburg  
18 Standard Oil site, since both sites would avoid the  
19 need to dredge in New York Slough and also avoid  
20 potential impacts to sensitive biological resources,  
21 including those along the onshore cable route  
22 associated with the Standard Oil converter station as  
23 well as the need to cross Kirker Creek with the  
24 proposed access road up to the Pittsburg-Antioch  
25 Highway.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1           The Draft EIR concludes that the Pittsburg West  
2 Tenth Street Alternative 1 and Mirant Pittsburg sites  
3 are the environmentally superior sites in Pittsburg.  
4 And the Final EIR will consider comments received on  
5 the Draft EIR including any pertinent comments on the  
6 alternatives considered.

7           And that concludes my portion of the presentation.  
8 I'm going to turn it back over to Randy.

9           MR. JEROME: Thank you, Robert. Now we go on  
10 to the real purpose of the meeting tonight which is to  
11 elicit comments and maybe questions from the general  
12 public.

13           This meeting is actually optional under the  
14 California Environmental Quality Act. However, it's  
15 important under CEQA that comments be received from the  
16 general public and public agencies which will then go  
17 into the document in terms of a Final Environmental  
18 Impact Report. So tonight what we're going to be doing  
19 is asking for those commence.

20           At this particular time I would like to introduce  
21 Joan Lamphier of Lamphier and Associates. She has been  
22 hired by the City of Pittsburg to be the Project  
23 planner for processing the Environmental Impact Report  
24 as well as the planning entitlements due to the City of  
25 Pittsburg for approval. And she will explain the rest

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 of the process tonight and what we're asking from you.

2 MS. LAMPHIER: Thank you. Actually, Randy  
3 gave most of the comments that I intended to make. But  
4 anyway, as he indicated, the purpose is for members of  
5 the public to be able to comment on the Environmental  
6 Impact Report and not to comment on the Project itself,  
7 but to address the document and the adequacy of the  
8 environmental analysis and mitigation measures that are  
9 addressed in the document.

10 And so you can either submit verbal comments or  
11 you can submit written comments. We have a form that  
12 Rebecca Gorton over there can -- you can give her the  
13 comments. These comments will all be incorporated into  
14 the Final Environmental Impact Report and the  
15 consultants will respond to each comment and make any  
16 changes that are appropriate to the draft document.

17 And that will be presented first to the City of  
18 Pittsburg Planning Commission and then to the Pittsburg  
19 City Council to consider certification of the document.

20 I'm going to ask people if they could limit their  
21 initial presentation to three minutes so make sure that  
22 we give everybody the opportunity to speak who would  
23 like to speak this evening.

24 Just in case any of you are not aware, we do have  
25 a Notice of Availability that is on the table there,

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 and that indicates all the places where the document is  
2 available for public review. It's on the city's  
3 website. We have CDs this evening that you can take  
4 with you, and also I think there's a copy at the  
5 Potrero Hill Neighborhood House where you can come in  
6 and read a hard copy.

7 So the comment period ends June 26th, and if you  
8 choose not to present comments this evening you still  
9 have an opportunity to write to Ken Strelo and to  
10 submit any additional comments that you'd like to.

11 So I think with that I'll turn it back over to  
12 you, Randy. Thank you.

13 MR. JEROME: Thank you, Joan. Okay. Well  
14 with that, if there are any comments that you would  
15 like to make now I'd ask you to come up and fill out  
16 one of these forms so we have it on the record.

17 MR. MOSS: I have a question. Can someone  
18 explain how this thing will be paid for? And since  
19 there appears to be, based upon the forecast, a  
20 significant length of time in which the full capacity  
21 is needed for the transmission line -- it may never be  
22 needed -- I'm wondering how the payment structure is  
23 for the -- and I ask this because you put a slide up  
24 there saying that this was a cost-effective project.

25 MS. LAMPHIER: You know, We're not going to

PM1:1-1

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 be responding to comments in this meeting. You can  
2 submit that as a comment and we will respond to that in  
3 the Final EIR.

4 MR. MOSS: Okay. So you're not answering  
5 questions?

6 MS. LAMPHIER: No, we're not going to. The  
7 purpose is to take comments. But we will respond in  
8 detail in the final document.

9 MR. JEROME: I do have two speaker slips, and  
10 I'd like to ask each of them to come up and bring their  
11 comments.

12 We are recording this, by the way. We do have a  
13 court reporter here so talk into the microphone so we  
14 can be sure to get those comments.

15 First is Michael Thériault.

16 MR. THÉRIAULT: I'm actually with the  
17 Secretary Treasurer of the San Francisco Building and  
18 COnstruction Trades Council. That's the coalition of  
19 construction unions here in San Francisco.

PM1:2-1

20 And by the usual logic of self interest, this  
21 would not be our preferred project. We would prefer a  
22 power plant. But we understand well that this eastern  
23 half of the city has suffered from the effects of power  
24 plants for years, that the power plant would produce a  
25 good deal of air pollution, a good deal of traffic that

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 this Project will not produce.

2 The air pollution effects of the EIR are minimal.  
3 The traffic is minimal. There's a little bit of dust  
4 from construction, but apart from that it's a  
5 wonderful project for the city. So we will forego our  
6 usual self interest and support this project. Thank  
7 you.

**PM1:2-1**

8 MR. JEROME: Thank you. Next I have Steven  
9 Moss.

10 MR. MOSS: Since I can't ask questions I'll  
11 read the comment. I think some of you have seen  
12 I've actually tracked this project for about two years.  
13 And I've attended most of the CAISO stakeholder  
14 meetings that led up to their approval of the project.

**PM1:1-2**

15 For the record, the project isn't cost effective  
16 and CAISO didn't find it to be cost effective. It  
17 found that the benefits of the project were deminimus  
18 and the costs were quite extraordinary. In fact, when  
19 I asked ISO on what basis did they value reliability  
20 ISO said, "We value reliability as infinitely  
21 valuable." They put an infinite value on this.

22 We're doing some analysis using city data and  
23 CAISO data and actually I think it's well known that  
24 this project isn't needed. It may never be needed.  
25 It's only needed in 2012 under some assumptions about

**PM1:1-3**

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 contingencies.

**PM1:1-3**

2 We have plenty of supply in San Francisco 'til  
3 probably 2020, but because of CAISO's reliability  
4 concerns they want redundancies, and those redundancies  
5 require that something be done to provide additional  
6 supply in the city around 2012. The project is not  
7 needed by anybody's count until at least 2012.

8 Based on city data, and based upon city planning  
9 for sustainability, there are many options that the EIR  
10 does not discuss that would actually deal with CAISO's  
11 reliability requirements. There are other transmission  
12 opportunities that were part of the CAISO record that  
13 should be considered in the EIR and need to be.

**PM1:1-4**

14 There's the city sustainability plans, the city  
15 consulting reports that point to many lower costs, more  
16 sustainable alternatives than the DC line that would  
17 make the DC line either irrelevant or at least  
18 extremely costly.

19 So I know everybody in the room. I know my  
20 neighbors. I know who is here from the neighborhood  
21 and who's not. Most people -- I'm talking to most of  
22 the consultants who are paid to be here. So I'm not  
23 trying to impact you guys. I'm just putting this into  
24 the record. I'll submit my comments.

25 MR. JEROME: Next we have comments from David

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Fierberg.

2 MR. FIERBERG: I'm a neighbor and I'm a  
3 resident here. I'm concerned about the visual impacts  
4 of what's going to be on this converter station. As a  
5 ratepayer, I'm concerned about the costs of this if it  
6 is not fully utilized, how that will be passed on to  
7 myself as a ratepayer of PG&E. I'm wondering when the  
8 EIR was drafted whether or not you all took into  
9 consideration the fact that our neighborhood is the  
10 fastest growing neighborhood in San Francisco. There  
11 are 4500 units of housing that are going in just right  
12 down here. I'm wondering if you talked to UC San  
13 Francisco who is promoting the Mission Bay campus.

14 There are certainly many potential utilizations of  
15 the waterfront. I can think of neighborhood and sort  
16 of alternative biosciences for this type of property.  
17 A converter station would not be the number one on my  
18 list.

19 I'm also wondering if there was consideration  
20 given to the projections that by 2050 the Bay will be  
21 reaching I-280. If the Bay reaches I-280 -- that's  
22 just right down here -- that means anything that you  
23 all build in the 40 years that you're projecting that  
24 this thing will be in service, I would say within the  
25 first 15 years it will be about two feet under water.

**PM1:3-1**

**PM1:3-2**

**PM1:3-3**

**PM1:3-4**

**PM1:3-5**

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

**PM1:3-5**

1 I'm wondering what the environmental impacts of that  
2 will be and wonder if that is being considered, if  
3 whatever hazardous chemicals that will be utilized or  
4 stored there will then flow into the Bay and what the  
5 potential impacts of those will be. Thanks.

6 MR. JEROME: Thank you. Next I have Mark  
7 Klaiman.

8 MR. KLAIMAN: Hi. Thanks. Good evening. My  
9 name is Mark Klaiman. I run a small business in the  
10 Bayview Hunter's Point neighborhood. It's the next  
11 neighborhood south of here. We are very close to the  
12 old Hunter's Point plant.

**PM1:4-1**

13 I have a couple of concerns regarding the EIR.  
14 And the first is I don't think you gave appropriate  
15 consideration of alternative energies. There is a very  
16 short discussion of why alternative energy won't work,  
17 but there's no math to support it. There's no  
18 explanation of why the composite alternative energies  
19 won't work. There is no discussion of why demand  
20 response programs wouldn't work.

21 As a small business in San Francisco, we've  
22 committed ourselves and our neighbors to do all sorts  
23 of things to limit power consumption. For example, our  
24 facility has a 33-kilowatt solar power system. There's  
25 no discussion of what other small businesses in the

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 community are planning. And there's no discussion as  
2 to why those alternatives might be more cost effective,  
3 might be more reliable.

**PM1:4-1**

4 There's been discussions of transmission  
5 congestion, but of course if you produce it in-house  
6 there's no transmission congestion at all.

7 There's issues of reliability. But clearly  
8 relying on one transmission cable to bring all of our  
9 power or a good portion of our power 57 miles -- if  
10 that goes down, if there's a problem there, we're  
11 really SOL. We should rely on local power. We should  
12 rely on ourselves to be self-reliant with alternative  
13 energy ideas.

**PM1:4-2**

14 I'm very concerned about whether this truly is  
15 going to bring about potential savings to the  
16 ratepayer. This is a very, very expensive project. It  
17 may never be necessary. Certainly all 400 megawatts of  
18 it may never be necessary. This is a \$300 million  
19 gamble that we don't necessarily need to be taking.

**PM1:4-3**

20 And lastly I'm kind of dismayed that I hear that  
21 this is simply a transmission cable; that it has no  
22 real environmental impact; we're not relying on fossil  
23 fuels; we're not telling you we're going to be creating  
24 more fossil fuels.

**PM1:4-4**

25 It starts at a power plant; it ends at a power

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

PM1:4-4

1 plant. It's a \$300 million encouragement to continue  
2 operating the same old way. If we want to make  
3 changes, if we want to be more reliant, if we want to  
4 get away from fossil fuels, let's take \$300 million and  
5 commit them to be self-reliant, to alternative energy,  
6 and demand response and lower consumption. Thank you  
7 so much.

8 MR. JEROME: Thank you. Does anybody else  
9 have any comments? Yes, sir.

10 MR. BOSS: My name is Joe Boss. Basically  
11 the area that I'm going to be chasing after has to do  
12 with cultural resources.

PM1:5-1

13 We work very hard to make Dog Patch Historic  
14 District where I live -- down at the bottom of the hill  
15 very close to where the San Francisco site is going to  
16 be -- an historic district. We've been working for  
17 years on getting an industrial historic district  
18 established at Pier 70 right on down through and  
19 including the Spreckels Sugar facilities which are  
20 those warehouses.

21 So I have not intensely read that part. I will be  
22 reading it. I can just go away for two weeks and sit  
23 in the desert and read that. But I think it's kind of  
24 glossed over when -- yes, you identified it as a  
25 non-mitigatable impact and I'm really excited to see

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 what the mitigations are going to be for that. And I  
2 will go fill out a piece of paper. Thank you.

PM1:5-1

3 MR. JEROME: Anyone else? Okay. I'll turn  
4 it back over to Joan and she'll explain the rest of the  
5 process.

6 MS. LAMPHIER: First of all, I indicated all  
7 of the comments that we've received this evening, as  
8 well as anything in writing, will be addressed in the  
9 final environmental document. And that will be  
10 distributed in the same way we did with the Draft. It  
11 will be on the city's website, and we will have CDs  
12 available for people who request it. We'll put you on  
13 our mailing list if you sign in this evening. And we  
14 expect that the final document probably will be  
15 prepared and available toward the end of July. That's  
16 the estimated arrival time.

17 So I think that that will conclude this meeting at  
18 this point, but that there are people -- feel free --  
19 we have a lot of consultants here. We have the project  
20 applicant and representatives of the city, myself,  
21 Randy Jerome and Garrett Evans. Feel free to walk  
22 around and ask us any questions if you have a specific  
23 informational item that you would be curious about. And  
24 take advantage of all of this talent that you have.

25 So with that, I'd like to thank you very much for

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 coming this evening, and we look forward to presenting  
2 the Final EIR. Thank you very much.

3 ---oOo---

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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 meeting.

15

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have thereunto set my hand  
17 on this 22nd day of June, 2006.

18

19

20

21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 Judith L. Larrabee, Hearing Reporter

23

24

25

26

