

# CHAPTER I

---

## INTRODUCTION

### A. CEQA PROCESS

In September 15, 2004, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) published the Final Initial Study on the proposed PG&E Potrero to Hunters Point 115kV Cable Project (A.03-12-039). Relying on the findings of the Initial Study, it was determined that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 21080, a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared and released to the public. In accordance with Section 15105(b) CEQA Guidelines, the public review and comment period began on October 15, 2004 and ended on November 15, 2004.

This Final MND has been prepared pursuant to CEQA *Guidelines*<sup>1</sup> which outlines all aspects of the preparation of the Draft MND and its review, as well as the subsequent steps to preparing a Notice of Decision. This document incorporates comments from the Applicant and the general public, and contains responses by the Lead Agency to those comments. As a result of Applicant and public comment, changes have been made to the Draft MND. The sole intent of the Final MND and purpose is to provide corrections to certain facts set forth in the Draft MND to ensure accuracy. No new significant environmental impacts are created with revisions made to the Draft MND text. No mitigation measures presented in the Draft MND were deleted; however, modifications were made while retaining the intent of the mitigation measure.

The Final MND is an informational document prepared by the CPUC (lead agency) to be used by decision makers before approving or denying a proposed project.

The Final MND consists of the following:

- (a) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft MND.
- (b) Comments and recommendations received on the Draft MND either verbatim or in summary.
- (c) Revisions to the Draft MND.
- (d) A Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance and Reporting Plan (MMCRP).

---

<sup>1</sup> Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Sections 15000 – 15387 and Appendices, accessible at [http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env\\_law/ceqa/guidelines/](http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/)

## **B. PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS**

Public review is an integral part of the CEQA process.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, in preparation of the Initial Study, an informational meeting was held on Thursday, July 22, 2004 at 6:00 pm in the Alex Pitcher Room of the Southeast Community Facility, located at *1800 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco, California* to receive comments from the community about issues of concern. On July 7, 2004 the CPUC provided notice to relevant agencies, organizations and individuals residing in the proposed project area of PG&E's proposed Potrero to Hunters Point Cable Project. Information describing what groups and organizations contacted is provided in Chapter 3 of the MND.

On September 1, 2004, the CPUC mailed a second letter to relevant agencies, organizations and individuals residing in the proposed project area, announcing that the Draft Initial Study was available for public review. The notice also summarized key findings of the study. The CPUC established a comment telephone line (415-962-8467), e-mail address ([potreroHPcable@esaassoc.com](mailto:potreroHPcable@esaassoc.com)), and web site ([www.potreroHPcable.com](http://www.potreroHPcable.com)) to enable the public to ask questions, provide comments, and obtain additional information on the proposed project and project alternatives discussed in the Draft Initial Study. The review lasted until September 10, 2004. These comments were considered and incorporated, as applicable, into the Final Initial Study.

Relying on the findings of the Final Initial Study, it was determined that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 21080, a Draft MND was prepared. The Notice of Availability, stating that the Draft MND was available for public review, was mailed on October 13, 2004 to relevant agencies, organizations and individuals residing in the proposed project area. The mailing list for this notice was modified to include property owners on Tennessee Street that would be adjacent to the proposed project, which was revised in response to a comment received on the Initial Study.

In accordance with Section 15105(b) CEQA Guidelines, the public review and comment period for the Draft MND began on October 15, 2004 and ended on November 15, 2004. In response to the publication of the Draft MND for public review, applicant and public comments have been received. These comments are discussed in this document and are available for public review at the CPUC located on 505 Van Ness, 4th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102-3298; contact John Boccio (415)703-2641.

## **C. AGENCIES COMMENTING ON THE DRAFT MND**

The CPUC (lead agency) submitted editorial comments to the draft MND during the public comment period. The comments were received on various dates. No other agencies submitted comments on the Draft MND during the public review period.

**D. ORGANIZATIONS COMMENTING ON THE DRAFT MND**

No organizations submitted comments on the Draft MND during the public review period

**E. INDIVIDUALS COMMENTING ON THE DRAFT MND**

The following individual submitted written comments on the Draft MND during the public review period (the date of the letter is also presented).

John Carney

November 12, 2004

**F. APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT MND**

Best, Best & Kreiger, LLP, a representative of the Applicant (PG&E), submitted written comments on the Draft MND during the public review period (the date of the letter is also presented).

Best, Best & Kreiger, LLP

November 8, 2004

**G. LETTERS OF SUPPORT RECEIVED**

The following individual submitted written comments supporting the proposed project during the public review period (the date of the letter is also presented). Each of these comments expressed support for the proposed project and did not state specific concern or question about the adequacy of the DMND so no specific response is necessary.

Catherine Doyle

November 16, 2004