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PROCEEDINGS

3:00 P.M.

MS. SPURR: It’s June 3, 2009 and I’m going to start the public meeting to hear comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the PG&E line 406, 407 natural gas pipeline and it’s about 3 o’clock.

We’re going to have another meeting at 5:30 so you can also stay and provide comments at that meeting.

We’ll have a meeting, another two meetings in Woodland as well tomorrow evening. We’re going to --

MR. DIBBLE: At 3:00 and 5:30?

MS. SPURR: At 3:00 and 5:30, yes. It was on the Notice of Availability of the draft EIR, which I have copies on the back table if you didn’t get one.

The next meeting in Woodland will be at St. Luke’s Episcopal Church tomorrow.

We’re going to transcribe this meeting so that we have a record of your comments and we will be responding to those in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

What I’m going to do first is to go through the CEQA process and then we are going to have a presentation on the Environmental Impact Report itself.

There’s a sign-in sheet in the back. We probably have most of your names and addresses on our
mailing list. But if we don’t please sign in and
provide your name and address and we’ll send you a copy
of the notice when our commission, when this Draft EIR
goes to our commission for certification.

We also have speaker slips. I think most of
you heard me. If you want to speak please put your name
on a speaker slip and hand it to me and I’ll call you up
one at a time.

The Environmental Impact Report was prepared
in accordance with the California Environmental Quality
Act or CEQA.

We sent out, this has been a long process on
this Draft EIR. We originally sent out a notice of

We had scoping meetings on July 9th and July
10th both in Woodland and in Roseville.

And we responded to those comments that we
received, both the transcripts of the meetings and the
written comments that we received, and we tried to
address those in this Environmental Impact Report.

The comment period, we released this draft
report for public comment on April 29, 2009. The public
review period will end on June 12, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. So
please get your comments in, your written comments. If
you have any please get those into me by June 12, 2009
at 5:00 p.m. I accept those by fax, e-mail or you can mail them to me.

Once that comment period ends we will respond to all the comments that we’ve received in a Final Environmental Impact Report. And I will send copies of that to all our commentors. And you’ll receive that 10 to 15 days before the commission meeting.

We’re expecting to have a commission meeting in August, sometime in August. We don’t have an exact date. We just had a commission meeting June 1st.

So typically every two months our commission will meet. But we don’t have that schedule yet.

We will be sending out notices on when the commission meeting will be held for this Environmental Impact Report at least 10 to 15 days prior to that hearing date.

We’ll also have on our website, if you check that frequently, we’ll have a list of our commission meetings.

And this meeting is merely to be held just to hear comments on the Draft EIR. We’re not going to have question and answer session, although we can do that after the close of this meeting. If you want to stick around we’ll be available to talk to you, any other questions that you have.
You won’t get the opportunity to comment again on this Draft EIR and the Final EIR before the commission who makes the decision whether to certify the EIR and approve the project.

So this is your first opportunity and your last opportunity before it be the commission.

Does anyone have any questions on the CEQA process?

Okay, I’d like to introduce Kerri Mikkelsen Tuttle. She’s with Michael Brandman Associates. And they helped us prepare the Draft Environmental Impact Report. She’s going to give a presentation on, a brief presentation, on the Impact Report. And then I’ll give you an opportunity to ask specific questions on the Draft Environmental Impact Report before I open it up for public comment.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: Thanks Crystal. Can everybody hear me? As many of you who have seen the doorstop-size volume of the Draft EIR, I’m not going to have time to go into a lot of detail. I’ll try to hit the highlights of those topics that I think that people will be interested in. So I’ll start out with a brief project overview discussing the project location.

I do want to point out that at the close of our presentation in the question and answer session we...
have some large-scale maps focusing on the Baseline School alternatives, the Hungry Hollow area and the entire project and the options that were considered that are large-scale. They are easier to see than my slides are going to be and I encourage to take a look at those.

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of three new transmission pipelines. Line 406, line 407 East and West and the Powerline Road Distribution Feeder Main. In the EIR that’s acronym DFM and I’ll use that in my talk today.

Once fully constructed the pipelines would extend 40 miles through four counties, Yolo, Sutter, Placer and Sacramento.

In addition to the pipeline itself PG&E is proposing to construct six above-ground pressure limiting and regulating metering and mainline valve stations along the alignment.

Those are designed to insure that proper pressures are maintained in the transmission system and to reduce the pressure of the gas before it’s delivered to the distribution pipeline system.

This is a schematic of the project. The blue boxes, excuse me I don’t have a pointer, but with the exception of this blue box which is the existing, the blue boxes here show the proposed above-ground stations
along the pipeline route.

In terms of the land requirements of the proposed project, construction is going to be taking place within a 100 foot wide right-of-way.

That consists of a 50 foot permanent easement and a 50 foot temporary easement that will be used during construction.

Additional temporary use areas consist of some staging areas, for the most part are located in industrial-commercial areas adjacent to the proposed project.

Pipe storage facilities, one that’s proposed in Arbuckle, one that’s proposed just north of the city of Woodland.

The EIR study area and the impact area. It’s evaluated in the document looks at all of those areas that will potentially be disturbed.

In addition the areas that would need to accommodate construction for the HDD and the borer locations, and I’ll define those in just a moment, would be larger. Approximately 18,000 square foot to 19,000 square foot for HDD locations. And those would be at the entry and exit for those.

PG&E will be taking a 50 foot permanent easement over the proposed alignment. Within that
easement a 50 foot wide area would have restricted agricultural opportunity. Specifically deep-rooted species such as trees and vines would be excluded.
Other agricultural uses would be permitted within the 50 foot right-of-way.
And the 50 foot permanent easement is designed to allow for pipeline maintenance throughout the life of the project as well as to minimize potential damage to the pipeline itself.

Construction is going to involve one of three installation methods. The majority of the pipeline, about 91 percent will be installed using conventional trenching. That’s basically digging a trench, following it and back filling it.

HDD, horizontal directional drilling comprises about seven percent of the pipeline. That’s a hydraulically powered horizontal drilling rig. It tunnels under large sensitive surveyed features such as wetlands, levees, rivers.

Two percent of the pipeline would be installed using conventional hammer and auger or jack-and-boring methods.

Hammer boring basically drives an open-ended pipe for short distances under roadways and smaller features and the auger and jack-and-bore methods install
pipes simultaneously with the excavation process.

The sequence of construction is loosely shown on this slide. Land would be cleared and graded where needed. The topsoil and excavated materials would be removed and stored for placement.

The pipe would then be installed and tested. Following the testing topsoil will be replaced and the land will be restored to its original contours and its original vegetation, or to conditions approved by individual landowners.

The trenches won’t remain open for more than five days on average and they’ll be back filled within 72 hours of the installation of the pipeline. There are about 21 days between the initial grading and back filling in any given location.

And each of the HDD takes approximately two to four weeks to complete.

Construction would occur between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. Monday through Saturday with the exception of the HDD installation which would occur continuously over 24 hour periods until the construction is complete.

MR. DIBBLE: Did you say 6 a.m. to p.m. or p.m.?

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: Six a.m. to 6 p.m.

And construction would require about 90 to 130
workers at any given time. They would be dispersed throughout the pipeline alignment depending on where construction is occurring.

    I put the main travel routes up here and I’ll probably stumble over them but I will read them out.

CR-85, CR-87, CR-88A, CR-17 and CR-19 are the main travel routes when Line 406 is being constructed.

And CR-16, 16A, 17, Baseline Road, Riego Road, Powerline Road are the major travel routes when Line 407 is being constructed as, well as arterials that intersect with those roadways depending on where construction is occurring.

    During the construction period they anticipated that up to 40 trucks a day, which is 80 trips a day back and forth would, temporarily use these roadways, again depending on where construction is occurring. And where construction is occurring.

    Line 406 construction is proposed to begin in September or October of this year with an in-service date proposed for February of 2010.

    Line 407 east and the Powerline Road distribution feeder main, the DFM, are expected to be constructed in May 2010 or earlier.

    The proposed in service date for Line 407 East of the DFM is September 2010.
And Line 407 West is expected to be installed by 2012.

Some of the steps that PG&E will be taking prior to construction will be easement and permit acquisitions, finalizing land surveys, surveys and staking of the construction right-of-way and other temporary use areas, the staging areas that I mentioned earlier.

And they will hold pre-construction meetings in the field for both the permitting agencies and construction workers.

MR. MOUARYANG: May I interrupt?

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: Okay.

MR. MOUARYANG: With the 407 East and 407 West where it begins and where it ends according to the map.

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: Do you mind if I answer questions at the end or --

MS. SPURR: Yeah, we’ll answer that after the presentation.

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: Thanks. Because I’ll need to go back to the previous slide, I’m not sure that I can tell you on that one. But I’ll go back to that slide at the end. Thanks.

CEQA requires that we evaluate alternatives to the proposed project in our Environmental Impact Report.
They require that we evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives that meet or feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and that avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project.

In the process of identifying alternatives to the proposed project we identified and eliminated from full consideration in the EIR four alternatives that are on this slide here.

The northern green alternative, which is along the top or northernmost, was eliminated due to increased risks from fault rupture. And its location on hillsides adjacent to CR-13.

The southern alternative for Line 407, which is shown in purple, that’s here, was eliminated due to increased number of crossings and tributaries of Steelhead Creek as well as increased crossings of sensitive vernal pool features.

That southern alternative also was located in close proximity to suburban populations, compared to the proposed project.

The central alternative, which is shown in this diagram in red here, was eliminated due to increased impact to special status species habitat and local water features.

And finally the fourth alternative, the
systems alternatives, which is not pictured, proposed 15 separate projects. And it was determined to be infeasible because it would result in greater construction impacts associated with the larger quantities of pipelines required to construct those 15 separate projects.

The alternatives that are considered in this Environmental Impact Report are shown on this map and I am going to go through them in detail in the following slides but I am just going to summarize them here.

We are going to look at 12 build alternatives, alternative options A through L, in addition to the no project alternative, which is required to be analyzed under CEQA.

Each alternative option A through L represented a particular segment of the alignment but differed in the location from the proposed project so as to attempt to avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the impacts of the proposed project.

At the conclusion of our evaluation of the alternatives -- and again I am going to go through each of the alternatives in detail. It was determined that none of the options would decrease a Class 1 impact to a Class 2 level. What that means is, none of the alternative options would take a significant impact and
with mitigation render it less than significant. Options would only lessen the magnitude of impacts, but again, not make it less than significant.

CEQA also requires that we identify an environmentally superior alternative based on how the alternative fulfills both the project objectives and how it reduces significant unavoidable impacts or reduces environmental impacts of the project.

And the EIR determines that the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project is implementing the proposed project and options I and options L. And I’ll show those options to you on the following slides. Options I and L have been designed to decrease safety impacts.

This slide shows project options, actually A through G but we are going to focus on A through C on this slide. Options A in red, the northernmost, and B in blue, which follows the Option A in red and then juts down to the south here. The EIR determined that these options would result in a greater magnitude of impacts to agricultural, biological and cultural resources, soils and seismicity, risk of upset hazards, land use, traffic. And those two options would also create a new high consequence area or HCA because they would be located in proximity to the Durst Organic Growers.
Options A and B would reduce the magnitude to aesthetics and noise during construction. Option C is shown in dark green. Option C is here. Option C would result in a greater magnitude of impacts to biological resources and soils and would not reduce any impacts associated with that portion of the proposed project.

This is the same picture but this slide focuses on options D, E, F and G. D is shown in light green. It’s also shown here. Option E is in yellow. Options D and E would result in greater magnitude of impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, soils, aesthetics and noise during construction. It would not reduce impacts associated with that portion of the proposed project.

Option F in maroon is sort of hard to see. It’s here, this dogleg. It was considered in order to avoid heavy terrain at that portion of the project. That option would result in a greater magnitude of impacts to biological resources and would reduce impacts to cultural resources.

Option G is shown in magenta at the bottom here, pulled out in a blow-up. It would result in a greater magnitude of impacts to biological resources but would not reduce any of the impacts associated with that
portion of the proposed project.

I’m almost done. Options H through L are shown in this slide. Option H actually travels through the Yolo bypass. The distance of option H is actually linearly less than that portion of the proposed project but it would involve a greater amount of trenching through that section. So it would result in greater impacts to biological resources, potentially to cultural resources, although it would reduce the magnitude of impacts to aesthetics and noise during construction because it would be located further away from residences that are located nearer to the proposed project.

Options I, J, K and L, but I, J and K are quite similar. They are located here. I is turquoise, J is, I’m calling that pink, K is red here and there’s a blow-up here. And then L is gray and it is going to be hard to see. It’s right here.

Those options were proposed to avoid impacts associated with being within a 1500 foot safety buffer around proposed school sites.

Options I, J and K would place the pipeline outside of that buffer, reducing the safety risks. It would also reduce impacts to noise and aesthetics but would increase biological impacts. There are quite a few biological resources that are located along those
Option L is a little bit different. Option L would occur along the proposed project alignment but would extend the proposed HDD at that location deeper and therefore would reduce the safety impacts in that regard.

Now I’m going to talk a little bit about the alternatives that are evaluated. I just want to briefly talk about how the EIR is constructed and what it covers.

The Draft EIR analyzes 14 topical areas that are required to be analyzed under CEQA. I touched on most of these in discussing the alternatives. I am not going to list them out here but I’m happy to answer questions about any of the resource areas that are listed.

The EIR also analyzes environmental justice, cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project, and includes a large volume, which is on the CD, of technical studies and data that support the analyses that are included in the EIR.

I want to focus a little bit here on the mitigation that has been incorporated into the proposed project and in the project EIR in three ways. Both through project design features, APMs -- Those are
features that have been proposed and incorporated into
the design, the project description section in Chapter
2, in order to avoid or lessen environmental impacts
right off the bat.

The second level would be applicant-proposed
mitigation measures. Those are measures that PG&E has
proposed to avoid environmental impacts. All of the
applicant-proposed measures that we were provided have
been included in the Environmental Impact Report.

What the team of environmental analysts then
did was they evaluated the project design features and
the applicant-proposed mitigation measures in light of
the different CEQA issue areas. And where it was
determined that project design features would not
provide sufficient environmental protection additional
mitigation measures -- and those would be what I call
EIR mitigation measures, are proposed. That go a little
bit above and beyond or in some cases are new, are new
areas that are discussed. Again, to reduce impacts on
the environment to less-than-significant levels.

The majority of the potentially significant
impacts identified that would result from the proposed
project have been mitigated to a less-than-significant
level using one of these three methods, or in some cases
combinations. My final slide will discuss the
significant but unavoidable impacts of the proposed project.

I am just going to touch briefly on some of the project design features, APMs and mitigation measures. If you have questions on where these are in the document I can assist you in finding them.

The design features include such proposals as increased depth to cover the pipeline beyond what is required by law. A good example would be in agricultural lands there is a minimum three feet depth. PG&E is proposing five feet.

There is a table in Chapter 2, the project description of the EIR, that shows the land classification, the minimum depth of cover, and the depth of cover that PG&E is proposing in each of those areas.

PG&E is also going to be coordinating with landowners. There will be financial compensation for temporary and permanent losses of agricultural areas. Certain biological resources have been proposed to be avoided in the project description, including giant garter snake, through construction timing to occur outside of the window of sensitivity for that species.

Other project design features: Topsoil
stockpiling and replacement, topographic restoration.

Utilization of HDD technologies to cross large waterways, wetlands and vernal pools. Thus keeping those resources intact and avoiding hydrologic and biological impacts to those areas. Including HDD contingency planning in case of accidental upset or spill.

And finally, we are going to see the word BMPs a lot in each of the slides. One of the sets of BMPs that’s proposed as part of the proposed project comes from PG&E’s water quality construction best management practices manual. Those are designed to avoid impacts to hydrological features by water features and other CEQA issue areas.

Some of the noteworthy applicant-proposed mitigation measures include implementing fugitive dust mitigation plans, minimizing construction areas through fencing, staking, flagging the construction right-of-way to ensure that construction occurs within that and not outside of it. That also includes staking of sensitive resource areas that might lie outside of the construction area but just out of protection for those resources.

Some of the construction operation measures to reduce air quality impacts include things like
minimization of vehicle idling or requiring regular
tune-ups of construction equipment.

There will be a biological monitor onsite
during construction activities.

PG&E will be conducting pre-construction
surveys for sensitive wildlife species like burrowing
owl, nesting raptors, nesting birds.

There will be erosion control measures,
hazardous substance control, emergency response plans
and procedures. Noise reduction plans and minimization
measures, including construction timing to occur between
6 a.m. and 6 p.m. And traffic management plan and
coordination with local entities that govern traffic
control and flow in some of the local areas. And again,
these are summarized in the applicant-proposed
mitigation measures or at least are summarized in the
mitigation and monitoring plan, which is located near
the back of the hard copy or the PDF of the EIR.

The project mitigation measures are summarized
in several places. They are summarized in the executive
summary, in the end of each environmental issue area as
well as in the mitigation and monitoring.

Some of the notable mitigation measures that
the EIR has identified include the requirement for
restoration of sensitive habitats. Riparian areas,
wetlands. As well as topographic restoration of these areas here to reduce alterations to surface water flows.

Trees will be avoided or replaced following construction to minimize or eliminate aesthetic impacts. There will be a requirement that vegetation be replanted, particularly screening vegetation and the use of light shielding.

Nearby wells will be monitored to ensure groundwater is not impacted.

And again, the BMP word. Construction and vibration noise limitations and BMPs will be implemented.

I should also point out that there have been energy efficiency measures proposed in the EIR to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

After all of that, the EIR has identified four -- which is loosely four, I’d say three, but four Class 1 impacts that are identified as significant and unavoidable after implementation of all of those mitigation measures that I just discussed. There are two Class 1 impacts in the category of air quality, both of which are related to exceeding standards, local standards or state and federal ambient air quality standards.

And then the hazards and land use sections
both discuss the same impact and mitigation that is
rendered significant and unavoidable. This is the
exposure to unacceptable risks of hazards, which is
defined to be greater than one in one million from
fires, explosions or release of hazardous materials.
So those are the significant and unavoidable
impacts of the project.

That concludes what I have to say here. I do
want to point out that, again to reiterate what Crystal
said. State Lands is accepting written comments until
June 12 at 5 p.m. I’ll leave this slide up here.

I am going to go back in my slides to my
project map. And I don’t see the beginning of 406 and
407 labeled. 406 is at Line 172A. Do you have that
graphic in your EIR?

MS. NEWTON: It’s 2-2.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: Thanks. This one.

MS. SPURR: 406 goes to that point. And then
407 West starts there and goes to the Power Line Road
main valve. And then that’s where 407 --

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: That’s the DFM portion.

MS. SPURR: Yes, and that’s DFM. And then 407
East starts at that point.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: So this is -- sorry
that that’s not more clearly labeled on that map.
So I am going to turn this back over to Crystal.

MS. SPURR: If you would like to -- I have some slips here. There are slips in the back, speaker slips. If you would like to make verbal comments at this time please fill out a speaker slip and give it to me.

MS. NENG YANG: I have a question. Did you pass out the PowerPoint? Can we have a copy of the PowerPoint?

MS. SPURR: I can. Do you need a copy of the EIR?

MS. NENG YANG: Can I have a copy of the PowerPoint?

MS. SPURR: Okay.

MS. NENG YANG: Thank you.

MS. SPURR: I have two hard copies of the EIR if you would like that and I have some discs back there of the entire --

MS. NENG YANG: But you don’t have the, you don’t pass out the PowerPoint that you presented today?

MS. SPURR: I don’t have it today. I could e-mail it to someone but I don’t have it. Would you like it e-mailed to you?

MS. NENG YANG: Yes, please.
MS. SPURR: Okay. I’ll get your name after the meeting.

Are there any other questions on the draft EIR?

Again, if you would like to speak fill out a -- okay.

MR. DIBBLE: Yeah, I’ve got a lot of questions.

THE REPORTER: He needs to come up to the microphone.

MS. SPURR: Could you please come up to the mic. We are going to record all the comments and questions. Could you please --

MR. DIBBLE: Oh I can speak loud enough, I guarantee you.

THE REPORTER: Please come up to the microphone for the recording.

MS. NEWTON: We need you at the microphone because it is being transcribed. So did you fill out a speaker card?

MR. DIBBLE: Yes.

MS. NEWTON: Okay.

MR. DIBBLE: Well these were just questions for her.

MS. SPURR: This is a question on the Draft
EIR first before we start the comments, okay.

MR. DIBBLE: Okay. My name is Bill Dibble. I live at 27960 County Route 19 in Esparto.

THE REPORTER: Spell your last name, please.

MR. DIBBLE: D-I-B-B-L-E.

Okay, where do I start? The 406 and 407 gas line is proposed. Chris with PG&E, he told me about the sloughing effect is why they did not choose County Road 16 as an alternate. Have you, since you are the one answering questions, have you driven that route?

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: No.

MR. DIBBLE: Who here has? Anyone?

MS. SPURR: We’ve gone along it and seen it from the roadway.

MR. DIBBLE: You have driven that route?

MS. SPURR: From the roadway, yeah.

MR. DIBBLE: Could you tell me where on County Road 16 there is any hills to worry about.

MS. SPURR: On County Road 16?

MR. DIBBLE: Yeah. Between 87 and 505.

MS. SPURR: No I can’t at this time.

MR. DIBBLE: Because there isn’t any, that’s why. So sloughing, that is an untruth as far as County Road 16 is involved.

MS. SPURR: Is that in the Draft EIR somewhere
that you read?

MR. DIBBLE: Chris with PG&E told me that himself.

MS. SPURR: Okay.

MR. DIBBLE: And if they’re worried about sloughing, which apparently they are, what are they going to do when they go through the Dunnigan Hills? There’s definitely going to be sloughing there. Because County Road 16 is as flat as your proposal.

MS. SPURR: There are some seismic issues in the Dunnigan Hills and --

MR. DIBBLE: Okay and I’m --

MS. SPURR: -- we do have, okay.

MR. DIBBLE: -- I’m getting to that.

MS. SPURR: All right.

MR. DIBBLE: Seismic issues. We are approximately two miles away, less than two miles away, from your proposed line to the County Road 16 alternate, okay.

MS. SPURR: Okay.

MR. DIBBLE: Anybody here been around an earthquake, a big one? Two miles isn’t a lot. Two miles is nothing if there’s an earthquake as we saw in San Francisco. Whenever they have one in LA. So that is, I’d say that’s another untruth. That’s two miles.
Fault rupture. When PG&E sent the geologist out to talk to me, were you with him? Are you the attorney from San Francisco?

MR. MOUARYANG: No

MR. DIBBLE: Okay. They sent an attorney from San Francisco and a geologist out to talk to me. The geologist informed me that this pipeline was 100 percent safe. His words not mine. Okay.

I went into Google Search. And actually here are just a few of the 22,500 30- to 36-inch gas line ruptures at that have taken place. Another untruth. The Durst Organic Farm, okay. That was brought up, right? Was there any mention of Chung’s Organic Farm? I didn’t read or see any. Because this pipeline goes right through Chung’s.

Mr. Chung has very limited English. I have talked to his grandson. His grandson is going to see if he can come to the meeting tomorrow. He has started school in Napa. He is not sure if he can. So I want to know if there was any consideration for his organic farm. Was there any consideration for that?

MS. SPURR: Not to my knowledge.

MR. DIBBLE: No.

MS. SPURR: I haven’t heard of Chung’s Organic Farm.
MR. DIBBLE: Okay. Well since I’m here, being there’s seven small farms along the Hungry Hollow route it is very, very difficult to find somebody to come in and farm small farms.

With this pipeline going through it will greatly limit our ability to make a future income on this land. On our property we made, and this was the best year we ever had, we made between five and six thousand dollars on the whole farm per year. That was last year.

I contacted Muller who is an almond grower and I contacted R. H. Phillips, the grapes. And if anybody, if you’ve been out there then you know that there’s a lot of new orchards going in that area. You’ve seen them on 87 and you’ve seen them on 16. You’ve seen them all over.

If you irrigate, which everybody does out that way, north to south, you can, I’ve already talked to these people, they would not even consider putting grapes or almonds in that area.

Grapes, almonds go for $4500 per acre. Grapes go for $4200 dollars per acre. So we could almost make --

MS. STEPHENS: Per year.

MR. DIBBLE: Per year, per year. So if we
would put almonds in, which we used to have almonds.

You have to let the soil stay without fruit trees for a while because they get some diseases. So if we were to put almonds in you would significantly reduce my income.

We barely make enough to pay the taxes now.

I was an arborist for the city of Woodland. I have seen the damage that natural gas leaks cause. I have seen fully mature trees die in a matter of days and the soil around them is worthless.

If this were to happen who is responsible for that? PG&E? Maybe. Who knows?

We were offered $7700. For 50 years actually because that’s what the thing says, it’s a 50 year project. So PG&E in their generosity is willing to give me a $154 a year which is real generous of them, real generous.

When I mentioned this to Lois Wolk’s office, who is a senator, and LaMalfa’s office who is the assemblyman, their representatives both laughed. I had to wait a while to carry on a conversation with them so they could finish laughing about the amount PG&E has offered.

The habitat, one of your representatives that came out and that I talked to, but he -- his words, you didn’t hear this from me. The reason they chose this
route is because they didn’t want to mess with the hunting club and all the things that go along with it. Hence, your habitat. So, I guess birds have more rights than we do. Snakes have more rights than we do. Or at least that’s the way we feel. So you have a 50 foot right-of-way that if something happens you could come in at any time whether I had tomatoes growing or whatever growing and destroy what was there. Is that correct?

MS. SPURR: As far as I know if there’s an emergency --

MR. DIBBLE: That is correct.

MS. SPURR: -- situation.

MR. DIBBLE: Right. So that is correct. It doesn’t make any difference what I have growing. I’ve got things kind of messed around here so let me. My mother -- I’m a third generation on that land. My mother, I went and talked to her today and asked her if she wanted me to say anything.

As everyone knows the value of land in California is not what it used to be. My mom is so concerned about this pipeline that she is considering selling out after being on that land for 60 years; longer than that, 70 years. But I guess that doesn’t make a difference either.
It devalues our land so much.
And one final comment and that’s it. It has
nothing to do with this project but in a roundabout way
it does because we have already been told that --
there’s seven of us out there. And if none of us sign
this piece of paper to sell that you’ll just eminent
domain us, we have already been told that.

When the government took me off of that land
and told me I had to go fight for this country in a war
I went. I didn’t want to go. I didn’t want to go at
all. But I went to defend our country.
The way this is, the way this is being
presented, or forced down our throats shall we say, I
feel like I might as well be living in a third world
communist country, not the United States of America that
I thought I went to defend. That’s all I’ve got.

MS. SPURR: All right, thank you.
The next person I have is Alisa Stephens.

MS. STEPHENS: Well, I am Alisa Stephens. I
have property next to Bill Dibble’s in the Hungry Hollow
area of Yolo County.

Before I start my comments I did have a couple
of questions on the unacceptable impacts that are Class
1. What is referred to by noise and vibrations?

MS. SPURR: It’s during construction. The
construction equipment will generate some noise and
vibration.

MS. STEPHENS: And then once the pipeline is finished is there --

MS. SPURR: Operational, yes.

MS. STEPHENS: -- anything emanating from the pipeline itself?

MS. SPURR: No.

MS. STEPHENS: And what is it about the pipeline that unacceptably degrades air quality?

MS. SPURR: Again, it’s construction impacts and dust, different emissions from equipment. And you determine those using thresholds from the air districts.

MS. STEPHENS: If there were any natural gas leakage would that be a factor in the air quality degradation?

MS. SPURR: It’s mostly a safety risk if there’s leakage and whether or not there would. Because I think it dissipates pretty rapidly in air, I don’t think it would be an air quality impact. But in case of an explosion or a fire that’s when it comes into play.

MS. STEPHENS: I am a co-owner of 58.8 acres in Esparto, north of Esparto. It is a family farm that was purchased by my grandfather in 1924. It is currently in -- excuse me. It is prime cropland and it
is currently in row crops. We have our family farmhouse on the property.

Which one of these maps is Hungry Hollow?

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: The far left.

MS. STEPHENS: Okay. So this is Road 19, Road 17, and Road 16 is up here somewhere. This property right here is our property, 58.5 acres. So it is bordered on the north by Road 17. And this right here is our family farm. And right down the middle is Road 88A. So our 58.5 acres is already bisected by Road 88A. And that would be further bisected right -- just about two-thirds of the way down from the north, which would just cut our property basically from two parcels into four parcels, segmenting prime, agricultural land.

Actually I think this map is bigger than my map so I’ll put mine away.

I don’t feel in reading as much as I could through the proposed EIR that enough emphasis has been placed on the impact on prime agricultural property. This area has been farmed, it’s very rich soil. It has been farmed since the late 1800s. It is not necessarily habitat for, you know, different wildlife although there are a lot of birds out there.

So my primary concern and point is the negative impact to the agricultural resources of the
area. We are going to find it very difficult with the pipeline cutting the property basically into four pieces. We are already a small property. It is going to be much more difficult to find a farmer who is willing to take on that small of a piece of property with the easement in it.

We too were contemplating in the near future putting in almond orchards or a vineyard, a family vineyard. It would be a good size property to have a small vineyard. But this is -- the pipeline and the easement prohibition on trees and vines would basically make it economically non-viable to put those plans into effect.

We do have two wells on our property. We supply our own irrigation water and we supply our own domestic water. A large concern that was raised in the EIR is that there is possible degradation of groundwater. And we use the groundwater, the aquifer under our property, so that is a concern.

The pipeline will be in close proximity to our farmhouse. You can see the farmhouse and the pipeline. It is less than, definitely less than a half a mile and probably a little more than 200 feet. But it does create a hazard of leakage and explosion.

On the north boundary of the property there
are historical eucalyptus trees that were planted in the early 1900s. They were supposed to be used for farm implements but it turned out that the wood was too twisted and didn’t work out well for farm implements. But they have been left there as bird habitat.

One of the materials disseminated was a map from the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service and it shows -- this black mark is our family property here. And there are four red dots in close proximity, which shows that it is prime Swainson’s Hawk habitat. There is bird nesting in the row of eucalyptus trees on the north of the property. There is also a lot of other bird life out there like pheasant. Owls nest in the eucalyptus trees. There’s red wing blackbird, magpies and valley quail on the property. So the construction and the heavy traffic usage of the road that goes right through our property, County Road 88A, is definitely going to impact the nesting and the bird habitat.

I don’t think that the proposed report has considered the significant, negative impact of the agricultural resources of this area, Hungry Hollow. It is in conflict with the Yolo County General Plan, which is -- Goal AG-1 is to conserve and preserve agricultural lands in Yolo County, especially areas currently farmed or having prime agricultural soils. And rural, outside
existing communities and city limits. This is definitely us. This land has been farmed for, you know, over a century, it is prime soil and it is negatively impacting our farm.

The EIR states at paragraph 4.1.1 something that I believe is untrue. It states: The proposed alignment of the pipeline parallels existing county and farm roads to the maximum extent feasible. However, some portions will cross through agricultural lands containing crops.

The plan has not considered running the pipeline along existing county roads to the maximum extent feasible. If it did it would run the pipeline along County Road 16. It would not decide to cross right through seven farms when it could go very easily along Road 16. There is, I believe, one house and one tree on County Road 16.

And going where it is here, it is also feasible to let it go along County Road 17. Because that is not -- I mean, it is just going to go along cropland, it is not going to bisect parcels like it is here. But up here on County Road 16, which is one of the options. If it just runs along County Road 16 it is almost a straight shot right across the, the Interstate 505. It would have a minimum impact on existing farming
parcels and cropland, homes and habitat. I mean, it’s flat and there’s basically nothing up there. And I can’t see any justification that even compares to bisecting seven family farms. I believe that in this area of Yolo County, it may be different for that portion in Sutter and Placer Counties. This is a prime consideration and more consideration should be given to the preservation of intact and leaving intact farm parcels. My preferences of options other than the proposed, and I think that these options speak better to preservation of agricultural land currently under agriculture and having the potential for almonds and vineyards would be Option A, following existing County Road I-505. I believe I read in the report there is only one residence within 200 feet of the pipeline. And the proposal, the current proposal for the pipeline runs within 200 feet of eight residences. Option A would cause the least impact on homes and agricultural cropland. I don’t know how Durst Organic Farms got a leg up on this but I don’t believe that there should be a higher consideration than any other type of cropland. And also the Chung land on Road 17 does have some organic crops in it, as was mentioned by Mr. Dibble.
My next preference would be Option F. It runs along County Road 17 and then jogs north through the Dunnigan Hills. This would not bisect fields, agricultural fields. And there are no houses within 200 feet of the pipeline on that option.

The next preference -- and I only have three more. I am not going to go through all of them that you guys have in the report. Option B would be the next preference. That follows County Road 16 again. And that is Figure 3-2B, Map 4. This route results in two miles less bisecting agricultural lands. And it is a sparsely populated area, much less than the current proposal and there are no residences located within 200 feet of the pipeline.

Option E. Less desirable but it goes along County Road 19, it does not bisect cropland. Which I think really is, should be a prime factor and consideration here. There are less residences impacted under Option E than the proposed pipeline.

And lastly Option D. This would shift a nearly two mile portion of the pipeline from bisecting ten agricultural fields between County Road 17 and County Road 19. And it would just follow along County Road 17.

It’s just inconceivable to me that the...
pipeline cannot be run along the roads, especially Road 16, and would not have to cut in halves or in quarters cropland that is currently under use.

So it looks to me that from the proposed route PG&E has simply chosen to make what is basically a straight shot across Yolo County, Sutter and Placer Counties, disregarding the negative impact on cropland. The straight shot in my opinion is just to keep the cost as low as possible. More consideration needs to be given to preserving family farms and cropland. As far as aesthetics, please go out and drive on Road 16. Any aesthetic impact would be de minimis, basically nothing.

And I would thank you for your attention and consideration.

MS. SPURR: Thank you.

The next person is Nick Alexander.

MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you. My name is Nick Alexander. I am representing a landowner named DF Properties. They have 150 acres on the northwest corner of Baseline Road and Fiddyment. I want to thank you for the opportunity to comment as well.

While this area is currently zoned agricultural this area has been targeted for regional growth for some time. It was identified as a regional growth area in the 1994 Placer County General Plan. We
are currently in the planning process with the city of Roseville for a specific plan known as the Sierra Vista Specific Plan. Our property in particular, we are currently planning a 750,000 square foot power center on that corner.

Our point is that while we are not opposed to, you know, the gas line going in, we would encourage PG&E to locate the ultimate right-of-way or the ultimate gas line underneath the right-of-way of baseline road underneath the pavement. So as to not to create impacts with a potential 50 foot landscape corridor that will be on the north side.

The city of Roseville conditions all landowners in those landscape corridors to plant shade trees in order to, you know, reduce the impacts and provide shading to, you know, black tops.

This property has been also identified as a regional area for growth in the SACOG blueprint as well.

We would also request that PG&E analyze the ultimate depth of this gas line. Currently with the exception of I believe it’s the Watt Avenue/Baseline Road intersection there’s five feet of cover. We would ask that a deeper depth be analyzed.

Also in particular to our property we noticed that there’s a 100 by 150 foot valve cluster. We are
just unclear as to what that pertains. Is there any aboveground facilities that are involved with that? We also would request that PG&E coordinate the ultimate location of that, of that valve cluster with us so we don’t plan a, you know, a Home Depot or anything on top of it.

So anyway, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this. We also would encourage you to coordinate, coordinate your efforts with the city of Roseville in Placer County as Baseline Road, the ultimate right-of-way, is planned to be six lanes.

And then we would also reserve the opportunity to comment further before the 12th. Thank you for your consideration.

MS. SPURR: Okay, thank you.

I just have one person, Norepaul.

MR. MOUARYANG: Thank you. My name is Norepaul Mouaryang. I am one of the property owners in Yolo County on County Road 17. James has contacted me many times about this.

And my concern is the CRP will not allow us to do anything on that. Is it PG&E has more privilege than anyone else and just go and put something under it when the PG&E needs to do. My question is, what is difference between the CRP and PG&E?
MS. SPURR: The CRP?

MR. MOUARYANG: Yes. It’s a conservative property, whatever, that don’t allow anyone to touch or do anything or build anything inside the land. That’s what they call CRP. Williams CRP or something like that.

MS. SPURR: I’m not sure what coordination PG&E would need to do with the CRP. I’m not sure who has the ability.

MR. MOUARYANG: Yes. The Farm Bureau of Yolo County don’t allow anybody to do anything on that land. So they pay us, the owner of the land, not to do anything. Not to farm, not to build, not to do anything. Now my question is, why then -- how come PG&E has the right to do things through that land?

MS. SPURR: That I’m not sure.

MR. MOUARYANG: Yes. And also James told us that when the pipe go in it will be eight feet under the ground but what I saw, it’s only five. Which one is correct, eight or five?

MS. SPURR: There’s five feet of cover proposed for the pipeline.

MR. MOUARYANG: Now since many of my colleagues here they said about County Road 16 and 17. Which one is the definite option for us over there? To
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me it looks like County Road 17 right after 113.

MS. SPURR: Alternative options, is that what you are asking?

MR. MOUARYANG: Yes.

MS. SPURR: All of the alternative options.

We have several.

MR. MOUARYANG: So which one will they stand for sure now?

MS. SPURR: There is no decision made yet on which options will be chosen. You will get a chance to speak before the Commission, the State Lands Commission, which is a panel of three people. And when we have our commission meeting, probably in August, everyone who is on our mailing list will get a notice of when that commission meeting is. They make the decision on whether or not to certify the EIR and which options to choose for the project. They will make the final decision.

MR. MOUARYANG: Oh, okay.

MS. SPURR: This is to get your comments. And if there is an option that you think would be better than others you can make your comments known to us.

MR. MOUARYANG: Oh, okay. Now then County Road 17 may not be the option because Yolo County is not going to maintain that road. So if you guys do go
through that route are you guys will be the ones that
make sure that county road is safe for you to do
business or to put your pipe? Because they are not
maintaining, it will be out for farming only.

MS. SPURR: Yes. PG&E would need to work
those details out during --

MS. STEPHENS: Yolo County is abandoning --
MS. SPURR: -- the construction.
MS. STEPHENS: They are abandoning Road 17.
MS. SPURR: Oh they are?
MR. MOUARYANG: Yes, a-ha. Thank you.
MS. SPURR: Okay, thank you.
Is there anyone else that would like to speak?
Would you mind. You can go ahead, just give your name.

MS. NENG YANG: I just have a question.
MR. MOUARYANG: She is my sister, by the way.
MS. SPURR: Okay.

MS. NENG YANG: My name is Mai Neng Yang and I
am also one of the owners with my brother for that land.

MS. SPURR: Okay.

MS. NENG YANG: And I have a question. I
don’t know much about easement at all so I am going to
ask like these people. What happens if we don’t sign
the thing? What is going to happen? Because we have a
gut feeling that this is not a good thing. We don’t
know exactly what are the bad things that’s going to happen but I just have a gut feeling that it’s not right. Let’s say if we decided not to sign, what’s going to happen? Are you guys going to go through anyway?

MR. MOUARYANG: Is it communist country?

MS. NENG YANG: Can somebody help me here in the audience? Like if you don’t sign.

MR. DIBBLE: Eminent domain. Eminent domain for the good of the people. It doesn’t make it it’s any good for us, it’s the good of the majority of the people.

MS. NENG YANG: So it doesn’t matter.

MR. DIBBLE: That is what I was told. It doesn’t make any difference.

MS. NENG YANG: So if they decide that it’s good for the people then regardless of my saying it’s no good?

MR. DIBBLE: Yep.

MS. NEWTON: I would recommend that you take up that question with PG&E. And we can provide you --

MR. DIBBLE: I already have.

MS. NEWTON: Okay. Because that’s really -- we are working on the environmental document. But as to with regard to whether or not PG&E would ever exercise
eminent domain is really something you need to discuss with PG&E.

MR. DIBBLE: And they will, they have already told me that.

MS. NENG YANG: So there is no point of going to meeting and meeting afterwards then.

MS. NEWTON: Yes it is, it is very important. This meeting is in regard to the environmental document. This document will go to largely an elected body. Our commission has two elected people on it and then the third person is a representative of the Governor’s Office, the director of finance.

And when it goes to our commission they will make the decision on first of all saying, okay, the document is good.

But also second of all, approving the project. And you need to make your concerns heard to our commission. And that’s why all your comments are being recorded here verbal. We have written. And so all that will be part of the record and our commission will see that.

But in addition if you want to, you know, have an even greater impact I would suggest you attend the commission hearing. Which I’m sorry we don’t have a date, I apologize. It’s hard to get these people pinned
down to a date. But as soon as we have a date we will
tell people know, it will be noticed. And if we have
your address you will be noticed directly so you can
provide comments.

MS. NENG YANG: Now the other things that I
have concerns with is this. I have experience with
easement before. Now when they want something, somebody
out, some big guy out there wants something, they will
offer you some hundreds of dollars. So once you sign
that, now when you want something in return you have to
go back to them, ask permission. Now you don’t just pay
hundreds but you have to pay thousands of dollars to get
whatever you need to do on that piece of property.

So it’s like easement, I don’t have good
feelings about easement so that’s my concern. But
exactly, I don’t know what PG&E have to offer. Or how
much are they going to charge me later when I want to do
something about the land. But I still have a feeling
that I am going to have to pay thousands of dollars in
order for me to, let’s say, put concrete over from the
road to my place.

So those things, those permission, I have to
go through lots of steps in order for me to get it done.
So I kind of feel like, if it’s my property why do I
have to go through all that just to get something done.
So those are my concerns at this time. Thank you.

MS. SPURR: Okay, thank you.

MS. STEPHENS: Excuse me, could you say again, I didn’t hear, who is the commission made up of?

MS. NEWTON: Our commission is made up of the lieutenant governor, who is John Garamendi, the controller, state controller, John Chiang, and the director of the Department of Finance, which is Michael Genest. But actually he usually has a standing person so that it’s very consistent. And the person that Department of Finance sends is Tom Sheehy.

MS. STEPHENS: So Garamendi and Chiang and possibly Sheehy will be present at that hearing?

MS. NEWTON: Right.

MR. DIBBLE: Is it possible to get their e-mail addresses before?

MS. NEWTON: I would go online and just look at the lieutenant governor’s website and the controller’s website.

MR. DIBBLE: Okay.

MS. NEWTON: I don’t have them off the top of my head.

MR. DIBBLE: I can find them.

MS. NEWTON: Yes, I’m sorry. Or you can go to our website and there should be links from our website.
MR. DIBBLE: Lois Wolk’s office is working with us and they are going to have two representatives at the meeting tomorrow.

MS. NEWTON: Okay.

MS. SPURR: Are there any other comments? Okay, I would like to --

MR. DIBBLE: I have one. Not directed to you but to anybody else that is having issues with this as we are. I’d really highly recommend going through your legislators. They have been, they have been more than helpful in this. Whether they do any good or not they can’t do you any harm.

MS. SPURR: Okay.

I would like to thank everyone for attending and I am going to go ahead and close the meeting. We will have another one at 5:30 today.

MR. DIBBLE: Thank you.

MS. SPURR: All right, thank you.

(Thereupon, the Public Meeting was closed at 4:12 p.m.)
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MS. SPURR: All right, I guess we’ll go ahead and get started. My name is Crystal Spurr. I’m with the California State Lands Commission. Can’t hear? Okay, I’ll try to speak really loud. I’m with the California State Lands Commission; my name is Crystal Spurr.

We are the CEQA lead agency in preparing the Draft Environmental Impact Report. We used a consultant to help us prepare that but I managed the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report.

This is a public meeting to hear comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the PG&E Line 406, 407 natural gas pipeline.

We have a court reporter here. We are going to record all the comments that we receive and we will be responding to those in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

So when I do call you up if you could tell your name, speak your name, and then just come up to the podium and tell us your name and you can provide your comments.

I have a sign-in sheet in the back and anyone who has not signed in before or if you haven’t received
a Notice of Availability or any notices regarding this
Draft EIR then we probably don’t have your address and
we’d like to get you on our mailing list. We’ll be
sending out future notice when we have a commission on
this Environmental Impact Report.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report was
prepared in accordance with the California Environmental
Quality Act, which is also CEQA.
The comment period was 45 days long. And it
started on April 29, 2009 and it will end on June 12,
2009 at 5:00 p.m.

So you can provide your comments to me by June
12, 2009 on this Environmental Impact Report. You can
do that by fax, e-mail, regular mail. You can hand
those comments to me today. On these speaker slips
there is room on the back if you want to provide
comments today and just write them out and we’ll accept
those.

Once the comment period ends on this Draft
Environmental Impact Report we will prepare a Final.
And we will respond to all the comments that we receive,
written comments and verbal comments that we receive on
these public meetings.

We had two public meetings in Roseville
yesterday and there will be two today here, one at 3:00
o’clock, right now, and one at 5:30.

Once we prepare the Final Environmental Impact Report we will send copies of that to everyone who has made comments on this draft report and we’ll also make it available on our web site.

You will receive, we will be sending out notices of our commission hearing. We are hoping that it will be in August. We don’t have a schedule yet of when our commissioners meet. But at that time what they will do is they will take everything that we have on record, all of your comments and the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report and they’ll look at everything.

They will have a meeting. You can attend that meeting. You can talk directly to our commissioners who will be making a decision on whether or not the EIR was prepared appropriately. And if they determine that’s the case they will certify the EIR. And then after the EIR is certified they will make a decision on the project and whether or not to approve the project and how that project might be approved. Whether it will be approved as proposed or with one of these alternative alignments that we’ve taken a look at.

So we are looking for your input so that we can determine if maybe one of these alternative
alignments would be best. And the commissioners will be
looking for your input as well.

So is there any questions on the CEQA process
at this time? Okay.

This is Kerri Mikkelsen Tuttle. She’s with
MBA. And they prepared the Draft Environmental Impact
Report.

And she’s going to give a presentation, a
short presentation with some of the highlights in the
Environmental Impact Report. Once she is finished then
I’ll open it up for comments.

MS. MIKKELEN TUTTLE: Can you all hear me?
Okay.

I’m going to briefly describe the project in
general terms, show you some maps of the project. I do
courage to take a look at the maps that we have in the
back which show the proposed project, the proposed
alternative options to the proposed project. And
especially the two graphics here that focus on some of
the options that are of most interest to the group here
this evening.

I’ll also talk about the content of the
Environmental Impact Report which many of you have
received a copy of and I’ll talk about the findings of
that document.
Just a general overview of the project to get us started. The project is a 40 mile natural gas pipeline spanning Yolo, Sutter, Sacramento and Placer counties.

There are three proposed transmission pipelines. Line 406, 407 East and West and the Powerline Road Distribution Feeder Main.

The project also proposes to construct six aboveground pressure-limiting and regulating stations along the project alignment.

I know this graphic is difficult to see and I’ll put it up at the end if anybody wants to take a closer look. It was in the Environmental Impact Report as one of our exhibits.

But the areas shown in blue, with the exception of this one which is an existing aboveground station, these are the proposed aboveground facilities along the pipeline alignment.

Construction of the proposed pipeline would take place within a 100 foot wide area that consists of a 50 foot wide temporary construction area and a 50 foot wide permanent easement.

Trenching, soil storage, installation of the pipeline, pipeline testing and backfill would all occur within this 100 foot wide area.
Additional areas would be necessary to accommodate HDD and boring locations at the entry and exit points as well as staging for construction vehicles and equipment.

And there are two proposed --
MR. STEPHENS: What is HDD?
MS. MIKKELEN TUTTLE: HDD, horizontal --
MS. NEWTON: Horizontal directional drilling.
MS. MIKKELEN TUTTLE: Horizontal directional drilling. Thank you.
Pipeline storage. There are two proposed storage facilities. One is located in Arbuckle and one is located north of the city of Woodland. And the EIR analyzes all of those temporary construction areas or staging areas in the Environmental Impact Report.
I do want to describe briefly, the 50 foot permit wide easement is to prohibit, sorry, 50 foot wide permit easement is proposed to allow PG&E to maintain the pipeline and minimize potential pipeline damage.
Within that 50 foot easement there will be a 15 foot area that would prohibit planting of deep-rooted vegetation, trees and vines. But agricultural uses would be permitted within the 50 foot wide easement.
The pipe will be constructed using three
installation methods.

Conventional trenching would be used to install about 91 percent of the pipeline. That involves installing pipe within an open trench and then back filling that trench.

HDD or horizontal directional drilling would be use to install approximately seven percent of the pipeline. That uses a hydraulically powered horizontal drilling rig to tunnel under sensitive, large sensitive features like rivers, roadways, levies, wetlands.

Hammer boring drives an open-ended pipe for shorter distances under smaller roadways, smaller wetland or water features.

And conventional and auger boring would be used to install about two percent of the pipeline.

The construction sequence is shown on this slide. First land would be cleared and graded where needed. The topsoil and other materials that would be excavated will be stored for later back filling.

The pipe would be installed and tested. Following testing the topsoil would be replaced and restored to its original conditions or to conditions that would be approved by individual landowners.

The trenches themselves would typically not remain open for more than five days and they would be
back filled within 72 hours of pipeline installation.

At any given point on the pipeline where construction is occurring there would be approximately 20 days between the initial grading and back fill.

The HDDs take a little bit longer to install and those HDD locations would be under construction approximately two to four weeks.

The construction hours would be 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Saturday, again with the exception of the HDD locations. At the HDD locations there would be 24 hour operations until installation of the HDD is complete.

At any given time there would be about 90 to 130 construction workers working along, they would be dispersed along the pipeline, the portions that are under construction. And I have listed here, I’ll read them out, this text is too small. But the main travel routes that construction workers would use for Line 406 would be CR85, CR87, CR88A, CR17 and CR19.

For Line 407 the major travel routes would include CR16, 16A, 17, Baseline Road, Riego Road and Powerline Road. And the arterials that intersect those roadways would obviously be used as needed to get people to and from the sites daily.

During construction it is anticipated that up
to 40 trucks a day or 80 trips back and forth would temporarily use these roadways. Again based on the construction schedule that’s in the next slide.

For Line 406 construction is anticipated to begin this fall, September or October, with an in-service date of February 2010.

Line 407 East and the DFM are anticipated to be constructed in May 2010 or earlier if necessary with an in-service date of next fall.

And Line 407 West would be constructed by 2012.

Prior to constructing any of these pipelines PG&E will be completing easement permit acquisitions. They will be finalizing land surveys. Once the land surveys are complete they will survey and stake the construction rights of way and other temporary use areas and they will hold pre-construction meetings in the field for permitting agencies and construction workers.

CEQA requires that we analyze reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that meet the basic project objectives and that avoid our substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the proposed project.

In evaluating and considering alternatives there are four alternatives shown in this slide that we
considered but eliminated from full analysis in the EIR for the following reasons:

The northern alignment, which is shown in green. First I’ll point out the proposed alignment here, which is black. The northern green alignment was eliminated due to increased risks from fault rupture and locations on hillsides.

The southern alternative, which is shown in purple, was eliminated because it would have involved increased crossings of tributaries to Steelhead Creek and sensitive vernal pool habitats. It was also located in closer proximity to suburban populations.

The central alternative, which is shown here in red, was eliminated because of increased impacts to special status habitat and water features in that area.

And an alternative that is not pictured but was also eliminated from consideration was called the systems alternatives. It was eliminated because it proposed and would have required 15 separate projects and would have resulted in greater construction impacts associated with the greater quantities of pipelines.

MR. SMITH: I have a question for you. The green alternative was eliminated. Doesn’t the existing transmission line exist in that same road?

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: I don’t know. Do you
know?

MS. SPURR: I’m not sure where the existing lines, PG&E --

MR. SMITH: Lines 400 and 401.

MS. SPURR: Lines 400 and 401. I think we show it in one of our graphics, I can take a look.

MR. OCHOA: Road 17 is in there too.

MS. NEWTON: While Crystal --

MS. SPURR: They may not go, they are not parallel. Perpendicular to?

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: I think -- Yes, yes.

MR. SMITH: They are running in a different direction but don’t they travel approximately that same route that you’re talking to?

MS. NEWTON: Four hundred goes north and south.

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: Four hundred is north and south, 172 is north and south.

MS. SPURR: Right. And I think they are going --

MR. SMITH: Because the existing pipelines, as far as I know, are in the foothill area.

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: Well all of these alternatives would have tied into the same PG&E infrastructure that does exist at either end.
MS. NEWTON: They do, yes. They are largely north and south.

MS. SPURR: They are. They are not parallel with the green line but they intersect it.

MR. SMITH: But they are pretty close, right?

MS. NEWTON: Right. But all of those, all of pipelines, according to a map that’s in the document, are north/south trending and this is going to tie the west side with the east side. So there is no other pipeline in this vicinity that ties the west side to east side.

MR. SMITH: Well where I’m going with this, isn’t it as dangerous where the existing lines are now? Because they seem to be in the vicinity of a fault.

MS. NEWTON: It’s not -- this is looking at this project only, we are not going back and looking at prior practices. I understand what you are saying and that would be a good comment to make to us.

MR. SMITH: Okay, I got your message.

MS. NEWTON: Anyway, can we let Kerri finish.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: The alternatives that are evaluated in the environmental document. There are 12 build alternatives lettered A through L that are alternative options in addition to the no project
alternative that is required to be analyzed under CEQA.

Each of these alternative options, which are shown in the maps behind you and I’m going to go into detail with each of the alternative options in the following slides, they represent a particular segment of the alignment but differ in locations from the proposed project in an attempt to avoid or lessen the significant impacts associated with the proposed project.

At the conclusion of our analysis in the EIR it was determined that implementing none of the alternative options would decrease a Class 1 impact to the Class 2 level. What that means is there are significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Implementing mitigation associated with the options would not reduce the significance of those impacts.

CEQA requires us to select an environmentally superior alternative based on how that alternative fulfills the project objectives and how the alternative reduces or minimizes significant unavoidable impacts on the environment.

The environmentally superior alternative that was selected for this project in the Draft Environmental Impact Report would be incorporating the proposed project along with Options I and L, both of which have
been proposed to avoid impacts to planned school sites. Now I’m going to go into just a little bit of
detail on each of the alternative options. I encourage
you if you are, if you like one of these options, take a
look at the Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 3
describes each option in great detail. And if you would
like to make a comment regarding any of the alternatives
please do so.

Options A and B. This graphic actually shows
Options A through G but this -- Option A and B, in red
and blue respectively, would result in a greater
magnitude of impacts to agricultural, biological and
cultural resources, soils, seismicity, risk of upset
hazards, land use, traffic. And it would create a new
high-consequence area near Durst Organic Farmers. And
that is based on the fact that Durst employs 40 year-
round employees and 300 employees during peak farming
periods.

Option C, which is shown in dark green, would
result in a greater magnitude of impacts to biological
resources and soils and would not reduce any impacts
associated with the proposed project.

MR. SMITH: Does Option B run from A to -- is
that north/south the B plan or what?

MS. SPURR: It starts in the same location as
A.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: Yes. Option A we start here.

MR. SMITH: Right. Where does the option run below that, where A starts? What is that? Yeah, what option is that?

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: This is the proposed project. Is that what you are asking?

MR. SMITH: What slide is that? Is that C?

MS. SPURR: The proposed project. Are you talking about the little jog? The little jog in the --

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: The green here?

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: That’s C.

MR. SMITH: That’s C.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: Yes.

MR. SMITH: When was that added? Recently?

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: No, it’s been in the --

MR. SMITH: From the beginning?

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: From the beginning.

MR. SMITH: I happen to be at Site A and I don’t, I’m not aware of the C site being a possibility. I only discovered this reading the data. So that’s not a recent addition then?

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: No.
MR. SMITH: Because I have already visited Site A with PG&E and I was not made aware of the site below it, which is still on my property. Okay.

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: Options D and E, light green and yellow respectively, there’s a large scale map of these two alternatives in the back, would result in greater impacts, magnitude of impacts to biological resources, soils, cultural resources, aesthetics and noise during construction and would not reduce any of the impacts of the proposed project.

Option F, shown in maroon right here, was considered to avoid hilly terrain, and would result in greater impacts to biological resources, although it would reduce impacts to cultural resources.

And finally Option G on this diagram here would result in greater impacts to biological resources and would not reduce any impacts of the project.

MR. STEPHENS: What are the biological resources that would be impacted?

MS. MIKKESEN TUTTLE: That varies depending on the option. And I have tried to abbreviate my comment on each option because I could go into great detail. Which option are you specifically referring to?

MR. STEPHENS: D and E, I guess, you know. Things don’t change a hell of a lot out in that area.
THE REPORTER: I’m not picking up your comments, sir.

MS. SPURR: We can go over that after the meeting if you want. Because I have a copy of the EIR and we can look and see what those biological specific impacts are.

MS. NEWTON: Typically the biological impacts throughout the alignment deal with either wetland and wetland-associated species, vernal pool or vernal pool-associated species or trees, which is associated with Swainson’s nesting. That’s in general what they typically are.

MR. STEPHENS: But there are drainage areas --

THE REPORTER: Sir, sir, I’m not picking you up, I’m not picking up your comments.

MR. STEPHENS: That’s probably better for me, you can’t sue me.

MS. NEWTON: Okay, let’s --

MS. SPURR: Well we’ll continue. You can come up, you can come up and speak after we’re done with the presentation.

MS. NEWTON: Yes. We want to make sure that we capture your comments. These are not mics for projecting sound, they are mics for just receiving. So if you say something when you are not up to the mic we
are not going to be able to capture it, is what she is saying.

MR. STEPHENS: Well just on some areas, like our part, it’s right along the drain ditch. It’s water, you know, it’s got water in it. It’s going to be the same in these other places. I think it’s just PG&E wants it to be a damn straight line and don’t care about us.

MS. NEWTON: Well that would be a good comment to make.

MR. STEPHENS: I just made it.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: I will make a --

MS. NEWTON: Let’s wait until the end, please.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: I will make the comment that during the analysis of the options rather than compare the entire project plus the option, which would be a little unfair to the larger options, what we did was we compared a portion of the proposed project to the equivalent portion of the option. So we were comparing that piece to the proposed piece. And if you want to ask specific questions about the analysis I can go over they with you after the presentation.

Just to quickly finish through the alternatives. Option H is shown in yellow here. It would result in greater impacts to biological resources,
predominately because it involves a greater crossing through the Yolo Bypass.
Options I, J and K would reduce the risk of upset hazards to planned school sites as well Option L, excuse me. And Options I, J and K would reduce impacts to aesthetics and noise due to moving a portion of the pipeline to a location with fewer residences. These options would increase impacts to biological resources like seasonal wetlands, vernal pools and creeks and would also increase disturbance to soils.

I’ll briefly point these out. Option I is in turquoise here, Option J is in pink here, Option K is here. It’s blown up here for better vision. And Option L is fairly difficult to see because it runs along the pipeline. Option L would extend the proposed HDD in that location, which would reduce the safety risks to the planned school site located south of Baseline Road.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Report we analyzed 14 environmental issue areas. And I am not going to repeat them all here, they are on the slide here. I have a copy of the EIR here if anybody would like to look at it. And I touched on a lot of the areas as I was going through the alternatives.

We also analyzed impacts related to environmental justice, cumulative effects of the
proposed project. And I do want to point out that the
technical studies and the data that supports the
analysis that is contained in the EIR are all included a
appendices to the Draft EIR.

Part of analyzing and minimizing impacts to
the environment involves implementing mitigation
measures and we have implemented mitigation measures in
three major ways for this project. One, through project
design features which are intended to avoid or lessen
environmental effects.

The second is applicant-proposed measures,
which are measures proposed by PG&E to avoid
environmental impacts during construction.

And third is once the EIR consultants and
analysts take into account the project design features
and the applicant-proposed measures, if there are still
areas that are needed to reduce environmental impacts,
EIR mitigation measures are proposed.

Those are summarized in the EIR, both in the
executive summary and in the mitigation and monitoring
plan.

Some of the notable project design features
include added cover to prevent damage from outside
forces, financial compensation for temporary and
permanent losses of agricultural lands. Stockpiling and
replacing topsoil. Hazardous materials contingency planning. Utilizing HDD technologies to avoid large, sensitive resources. Implementing best management practices to avoid impacts to hydrology and other resources.

Some of the notable applicant-proposed measures that are included, all of the applicant-proposed measures that PG&E proposed are included as part of the requirements of the project in the EIR.

Some of these include fugitive dust mitigation, construction operation measures to reduce air quality impacts through maintenance of construction equipment, minimizing the idling time of vehicles, et cetera. Minimization of construction areas by staking and fencing and flagging the construction right-of-way, making sure that workers aren’t going outside of that 100 foot boundary. In addition there’s hazardous substance control, emergency response plans and procedures, traffic management plans, noise reduction and minimization measures.

And as I said earlier, in addition to the project design features and the applicant-proposed measures, some of the EIR mitigation measures that are proposed include the need to restore habitat and topography following construction, replanting screening
vegetation and light-shielding to prevent long-term aesthetic impacts. And implementing energy efficiency measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, monitoring nearby wells to ensure that groundwater is not impacted, and again, implementing best management practices to control construction vibration and noise.

At the conclusion of the analysis the Environmental Impact Report identified four Class 1 significant but unavoidable impacts. There are two such impacts related to air quality, both of which are related to temporarily exceeding air quality thresholds during construction. The other two impacts are related to hazards and the exposure to an unacceptable risk of hazards from fires, explosion or release.

That concludes my portion of my presentation on the EIR. This is Crystal Spurr’s address and e-mail address. I do encourage you to send your comments to her by June 12.

MS. SPURR: Okay. Again, if anyone would like to speak, provide your comments, could you please just fill out your name and then I’ll call you up one by one. I just have one at this time, Howard Lopez.

MR. H. LOPEZ: Okay. My name is Howard Lopez and I have got a piece of property that is in the projected line that you guys -- the one that you guys
are saying is the way to go.

The thing of it is they are cutting right through my property. They are dividing it. They are cutting it in half instead of going along the edge of the county road, okay.

That’s going to cause a lot of problems. One of them being a financial problem because of the deep-rooted crops. I won’t be able to plant almond trees there. Almond trees I found out are $4500 per acre and I’m losing an acre and a half, okay. And over a 15 year period you’re looking at over $100,000 that I’ll lose on that acre and a half, believe it or not.

And the thing of it is is I’m not the only one that’s going to lose income off of losing this acre and a half. The community will, you know, in taxes and in jobs lost. Because some of this, you know, revenue is paid out to vendors and that for the almond trees, okay.

The next thing I’d like to say is I don’t know how much this thing cost the taxpayers. I’d like to know.

MS. NEWTON: How much what cost?

MR. H. LOPEZ: How much this report (tapping on binder).

MS. NEWTON: PG&E paid for 100 percent of that.
MR. H. LOPEZ: PG&E paid for that. Well, then I can see why things are the way they are. Because let me tell you. Before you guys sent me this book, this thing, I was offered, I was offered money to sell an easement to them. And I questioned them. I says, well why are you guys trying to buy an easement when it hasn’t gone through environmental impact yet? And I didn’t get a good straight answer on that. Plus there’s been a fellow out there that’s -- he’s a contractor that puts in the pipe. And he’s out there on my property looking where this pipe is going to go. And I’m asking him, I say hey, you know, what’s the deal here? Why are you -- you guys are acting like this is a done deal. It hasn’t gone through environmental impact. He’s looking for water lines and things that he’s going to have to go under or tear up, see. So I don’t know if you guys, you know, have got any power that you can turn them away or not. You see what I’m saying?

MS. NEWTON: As Crystal -- I’m Gail Newton, I’m the chief of the environmental division for State Lands.

As Crystal said in her opening remarks, there’s actually two decisions being made here. And the first is on the document, certifying the document. And
this will be at our commission hearing, which we will
notice you of. So the first one is certifying the
document.

But the second decision is on the project.
And our commission has the ability to either approve or
not approve the project.

MR. H. LOPEZ: Well again, what they are
offering us is nothing. What they are offering us is
nothing. You can get -- If you have a cell tower on
your property they are paying $1200 to $1500 a month for
that. And, you know, I’ve been offered, I don’t know,
$7,000 for my acre and a half. You know, that’s nothing
because that’s all I’m going to get forever, you know.
And I’m not going to get any benefit off this line.

And like I say, if they would put it at the
end of the field it would be a lot better, along the
county road. Because if they put it in the middle of
the field what they are doing is they are taking that
piece of ground out of production.

MS. NEWTON: Is there one of those
alternatives that was shown that would include one of
those county roads that you think is preferable?

MR. H. LOPEZ: Yes. What I would like to see
is the No Option, the no project option, first of all.
The second would be, I think it’s A. It’s the County
Road 16 option. Or the County Road -- E, the County Road 19 option. And I own a piece of property on 19 that they would have to go through. And I’d be willing to give them, to work with them on an easement on going through that piece of property if they would do that, where they would stay along the road. Instead of dissecting my property, see.

Because I am not going to give them an easement, I am not going to sign an easement. And I have already told them that if they come on the property that they are going to be trespassing. And they continue to come onto the property. And when I confront them what they tell me is, oh, we haven’t been told to stay off your property. That’s what they tell me, see. So the PG&E is just giving me a bad time the whole, this whole thing. This whole, you know, this whole situation.

And another thing. Because I’ve got some, I’ve got some property over along the foothills where these two lines run. And there was a problem with one of the lines, it become exposed. So I called the PG&E. They came out and they did some work on it and they made it worse. I have some pictures here to actually show you guys and you guys can keep them. This is what they left me. And this has been going on for four years.
This is a wash. See these are the two lines right here. And what happened was right here they had -- the pipe was exposed, the pipe become exposed. So I called them and they came out and they put this little dinky pipe in here and loosened all this ground. Now you see where you’ve got all this erosion, okay. Two engineers from the PG&E came out.

Here’s some more pictures of it. This is what they did to cover up their exposed line. Well you can see it’s already washing around the back of that, okay. This is another view of it.

Maybe these people out here would like to look at this. Because this is the way the PG&E maintains their gas lines. And this is -- and I’ll tell you, they are not going to change after they put in these gas lines on our property, okay.

This is -- all this is erosion where they didn’t do it properly. Because two engineers came out and told me that they didn’t do it properly. But they told me that they were out of money. They were out of money and they couldn’t -- the initial repair wasn’t done right because they didn’t have enough money to go to Napa and get the proper rock to rock it. So this is the way the PG&E maintains their gas lines, okay.

And getting back to this thing here. I’ve
read, I’ve been through this thing. And all that it
tells me is that the primary route is the best route
because it’s the shortest route and it’s the cheapest
for the PG&E. That’s all this book is telling me, I’ve
been through it.

Those alternative routes. You’re saying, well
there’s dust up there and there’s noise up there and
seismic activity. That’s only a mile from the proposed
route. You can’t tell me that just because it’s a mile
away that you’re going to get dust and you’re going to
get noise and you’re going to get seismic activity.
You’re going to have all the same things on the proposed
route.

Let’s see, I think that’s it. Yeah, that’s
it. I’ll never give them an easement.

What I’d like to know though is, what will
happen if you guys -- because it looks to me like you
guys are going to go with the PG&E. I don’t know,
that’s the feeling I get. And what’s going to happen
when you guys go with the PG&E? Are they going to force
their way through? I’d like to know what’s going to
happen then.

MS. NEWTON: We can give you a contact number
for PG&E. We are just the lead agency on this. But we
can give you a contact number and you can ask those
MR. H. LOPEZ: You can’t tell me, huh?

MS. NEWTON: Well I know that PG&E has eminent domain powers; I don’t know that they have ever exercised them. So that’s a conversation that you would have to have with PG&E.

MR. H. LOPEZ: You know, another thing that I was told was talking about the deep-rooted crops. A representative from the PG&E came out. This guy was from the PG&E. I told him -- he says, well what’s your complaint, you’re going to get, you’re going to get compensated for it. And I told him I didn’t like the compensation.

And then he told me. I says, well I can’t plant, you know, the high dollar crops in here, I won’t be able to plant the high dollar crops on this strip of land that you’re going to take out of production for me. And he says, oh, like what, trees? I said, yeah. He says, go ahead and plant the trees. He says, after we leave, after we’re down the road plant the trees. I said, oh yeah, like that’s going to work. That’s what he told me. That’s the guy from the PG&E. So that’s what I’ve been getting see.

MS. NEWTON: Thank you for your comments.

MS. SPURR: The next person is James Bennett.
MR. BENNETT: My name is James Bennett. I have a piece of property on the proposed line. My concern is I have an irrigation well right at where it makes a 90 degree turn and I’m concerned about that, it’s a pretty important item. Then also I have a concrete pad that’s within that 50 feet from the property line that’s there. Is that going to disappear also, you know, during that construction and all that? They’re asking for 100 feet for, you know, during the construction. That totally encompasses both the well and the pad.

And then I have another question about the liability if there is a problem that arises. Who addresses that? Who is responsible for that?

MS. NEWTON: Well during the construction that would be PG&E.

MR. BENNETT: Okay, and then also during, afterwards?

MS. NEWTON: If it’s associated with the pipeline.

MR. BENNETT: Okay. Anything that comes up they’re liable for it.

MS. NEWTON: Well, I wouldn’t say anything.

But that would be in your agreement with them.

MR. BENNETT: Well, anything connected with
the pipeline. Okay. That was all I had comments on.

MS. NEWTON: Do we have an address for you?

MR. BENNETT: Yes.

MS. NEWTON: Because I know that PG&E was very interested in where there were wells that were located within the easement. So if we have your address --

MR. BENNETT: There’s also a pipe that goes across the road. Where they are actually putting the line in in front of our property is across the road, but then they make a 90 degree turn and come down the property line. And there is a pipe that goes -- before they put the road in there was a pipe that went across the road and we don’t really want to lose that.

But yes, you have my, my address. Thank you.

MS. NEWTON: Thank you very much.

MS. SPURR: Thank you.

Wilma Hill.

MS. HILL: I’m Wilma Mast Hill and have property very close to Howard Lopez.

And this pipeline would cut right through the middle of our property, totally devaluing it for future use and for future sale. If you have, if this easement would go through and if we wanted to sell our property it would devalue it tremendously. And even though -- this little compensation, quote/unquote compensation for
putting in the line is totally inadequate. If it were a yearly compensation that every year we got compensated because of loss of value of your property I would, it would be something to consider.

But there is no reason why this pipeline can’t be put along Road 19 where it is out of the way and not in people’s -- cutting through their land, getting into their wells. And I feel PG&E should accommodate the farmers instead of working against them. And it just seems to me that PG&E is giving people the runaround. At least Howard Lopez has been trying to work with them.

And I would like to see some kind of coordination here with us people in this room. I would like to know who was here. I would like us to be able to contact each other and find out from each other what is happening. Because I just feel like this is a game that’s going on. We have a huge corporation here, PG&E, that wants to do the cheapest thing they can. And we are not able to -- until we get the impact report. And when we go to the commission I’m sure we’ll be able to make our -- but that is not so easily done when you live 70 or 80 miles away like I do.

So I just wanted to put my comments that I would like to know what’s going on and I would like to have us know about the meetings. I want to know about
when the meetings are and every contact we can have.

MS. SPURR: All right, thank you.

Chris Ochoa.

MR. OCHOA: Chris Ochoa, Klein Family Farms.

I agree with Mr. Lopez, we are having the same problem. We’re going right through the middle of our property.

I don’t think that’s fair that you guys singled out an organic farmer. I mean, our farm is way, way bigger than Durst Farms. I mean, we’ve got a lot more land affected here. And I think that’s not right, just because he’s organic and I’m conventional, that you guys go around him. I mean, we’ve got way more employees and we have more economic to do with this county than he does.

MS. NEWTON: Do you mind if I ask how many employees?

MR. OCHOA: During harvest/transplant season we could be up there 60, 70 employees. If you took it all year round we could be up there in the hundreds. You know, hoeing crews, everything like that. Like I say, we farm almost 5,000 acres. I know Mr. Durst isn’t close to that.

This started for us about two years ago, March two years ago. My guys would call me on the radio and...
say hey, there’s people out here putting stakes, holes
in the field. No one ever contacted us, no letters. We
damaged equipment. Which we finally did get somebody at
PG&E for damaged equipment. It’s just been recently I’m
finally getting phone calls saying, we’re going to come
out on your property. It took me a year and a half to
get that to happen.

Another issue that no one has talked about is
they are asking for a 100 foot right-of-way right
through the middle of our crops. But we’ve still got to
spray and the ag commissioner has buffers for us to
spray. So if they are in the middle of our property and
we’ve got a 300, 400 or 500 foot buffer depending on
what we’re spraying, we can’t spray. And I mean, that’s
in the middle of my own property.

So we might have a 1,000 acre field that, you
know, half of we can’t spray because they are doing
construction out there. And most of these materials
nowadays we use are a minimum of 24 to 72 hours reentry.
So, I mean, my question is, are they going to shut the
project down for 72 hours so I can spray? I doubt it.
We have a big impact here on our crops, you know.

And another thing I ask is if they do their
construction in the summer and not pack our soil any
more than they are going to. I mean, they picked their
route, they are going to get their route. And, I mean, I don’t think there’s any way to stop it. And I just, you know, ask that we be compensated, which I know we are not going to be. That’s all I have to say.

MS. SPURR: I have a question for you.

MR. OCHOA: Yes.

MS. SPURR: This 913 Ridgeview Drive. Is that the address of Klein Family Farms?

MR. OCHOA: That’s -- send it to me and I’ll make sure they get it.

MS. SPURR: Well I’m just trying to, I would like to locate it on the map. So is that the address of the farm?

MR. OCHOA: No, it’s in town, that’s not actually where our farm is. I can go over the map afterwards with you.

MS. SPURR: Okay.

MS. NEWTON: That would be great.

MR. OCHOA: Because we are two miles of this pipeline on our own property. Thank you very much.

MS. SPURR: Thank you.

Ed Mast.

MR. MAST: I’m a neighbor of Howard Lopez and feel the same way that he does. Number one, we are being shafted on the payment. I have got a piece of
property up on Road 85. We started out with MCI, now it’s Verizon, and I’m getting $2500 a year for a piece that big. And you want to offer us practically nothing for trespassing. And this contract goes for 60 years. If you’d come up with something like that for the landowners who have some long-term interest in it, it might sweeten the pot a little bit, I don’t know.

But anyway, you’re shafting the public, you know, and you’re bulldozing your way through and I just don’t like it. You’re dividing our fields up. I don’t know whether we can irrigate a row crop, because we have row crops. If you have a field worker on this property what do we do, shut down the irrigation pumps? I don’t know.

How are we going to be compensated, for the whole field or what’s lost? If the pipeline divides the field and we can’t irrigate the other half -- if we can’t irrigate the whole field where’s the compensation come? There’s nothing -- But I’m highly opposed to it, thank you.

MS. SPURR: All right, thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

MR. STEPHENS: Fulton Stephens, property owner out there. Ours isn’t as bad as Mr. Lopez’s because it goes along the property line. But it’s criminal to just
divide people’s property. It should go down existing
roads or property lines. I mean, that’s just asinine.

I feel that PG&E’s mission statement is just to try to
screw us the best they can.

And on the compensation, and I don’t know if
that’s you guys’ deal or not. But why can’t some of the
greater good come to us out there. I mean, it’s on our
property. We’d like to have electricity and gas. You
know, not just do the greater good for Roseville or
whoever the hell gets it.

MS. NEWTON: Okay, thank you.

MS. SPURR: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: The name is Paul Smith. I have
property right on County Road 85. Actually I’m right
there at the junction where the new connection would be
at 400 and 401.

Now currently I have gas lines on my property
that run about 100 or about one mile or a mile and a
half perhaps. So I have already been introduced to the
gas lines.

Now the way I see it, with the connection
point on my property I am being introduced to another
project on my property. I would prefer that they take
that connection point and move it to the north, which I
had a question a little bit earlier about. I don’t want
the connection site on my property. I’ve got enough easements already on my property.

Now, and I was just made aware today after reading some of the literature on the boards back here, of the other alternative which is also on my property. I had not been appraised of that, hadn’t been made aware of it. I don’t even know where they are thinking about putting it on my property except for what I see on the drawing board back there. I have only walked the site that is proposed right now with PG&E.

Now, I got a letter, I think a few months back, that I was supposed to sign giving them permission to connect to my area on my property where the pipeline is going to start, the new pipeline. The compensation that they offered for this project was an insult to me. Now I’m sure that other property owners here also have received a similar compensation offer. It’s an insult to me and I’m sure to other people.

The fact is that PG&E is going to put this line in and service a lot of people up towards Northern California or up in that direction. They are going to make billions of dollars on this gas; there’s no question in my mind. Over a period of years there’s going to be billions in return. And they want to offer us a pittance. It’s just, it’s almost, it’s an insult
to me what they are offering us.

We become partners with PG&E. We sign over easements to them, we are in partnership with them. And what do we get for it? Practically zero. It’s totally unfair. And again, I would rather them take it off my site, get out of my neighborhood. I know that’s impossible but this is my sentiment right now.

I have already had experience thanks to Mr. Lopez acquainting the public here, with the gas line going under Cache Creek that’s on my property also. It is an accident waiting to happen. The state may not be aware of it but PG&E has worked on this problem. It’s the gas line going into Cache Creek, which happened to be exposed now through erosion. They patched it and patched it and they’ll probably continue to do it. It’s a mess. So I’ve already got exposure to what PG&E can do and what they won’t do. There’s no compensation there to me whatsoever for this gas line on my property which runs -- Cache Creek runs right through my property.

The other thing that I would like to comment on is the route for this gas line through all of these properties on up north of here, northeast I guess. Is this going to be considered a hazardous situation throughout these properties? Is it going to be
considered a hazardous site on our properties? Is it
going to be looked upon?

What if development occurs on any one of our
properties and the county steps in and says, well you
can’t build a development here, you can’t do this or you
can’t do this because you are right here on a hazardous
site. Am I looking at this correctly or incorrectly?

MS. NEWTON: Well there are various -- this is
kind of similar to the issue that happens on the east
side of the alignment where the proposed route is along
Baseline Road and there is proposed development that has
already been approved that has school sites right up on
that road. And that was reason for some of the options
to get outside what the state mandates as an evaluation
zone that’s 1500 feet.

So if were to, if there were a subdivision to
go on one of your pieces of property where the pipeline
is, part of the subdivision development that would have
to be considered as to if it needed to be upgraded for
whatever density, you know, or something like that were
to happen. It would be considered, it wouldn’t
necessarily preclude everything. I don’t know all the
regulations but it would definitely have to be a
consideration.

MR. SMITH: But I think it’s --
MR. STEPHENS: How about a single house?

MR. SMITH: Pardon me?

MR. STEPHENS: Excuse me.

MR. SMITH: Go ahead.

MR. STEPHENS: Just a single house if it were being put in there. How far away do you have to stay from the pipeline?

MS. NEWTON: I don’t think there’s any guidelines. I am not certain but I don’t think there’s any guidelines for a single house. Whenever it looks at pipelines it looks at density of population. And so it’s when you get into certain densities that there’s different criteria.

MR. STEPHENS: One person, they’re expendable, right?

MS. NEWTON: We all, you know, anybody that has natural gas in their house lives near a pipeline.

MR. SMITH: Well you guys are representing the state, I presume.

MS. NEWTON: I’m sorry?

MR. SMITH: You’re not with the counties.

MS. NEWTON: We are not with the county, we’re the state.

MR. SMITH: Well we live in the county so we, you know. And I’m not saying that this is going to
happen next year but look what’s happening in this
country right now, things are changing. Five years down
the road, ten years down the road if you are on a
hazardous site the rules may change. Can anybody
guarantee that adjacent to these gas lines that we could
build and do anything we want? I doubt it.

MS. NEWTON: No, no one can guarantee that.

MR. SMITH: So that’s what we are faced it.

It’s a consideration, believe me.

MS. NEWTON: You would have to go through the
environmental analysis.

MR. SMITH: And that’s why I go back to the
compensation that’s offered to us is an insult to all of
us. I don’t know what these other people got but mine
was a total insult.

I don’t know, I could go on and on. I think
that’s it, thank you.

MS. SPURR: Thank you.

MS. NEWTON: Any additional comments? Once
again --

MR. H. LOPEZ: I’d like to say something else.

MS. NEWTON: The written comment period is up
until the 12th so you could put some more in writing.

MR. H. LOPEZ: You know, you guys were talking
about Jim Durst up there, the organic. One of the
reasons that you wouldn’t use 16 as a, as an option.

There’s an organic on the proposed route just right next
to me, an organic farmer, Capay Fruits and Vegetables.
He employs a lot of people out there and you’re going to
go right through that place, cut it up too.

    MS. NEWTON:  Okay.  The issue with Durst
Organic, you did get it correctly, it’s about how many
people are there, it is about the risk to people.  And
so it is about how many employees are on that site and
that type of thing.  So if you can give us numbers of
employees that would be great.

    MR. H. LOPEZ:  Capay Fruits and Vegetables,
they are right next door.

    MS. NEWTON:  Okay.

    MR. H. LOPEZ:  They are an organic, he’s an
organic farmer just up out of Capay.

    MS. NEWTON:  Thank you.

    MS. SPURR:  Would anyone else like to make
comments at this time?

    MR. H. LOPEZ:  One other thing.  You know, I
don’t it’s appropriate that the PG&E is paying you guys
to do this, this project, I really don’t.  It looks like
it would be a conflict of interest.  I mean, if they are
paying you guys -- Why doesn’t the state, the taxpayers
pay you guys?  Then it would be -- you see what I’m
saying?

MS. NEWTON: No, I think -- Okay, so we work for the state, we are the State Lands Commission. And the reason why we are the lead agency, typically if there is any project that goes on in your county, your county is going to be the lead agency.

And the way most counties do this and the way the state does it is we either have our own staff write the document, and PG&E hands us the money to pay our staff. Or what we do is we take PG&E’s money and then we go hire a consultant. This is our consultant; this is not PG&E’s consultant. They have their own consultants as well. This is our consultant. And PG&E is at arms distance. This is an independent review of the project.

The reason why we are the lead agency instead of the counties is because we have a piece of property, we are a landowner too. We have a piece of property that the line will cross. They have to get a lease from us.

And the way the laws are written -- and you would also have, you also have other counties involved. And so the way the laws are written they ask that only one agency take on the responsibility of lead. And it be the agency that either has to take the first action
or has the broadest action. And so rather than Yolo County, Sutter County, Placer County, Sacramento County being the lead, we the state are the lead.

But it is not -- It is PG&E’s money, not tax dollars money. It’s not your taxes that’s paying for our efforts. PG&E is paying for our efforts but it is our consultant and it is our analysis. So it is not PG&E’s document, they didn’t write this. Kerri and her staff did. I realize it’s odd that the state would step in but that’s why, there’s multiple counties and they also cross our property.

MR. H. LOPEZ: Well I think that what you ought to do, you’re going to do an impact report on the environment, you ought to do an impact report on the farmers, the people that live there. I mean, aren’t we just as important as the environment?

MS. NEWTON: You are as important and that’s -- I think it is extremely important that -- that’s why we have these public hearings, so we can get your comments. I think it is extremely important to get your comments into the record. And I know that our commissioners, which are -- two of them are elected officials, one is an appointee from the Governor, they are very interested in what the public has to say.

MR. H. LOPEZ: We just get dumped on. That’s
what happens to us, we get dumped on.

MS. NEWTON: Well your comments, these comments will go directly to our commissioners. And whenever that public hearing is, which we hope it is in August, that’s what we are looking for, we are looking for a date where they can all be present. And as long as we have your address you will be noticed about that hearing. That’s a good time to make your voice heard.

MR. STEPHENS: Either way we pay for it. PG&E will raise our rates so they can fund fighting us.

We’re screwed.

MS. HILL: Do any of you work for PG&E? Now you said you don’t work for PG&E.

MS. NEWTON: None, none of us here work for PG&E.

MS. HILL: I guess I didn’t get that straight at the beginning. I couldn’t hear until --

MS. NEWTON: Right.

MS. HILL: None of you, you didn’t -- I just thought you worked -- we came here and PG&E was giving us a report.

MS. NEWTON: No, but we can give you some contact names and numbers for PG&E if you have questions with regard to compensation, their rights, whatever.

That type of action. We are here for the environmental
document.

MS. HILL: Which one of you is Crystal?

MS. SPURR: That’s me.

MS. HILL: Oh you’re Crystal, okay. And you’re the project manager of the California State Lands Commission.

MS. SPURR: Right, right.

MS. NEWTON: Maybe we should have you come up.

MS. BUTTERFIELD: I was just going to say, the people in the audience might be interested in specifically knowing who the commissioners are.

MS. NEWTON: Sure, certainly. The commissioners, there’s three commissioners. One is the Lieutenant Governor, John Garamendi, one is the State Controller, John Chiang. And the third is the Director of Finance who is appointed by the Governor, who is Mike Genest. But he has delegated his responsibility to the commission to his chief deputy director who is Tom Sheehy. And you can access their websites, they all have websites. You can also get to their websites through our website. Which is not up there. Our website would be www.slc, as in State Lands Commission, .ca as in California, .gov as in government.

You know, I really want to encourage you to come up to the mic if you want to talk because
otherwise --

MR. HULSMAN: It’s just a question.

MS. NEWTON: Okay, a question.

MR. HULSMAN: A general knowledge question.

Is anybody from Yolo County government here?

MS. NEWTON: I’m sorry?

MR. HULSMAN: Is anybody from Yolo County, the government here? Did they submit comments or do they even care?

MS. NEWTON: The question was is there anybody from Yolo County here and have they submitted comments.

MS. HULSMAN: Yes.

MS. NEWTON: I don’t believe we have received any comments.

MS. SPURR: We have not received any comments from Yolo County. I don’t know if anyone is here from Yolo County but they are certainly invited --

MR. H. LOPEZ: Phil Hogan with the RCD sent something to you.

MS. NEWTON: He’s RCD, that was NRCD, that’s different than the county.

MS. SPURR: That was during the scoping. But I haven’t received anything on this particular document. That was during the scoping. We did have scoping meetings and we did get comments on what we should look
at in this Draft EIR. But we haven’t received anything yet from Yolo County.

MR. HULSMAN: Okay, I was just curious.

MS. SPURR: But we might, we might by June 12.

MS. NEWTON: From all the counties.

MR. OCHOA: Chris Ochoa again, a quick question. I know Yolo County Farm Bureau sent a letter about a year ago.

MS. SPURR: Right.

MR. OCHOA: Supporting the line that you guys took off. And asked to be kept in the loop. And I know we have not been kept in the loop or to work with us to find a route that would be the best for agriculture.

MS. SPURR: Yes, they are on our mailing list.

MR. OCHOA: They’re on our mailing list but we never got, you know, a response back. I mean, the next thing we know the lines just dropped off, you know. They asked to support that line as much as possible. The next thing we know you guys pulled that route, the route off the agenda and that’s the last we heard, you know. We asked to work with the Farm Bureau, to work with landowners and farmers to find a good route, or the best route to, you know, support agriculture.

MS. SPURR: Okay.

MR. OCHOA: So I’d like a response on that
please.

MS. SPURR: All right.

MR. OCHOA: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: I’ve got a comment. Wouldn’t it make sense that we talk to PG&E before they get to you guys? I know that you have probably the say-so in the matter whether they can proceed with the project. But why don’t we give, why aren’t we given a chance to talk to speak to PG&E and vent our opinion with them before they pass this package on to you? Is there something wrong with this picture or is it me or what?

MS. HILL: That’s what I thought, where’s PG&E. Why aren’t we talking to PG&E?

MR. SMITH: I mean, does that make a little bit of sense?

MS. SPURR: We can give you PG&E’s contacts. That might have been something that they could have done themselves and had their own public meetings.

MR. SMITH: Yes. Because see, we haven’t had a chance to get our opinions across. And yet we’ve got a book that’s about four inches thick here with the entire proposal. And our comments aren’t in that book. How that could be formalized and put together without listening to our side of the picture is beyond me.

MS. NEWTON: Well, you know, once again I want
to encourage you to provide comments on some of these alternative options that you think are better, provide comment on those. If you think that something should be tweaked slightly or whatever to go around another high consequence area such as where there is another large number of employees or something, you know, provide those comments. And we will be looking at that prior to the final.

MR. SMITH: Because I know I met with them probably almost two years ago in Woodland at a meeting and it was about the proposal only. We couldn’t really vent our opinions and so forth on it. And I believe we were told that there was going to be subsequent meetings where we could attend and participate. I haven’t seen it. Well, you’ve got my comment.

MS. SPURR: Thank you.

Are there any other comments? Any other comments?

All right, I am going to go ahead and close this meeting. It’s 4:05 p.m. and I’m going to go ahead and close the meeting.

But we are going to be around and we are going to have -- we are going to just stick around here. We don’t mind talking to you after the meeting. You know, in-between the next meeting, between now and -- we’ll
have another meeting at 5:30 so we are going to be
sticking around if you have any questions or would like
to go over anything.

MS. NEWTON: Thank you for your time. I know
that everyone had to take time out of their days to come
here, we really appreciate that.

(Thereupon, the Public Meeting was
closed at 4:05 p.m.)
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PROCEEDINGS

5:39 P.M.

MS. SPURR: We will go ahead and start the meeting. If anyone would like to provide comments at this meeting if you could fill out a speaker slip at the back table. Write your name on it and then give it to me and I’ll call each of you up to the podium one by one.

My name is Crystal Spurr and I’m with the California State Lands Commission. We are the lead agency preparing the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the PG&E Line 406/407 natural gas pipeline project.

Gail Newton is going to speak a little bit and then I’ll come back. Gail Newton, the chief of environmental planning and management with the State Lands Commission.

MS. NEWTON: I thought I would take just a real quick moment to explain our function in this process.

(Mr. E. Lopez moved from the back of the room to the front.)

MS. NEWTON: So to give you an understanding, of the process here. We are the State Lands Commission. And typically if there is a project proposed a county would often be the lead agency. However, this project
spans four counties and also spans our jurisdiction,
some of our land. And therefore since we have one of
the earliest actions and also one of the broadest
jurisdictions we are the lead agency.

And that means that we have hired an
independent consultant to work for us. This is Michael
Brandman Associates. The money to do this process was
provided by PG&E but it is our consultant that is
working for us that has prepared the document to analyze
the environmental impacts associated with this project.

So we are an independent commission within the
state. There are three commissioners. And what will
happen is we are hoping in August there will be a public
hearing. We haven’t a confirmed date yet. But at that
public hearing the environmental document will be
considered for certification. And once it is certified,
then our commission can make a decision on whether or
not to approve the project. So there are two
independent decisions being made there.

And our commission is, once again, the State
Lands Commission. The commissioners are two elected
officials and one appointed. The elected officials are
John Garamendi who is the Lieutenant Governor, John
Chiang who is the State Controller. And then the
appointed gentleman actually works for the Department of
Finance and his name is Tom Sheehy and in essence he is representing the Governor. So those are our three commissioners.

And I want to encourage you to not only participate in the process during the draft environmental document and the final environmental document, but also participate at the commission hearing. And if we have your name and address on our sheet we’ll notice you about the hearing.

And with that I’d like to turn it back to Crystal.

MS. SPURR: Okay, we are going to be transcribing this meeting and all of your comments so that we can respond to those in the Final Environmental Impact Report, which will be a consolidation of all of the comment letters that we receive. And if you want to write a letter you can send it by mail, e-mail, fax. It was on the Notice of Availability that was mailed out to everyone. If you didn’t get one of those let me know. The Final EIR will have all those letters and our responses to all of your comments, including any comments that you make here, that’s why we are transcribing this.

There is a sign-in sheet. If you haven’t been to any of our meetings before or you are not sure if you
are on our mailing list if you would sign in and provide
your address we’ll make sure that you are on that
mailing list for the notice of the commission meeting.
The comment period is 45 days on this Draft
Environmental Impact Report and it started on April 29,
2009 and it will end on June 12, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. So
make sure you get your written comments to me by June 12
at 5 p.m.

We are going to have a short presentation on
the Environmental Impact Report just going over some of
the highlights of what is in this document and some of
the alternative options that we looked at. Kerri
Mikkelsen Tuttle is from MBA and she will be providing
that.

MS. MIKKELSEN TUTTLE: As Crystal and Gail
mentioned I work for a company called Michael Brandman
Associates and we have been assisting the States Lands
Commission to prepare this Draft Environmental Impact
Report.

Today I am going to give a brief overview of
what that document contains, a few details about the
project. I am going to discuss the options, the
alternative options that were considered in the document
and evaluated, and discuss some of the document’s
findings.
Just a brief overview. The project is a 40-mile gas pipeline that would extend across Sutter, Yolo, Placer and Sacramento counties.

There are three new transmission pipelines that are being proposed, Line 406, Line 407 East and West and the Powerline Road Distribution Feeder Main.

In addition to -- I’m actually going to show you the graphic as I talk through this. In addition to the pipeline itself the project is proposing to construct six aboveground pressure limiting and regulating stations along the project alignment. Those are shown on this graphic in blue, with the exception of this, which is an existing below ground station.

At the western terminus of the project a new major connection point would be added to existing Lines 400 and 401. The Capay Metering Station in here. From that point the project would construct a large diameter, 30-inch pipeline across the valley, essentially bisecting the existing loop system that is already in place.

Construction of the pipeline would take place within a 100 foot wide area, which consists of a 50 foot permanent easement and a 50 foot temporary construction area.

Additional temporary areas that would be used
during construction for staging purposes would be
located predominately in existing commercial and
industrial areas. There are two pipe storage facilities
that are proposed to be used to store pipe during
construction, one in Arbuckle and one north of the city
of Woodland.

And the areas that would be required to be
used for installing the horizontal directional drill
pipeline that will be installed using HDD technology
would require about 19,000 square foot temporary use
areas. The area that is evaluated in the EIR
encompasses all of those temporary construction areas.

Within the 50 foot permanent easement that
would remain to allow PG&E the freedom to come and
maintain the pipeline as well as minimize potential
pipeline damage. Deep-rooted plants such as trees and
vines will be prohibited within 15 feet of the pipeline
centerline.

But agricultural operations could continue
within that 50 foot permanent easement as long as not
that 50 foot area.

Project construction would install pipe using
three methods.

Conventional trenching, which is digging a
trench and back filling it, would comprise about 91
percent of construction.

The horizontal directional drilling methods, which use a hydraulically-powered horizontal drilling rig to tunnel under large features, levees, roads, rivers, wetlands, would be use to install about seven percent of the pipeline.

And then conventional hammer and auger boring or jack-and-bore would be used to install approximately two percent of the pipeline.

The sequence of construction activities will begin with land being cleared and graded where necessary.

Topsoil and other excavated materials will be removed and stored while the pipe is being installed. The pipe would be installed and tested.

And subsequently the topsoil will be replaced and restored to its original conditions, both re-vegetated and restored topography.

The trenches will typically not remain open for more than five days. And once the pipe is installed they would be back filled within 72 hours.

There would be approximately 21 days between initial grading and back filling of any given location. And each HDD takes approximately two to four weeks to complete.
Construction hours will be 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Saturday, except for the HDD construction which would require 24 hour operations until the HDD construction is complete.

During construction about 90 to 130 workers will be working along the pipeline alignment. At any given time they would be dispersed along the alignment depending on where construction was occurring at that time.

The main travel routes are shown here. For Line 406 those travel route would be CR-85, CR-87, CR-88A, CR-17 and CR-19. And during construction up to 40 trucks a day would use these roadways temporarily and that would be 80 trips back and forth.

Line 406 construction is slated to begin in September or October of this year with a proposed in-service date of February 2010.

The other pipelines, Line 407 East and the DFM, are expected to be constructed in May of 2010 or earlier if possible. Proposed in-service date for Line 407 East and the DFM is September 2010.

And then Line 407 West is expected to be installed by 2012.

Prior to constructing any of the pipelines, PG&E would complete easement and permit acquisitions,
they’ll finalize land surveys, they’ll survey and stake the construction right-of-way, that 100 foot corridor, as well as other temporary use areas that they will be using for staging. And they will hold pre-construction meetings in the field.

CEQA requires that we analyze, excuse me, feasible alternatives to the proposed project that meet the project objectives and that avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project.

For this project we analyzed and eliminated from full evaluation in the Environmental Impact Report four alternatives that are shown on this slide. The northern, green alternative here was eliminated due to increased risk from fault rupture and the location of portions of this alignment along hillsides.

The southern alternative, which is shown here in purple, was eliminated due to an increased number of crossings of tributaries to Steelhead Creek as well as increased crossings of vernal pools. That alternative, the southern alternative, would have also placed the pipeline in closer proximity to a large number of people.

The central alternative, shown in red, was eliminated due to increased impacts to special status
species habitat and other local hydrologic features.

And the fourth alternative that was eliminated, the systems alternative is not pictured. It was eliminated because it proposed 15 separate projects and would have resulted in greater construction impacts associated with the greater lengths of pipelines.

The alternatives that are fully evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report. There are 12 build alternatives; alternative options A through L. And I am going to go through them briefly on the following slides in addition to the no project alternative, which is required to be analyzed under CEQA.

Each option represents a particular segment of the proposed project that has been proposed because it differs in location and may avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the project impacts.

CEQA also requires that we select an environmentally superior alternative based on how that alternative fulfills the project objectives and how it reduces significant unavoidable impacts or substantially reduces impacts associated with the proposed alignment.

For this project the environmentally superior alternative that has been identified in the draft document is incorporating the proposed project as well as Options I and L, and I’ll show you those options.
next.

I’ll briefly run through -- Basically as part of the environmental analysis when we looked at options we analyzed the option and the equivalent portion of the proposed project.

And what I am going to go through here is what is the difference between Option A, which is shown in red, and the equivalent portion of the proposed project. And B, which is shown in blue, and the equivalent portion of the proposed project. Is that Options A and B would result in a greater magnitude of impacts to agricultural, biological or cultural, soils, seismicity, risk of upsets, land use, traffic, and would create a new high-consequence area near the Durst Organic Farm that would not occur under the similar portion of the project.

Option C, which is shown in dark green here, was proposed to avoid segmenting an agricultural field there. That would have resulted in a greater magnitude of impacts to biological resources and soils and would not reduce any of the impacts of the proposed project.

This slide shows options D, E, F and G. D is in light green. This is the Hungry Hollow area. E is in yellow; it’s the southern portion there. Those options would result in a greater magnitude of impacts
to biological resources, soils, cultural resources, and aesthetics and noise during construction compared to the similar portion of the proposed project.

Option F, which is very small, shown here in maroon, was considered in order to avoid hilly terrain located just to the west. And that option would result in a greater magnitude of impacts to biological resources, although it would reduce impacts to cultural resources.

And then finally on this slide Option G here is shown in magenta. It’s located here along the pipeline. It would result in greater impacts to biological resources compared to the equivalent portion of the proposed project.

Project options H through L are shown on this slide. Can you guys see that? Okay. H, Option H is here. It would require a greater crossing through the Yolo Bypass and therefore it would result in greater impacts to biological resources.

Options I, J and K as well as L. This is I, J, K and L is here, you can’t see that one. They are all being proposed to avoid impacts to proposed school sites and therefore would reduce the risk of safety hazards to proposed schools by placing the -- for Options I, J and K, placing the proposed pipeline
outside of the 1500 foot buffer.

Just a very brief overview of the layout of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR analyzes 14 topical areas. I’ve mentioned many of them in my discussion in the previous slides. It also evaluates environmental justice and cumulative effects. And I do want to point out that the technical studies and data that underlie the analysis are located in the technical appendices to the EIR.

There are several ways that potential impacts of the proposed project have been mitigated to less-than significant levels including project design features that are intended to avoid or lessen environmental impacts, applicant-proposed measures, which are measures taken by PG&E to avoid potential environmental impacts during construction. All of the APMs that PG&E proposed are included in the EIR. When it was determined that implementation of project design features and applicant-proposed measures were not sufficient to substantially reduce impacts to less-than significant levels the EIR proposes additional mitigation measures in the document.

I’ll briefly, briefly, briefly go through some of the project design features that are noteworthy.

PG&E is proposing added cover to prevent damage from outside forces along the pipeline alignment.
And a good example of that is there’s a three feet minimum in agricultural areas, PG&E is proposing five feet of cover.

PG&E is also proposing financial compensation for temporary and permanent losses of agricultural areas.

Soil will be stockpiled and replaced following construction.

And HDD technologies will be used to cross sensitive features.

Some of the notable applicant-proposed mitigations include managing fugitive dust, maintaining construction equipment and minimizing idling, which reduce air quality impacts during construction.

Restoring the construction area within the right-of-way following construction. And planning for emergency responses and controlling hazardous substances during construction.

Some of the noteworthy measures that the EIR identifies are habitat and topographic restoration following construction, replanting screening vegetation and light shielding during construction to minimize aesthetic impacts. Emergency plan measures and measures to minimize hazards. Monitoring the nearby wells located along the alignment to ensure that groundwater
is not impacted.

The EIR identifies four significant
unavoidable, which we call Class 1 impacts. Two of
those are related to air quality and they are related to
temporarily exceeding air quality thresholds during
construction. The other two are related to hazards and
they are described in two places in the EIR, in the
hazards and the land use section, and they are related
to exposure to an unacceptable risk of hazards from
fire, explosion or release.

And I’m sorry, that was a lightning tour
through the document. I’m happy to answer questions
after this entire presentation is over but I’ll now turn
it over to Crystal.

MS. SPURR: All right.

Do we have anyone that would like to provide
comments at this time on record?

Would you like to?

MS. NEWTON: We put a mic right there so if
you would like to --

MS. SPURR: If you would just state your name
and then provide your comments.

MR. E. LOPEZ: What am I supposed to say?

MS. SPURR: If you could provide your name and
then --
MR. E. LOPEZ: What am I supposed to say?

MS. SPURR: Any kind of comment that you had on the project.

MR. E. LOPEZ: I just barely hear you.

MS. SPURR: Do you have any comments on the project or the Draft Environmental Impact Report?

MS. NEWTON: Basically when we talked to you at the beginning of the meeting and we talked about the map, you had some preferences.

MR. E. LOPEZ: Yes.

MS. NEWTON: So this is the time to put those preferences into the record. Because this is being transcribed. So this would be the time to put your preferences that you voiced earlier into the record.

MR. E. LOPEZ: Yes. Well, I just have to, I just have to figure things out more. You know, more, more of what’s going on, before I can say that I agree on it.

MS. NEWTON: All right. Maybe I could get, can you write down your name so we can know who was speaking, or tell me, whichever.

MR. E. LOPEZ: You want me to write it down?

MS. NEWTON: Sure, that would be fine.

MS. SPURR: Is there anyone else who would like to provide comments at this time?
Okay, if you could come up to the podium and just state your name.

MS. DIBBLE: My name is Barbara Dibble and I believe you spoke with my husband yesterday at the last meeting. I’m sure he pretty much covered everything but I have a few questions of my own. And one of them is, where exactly is the original PUE?

MS. SPURR: PUE?

MS. DIBBLE: Your public utilities easement.

MS. SPURR: That would be a question for PG&E.

You are asking about PG&E’s public utility easement?

MS. DIBBLE: Yes.

MS. SPURR: I can provide you after the meeting with contact information for PG&E.

MS. DIBBLE: Okay. Because my understanding is it’s from the street on. It should be -- I think it’s like 15 feet. And I’m just wondering why you don’t go that way.

I mean, I don’t want it -- Don’t get me wrong because I don’t want it on my property at all because I’m scared to death of this. And I have seen many, many -- I have gone on-line and researched it and I have looked and I have seen those explosions. And it doesn’t matter where it’s going to be, whether it’s in the front or the back of my property. When that thing goes it’s...
going to take us all.

MS. SPURR: There is a risk, yes. We talked about that in the EIR.

MS. DIBBLE: But my thing is you are trying to tell me that you are going to do the best you can not to contaminate my water, you are going to do the best you can to make sure that there’s no explosions. How can you guarantee that? I mean, how do you guarantee that? How is that safe for my family right there?

MS. NEWTON: The document does do a risk analysis and it says that there is a risk. And that’s why one of our unavoidable impacts is the risk for fire and explosions and that’s what is evaluated. And that’s why it’s unavoidable and that’s why it’s pointed out as such.

And because there is an unavoidable impact in the document, if our commission adopts the document they have to make specific findings and a statement of override saying that we know there’s a risk here and we can’t mitigate it. It’s still going to be significant, there is a risk for the people, but we find that it is more important to approve the project. And that will be part of the public record if that decision is made.

MS. DIBBLE: Okay. So this is like, for the good of the people, right?
MS. NEWTON: Well that would be the --

MS. DIBBLE: But we’re people too. We’re people too.

MS. NEWTON: Right. And that’s why we are holding this public hearing because we want to get this into the record and that’s what this is all about.

MS. DIBBLE: Okay, well I still do not feel safe. I mean, having this great big pipe go through my property does not make me feel safe.

And you’re doing this for the good of the people. You’re going someplace where there is no people yet. Am I wrong? You’re putting this pipe over there to put in new housing; is that not right?

MS. NEWTON: At the beginning of the meeting I talked about how we are the lead agency. We actually are not PG&E. So we are evaluating the project and our commission will make a decision.

MS. DIBBLE: So you have no representation here from PG&E?

MS. NEWTON: We can give you phone contacts for PG&E and numbers and you can speak to them directly about that.

MS. DIBBLE: Well I have a lot of concerns about that because I see these houses that are foreclosing all over the place and yet they still want
to build. I don’t understand that.

MS. NEWTON: So probably the best way to state
that is, who are they serving?

MS. DIBBLE: Basically yes.

And another thing is that I have, I have owls
in my barn. They have been there for a very long time.
And I have hawks, a hawk family that is up in my
eucalyptus trees, which keep my rodents down.

Now you bring all that equipment in there and
it’s going to chase them off. And you’re telling me
that you’re supposed to go away from other areas to save
animals, right? Is that not it? Because my husband
said something about snakes.

MS. NEWTON: Part of the environmental review
process is trying --

MS. DIBBLE: Well what about my --

MS. NEWTON: -- to minimize impacts to other
species, especially listed species.

MS. DIBBLE: Well what about my owls and my
hawks?

MS. NEWTON: That is part of the evaluation.

MS. DIBBLE: I mean, because I really don’t
want to see them go.

All right. So my husband pretty much covered
everything else but those are my concerns that are, you
And I really think that this whole project should go down 16. And if you have ever gone down there you would see that it is flat. And I don’t see how any of that is going to move or cause any problems for your pipe. I mean, there’s one house that I have seen on County Road 16, that’s it. I mean, there’s nothing out there, you can’t farm it.

So, I mean, you’re going through prime farmland. And I don’t think that we should be, you know, take the burden on our shoulders so that you can -- I mean, I just don’t understand it.

And I looked at the map and you’ve got it coming down and right down 19 and then back up. Why don’t you go straight through? I don’t understand it. That’s prime farmland. We are the third generation in that house.

And as far as the rest of it, I mean. Our crops and stuff that we put in, we’re not going to get the revenue for that because you are limiting our ability to plant what we like to plant. So now I can’t put grapes in, and I can’t put almond trees in.

And honestly, I just, I don’t feel safe about this.

My husband pretty much filled out the rest of
it so -- but those are my thoughts.

MS. SPURR: Thank you.

MS. NEWTON: Thank you.

MS. SPURR: Any other commentors? Anyone else?

All right, we are going to go ahead and close this meeting then. I want to thank everyone for attending.

MS. NEWTON: And as long as we have your address you will get noticed about the Commission hearing.

I want to thank everyone for attending.

(Thereupon, the Public Meeting was closed at 6:07 p.m.)
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