

1 BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND
2 DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

3
4

5 APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION)
6 FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO) Docket No. 04-AFC-1
7 ELECTRIC RELIABILITY PROJECT)
8 _____)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17 COMMITTEE CONFERENCE
18 FRIDAY, MAY 6, 2005
19 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

20
21
22
23

24 Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR, RPR
 License No. 5527
25 Contract No. 170-04-001

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

A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S

COMMISSION COMMITTEE: STANLEY VALKOSKY - Chairperson
JAMES D. BOYD
JOHN L. GEESMAN
MICHAEL SMITH

FOR THE APPLICANT: KAREN KUBICK, SFPUC
JEANNE SOLE, ESQ., City Atty
BARBARA HALE, SFPUC

FOR THE RESPONDENT: BILL PHANNER, Energy Comm.
DICK RATLIF, Legal Counsel

BE IT REMEMBERED that on May 6, 2005, at
the hour of 2:09 PM, at 953 DeHaro Street, San
Francisco, California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR
No. 5527, State of California, there commenced an
arbitration pursuant to the provisions and rules of the
Energy Resources Conservation and Development
Commission.

| | I N D E X | |
|----|---------------------------|--------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | WELCOMING STATEMENT BY: | Page |
| 3 | Mr. Valkosky: | 4 |
| 4 | PRESENTATION BY: | |
| 5 | Ms. Kubick: | 8 |
| 6 | Mr. Phanner: | 20 |
| 7 | SPEAKERS FROM THE PUBLIC: | |
| 8 | Mr. Francisco DeCosta: | 30, 46 |
| 9 | Mr. Isray Marculis: | 37 |
| 10 | Mr. Steven Moss: | 41 |
| 11 | Mr. Robert Sarvey: | 47 |
| 12 | Mr. Chris Kaiser: | 48 |
| 13 | Mr. Lynne Brown: | 54 |
| 14 | FINAL STATEMENT: | |
| 15 | Ms. Sole: | 45 |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

1 MR. VALKOSKY: If I could have your
2 attention, please. We're ready to begin.

3 Welcome back from the site visit. As
4 we -- Commissioner Boyd indicated before the hearing,
5 I'll redo the introductions for those of you who might
6 not have been there.

7 My name is Stan Valkosky. I'm the
8 hearing officer for this project. To my right is Mr.
9 James Boyd, who's a presiding member. To my left is
10 Commissioner John Geesman, who's an associate member
11 and to Commissioner Boyd's right is Mike Smith, who is
12 Commissioner Boyd's advisor.

13 What I'd like to start off is by having
14 the parties introduce themselves, beginning with
15 applicants.

16 By the way, parenthetically we're going
17 to have to play pass the microphone and so we ask
18 everyone's understanding on that.

19 MS. HALE: I'm Barbara Hale, Assistant
20 General Manager for Power at the SF Public Utilities
21 Commission. Thank you.

22 MS. SOLE: Hello. I'm Jeanne Sole with
23 the City Attorney's office.

24 MS. KUBICK: I'm Karen Kubick with the
25 San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and project

1 manager.

2 MR. RATLIF: I'm Dick Ratlif, counsel
3 for staff.

4 MR. PHANNER: Bill Phanner, project
5 manager for the Energy Commission.

6 MR. VALKOSKY: Are there any of the
7 intervening parties here present? I know I saw Mr.
8 Sarvey before.

9 Mr. Sarvey -- sir, if you could identify
10 yourself.

11 MR. BOSS: Joe Boss, Potrero Hill.

12 MR. BROWN: My name -- my name is Lynne
13 Brown. I'm a resident of Hunters Point.

14 MR. VALKOSKY: Lynne Brown, resident of
15 Hunters Point. Are you affiliated with Californians
16 for Renewable Energy?

17 MR. BROWN: Yes, sir.

18 MR. VALKOSKY: Any other present?

19 By way of background, we previously held
20 an information hearing and site visit for the San
21 Francisco Electric Reliability Project on June 15th
22 last year. At that time the proposed project site was
23 within the existing variance of Potrero Power Plant.

24 On March 25th of this year, the applicant
25 filed supplemental information proposing use of a site

1 on a property owned by the city. Committee then
2 convened today's conference as part of the Energy
3 Commission's licensing proceedings on this project in
4 order to provide the public opportunity to discuss the
5 project in its current proposed location and
6 configuring.

7 Notice of today's events was sent to all
8 parties, adjoining landowners, interested governmental
9 agencies and other individuals.

10 On April 7th, documents pertinent to
11 today's hearing include Applicant's proposed schedule
12 filed on April 29th, and the staff issued
13 identification report which was late filed May 4th.

14 The purpose of today's conference is to
15 provide a public forum to discuss the proposed
16 reliability project and the currently proposed site.

17 As most of you are no doubt aware, we
18 just held a visit to the proposed site, and for your
19 information, staff has separately scheduled a public
20 workshop, which will commence -- commence immediately
21 following conclusion of this conference.

22 The commissioners conducting this
23 proceeding will eventually issue a proposed decision
24 containing their recommendations on the proposed power
25 plant.

1 It's important to note that these
2 recommendations must by law be based solely on the
3 evidence contained in the public record.

4 To preserve the integrity of the
5 Commission's review process, our regulations and the
6 California Administrative Procedures Act expressly
7 prohibit off-the-record contacts concerning substantive
8 matters between the participants in this proceeding and
9 the commissioners, their advisors and myself.

10 This is known as our ex-parte rule, which
11 means that all contacts between a party to this
12 proceeding, Commissioners Boyd and Geesman, their
13 staffs concerning a substantive matter must occur in
14 the context of a public discussion such as will occur
15 today or in the form of a written communication
16 available to all parties.

17 The purpose of this rule is to provide
18 full disclosure to all participants of any and all
19 information which may eventually be used as a basis for
20 the future decision.

21 Now a little bit about today's procedure.
22 In the course of today's hearing, we're going to
23 proceed -- proceed in the following manner: First, the
24 applicant will describe the proposed project as
25 recently revised and explain his plans for developing

1 in the new project site.

2 Staff will then briefly explain the
3 potential issues which it believes may arise.

4 Upon completion of these presentations
5 and those by any other parties, interested agencies and
6 members of the public may ask questions or offer
7 comments.

8 At the conclusion of these informational
9 presentations, we'll briefly discuss scheduling and
10 other matters addressed in the issue identification
11 report.

12 Are there any questions?

13 Seeing none, we'll begin with applicant's
14 presentation, and for those in the -- in the audience,
15 I'd ask you to hold any questions you may have until
16 the applicant has completed their presentation and then
17 you will have a chance to -- to ask for any
18 clarifications you may desire.

19 MS. KUBICK: Thank you very much.

20 Once again, my name is Karen Kubick. I
21 am the project manager for this project. I first thank
22 the CEC for making all the plans for this day. We've
23 been looking forward to this day for quite a long time
24 on our schedule.

25 I want to go to the next slide actually

1 to be able to go over what I'll be talking about today
2 very briefly. I want to introduce the project team,
3 talk about the project changes, talk about our public
4 involvement process and then where we are in the
5 project.

6 Next slide. The most active portion of
7 the project team includes the mayor's office, Jesse
8 Blout, Supervisor Maxwell's office, Greg Asay.

9 The City Attorneys have been marvelous in
10 this project, and today we have Jeanne Sole with us,
11 Jackie Minor and Theresa Mueller. Many of you have met
12 through the process, as well. Anne Eng for the
13 Department of the Department. In addition to Barbara
14 and myself, Ralph Hollenbacher and Russell Stepp are
15 here from the San Francisco Public Utilities
16 Commission.

17 The project also depends on the expertise
18 of numerous consultants with vast experience. Steve
19 DeYoung seated there, John Carrier, Steve Brock, City
20 Power, and Gary Rubenstein.

21 This is, however, a City project. The
22 PUC is responsible for water, wastewater and power in
23 San Francisco, but we have other members and agencies
24 and folks that participate in this project, as well,
25 including Department of Public Health, City Planning,

1 Muni and the port.

2 We also depend on a number of City
3 agencies, city regulatory agencies, state regulatory
4 agencies and federal regulatory agencies to be able to
5 have a successful project, and that's why all those
6 locals are pictured there today.

7 This is a big project that requires an
8 awful lot of coordination to make it happen.

9 The San Francisco PUC is looking at a
10 number of things. We actually have an energy
11 reliability process that's occurring now where we're
12 looking at renewables, demand management, conservation,
13 but the CTs and the Peaker Plant project, the
14 project -- the site that you just saw today is part of
15 this overall portfolio.

16 One exciting change that is different
17 from the last time that you were in this very room --
18 although I understand you were facing the other
19 direction the last time you were here -- is the Cal ISO
20 action plan.

21 Cal ISO is basically the traffic cop,
22 independent traffic cop for power in California and the
23 western states, and unprecedented, I understand, but
24 they've come out with a road map that sets up a path
25 for us to be able to shut down in-city generation, and

1 this is extremely exciting.

2 The requirements of Cal ISO include fuel
3 transmission as well as new generation in San
4 Francisco. Fourteen transmission projects and the in-
5 city and San Francisco Airport CTs. Next slide.

6 Specifically what that means is ten
7 transition projects that are underway now by PG&E,
8 including the Jefferson Martin transmission line, this
9 will complete spring 2006 allowing Hunters Point Power
10 Plant to shut down.

11 Peakers in place summer 2007. The
12 facility that we're talking about today we're looking
13 at having commissioned by the summer 2007.

14 This would allow us to release Potrero
15 Unit 3 from its reliability must run status. This is
16 very exciting, and that would be effected the beginning
17 of 2008.

18 Additional transmission projects by PG&E,
19 and we can also no longer need Potrero Peaker Plants 4,
20 5 and 6.

21 This is unprecedented, a written document
22 from Cal ISO, and this is the action plan we are
23 operating off of. That is why we are proceeding with
24 this project so diligently.

25 The in-city project changes, as many of

1 you saw who were on the bus, are simply the site and
2 associated linears, the gas and electric lines and the
3 actual site of the facility.

4 We have moved a location to City owned
5 property. I'm sorry. I'm not looking at you.

6 COMMISSIONER BOYD: That's all right.

7 MS. KUBICK: That is it in a nutshell.
8 These are the changes. Next slide.

9 And I put a pullout map in your handout
10 that details the exact location, but as Russell very
11 eloquently on the bus described, we'll be looking to
12 site the three CTs on a rectangular piece of Muni
13 property.

14 It's a four acre site. We will be
15 staging the construction just to the east, and this is
16 all just north of 25th and Cesar Chavez. And each of
17 you do have that in front of you.

18 I think an issue that's been of great
19 interest to many of you, since we've been out working
20 with the public quite a bit lately, is the particulate
21 matter mitigation. This is also new news that I want
22 to discuss with you.

23 We've gone through a process of lots of
24 public meetings. There were previous workshops, a lot
25 of screening effort, a lot of work by staff, a lot of

1 work by consultants, but we have screened down from
2 having over 47 mitigation measures to currently
3 focusing on four for the PM10 mitigation package to
4 satisfy the CEC's requirements for PM10 full
5 mitigation.

6 Those are enhanced street cleaning, high
7 efficiency street cleaning. It's not the kind of
8 street cleaning that you go to the side of the street
9 where you have to move your car more.

10 This is the middle of the street hitting
11 all that portion that's unswept, picking up particulate
12 matter.

13 We saw a lot of blowing dust out there
14 today. That won't be the case after this project is in
15 place, as well.

16 Sodding and paving open dirt lots is
17 another potential mitigation measure. Vehicle
18 scrappage, getting old polluting vehicles in
19 cooperation with the Bay Area Air Quality Management
20 District off the street, and there is also a potential
21 of fireplace retrofits, no longer having wood burning
22 stoves. Using natural gas fired stoves instead.

23 I just do want to highlight, though, that
24 a favorite of the public when we've been out and about
25 has been the street cleaning at this point.

1 The neighbors and in particular the Power
2 Plant Task Force -- I see Steve Moss here and Joe Boss
3 and there's several other very other active folks that
4 represent that group.

5 I'm in front of them at least once a
6 month. Feels like more sometimes, but I'm in front of
7 them at least once a month, and they have basically
8 said to us this is all great. It's very interesting,
9 but we need to know more about the background air
10 quality.

11 So working with the local folks, people
12 that live in Potrero and Bayview/Hunters Point, we have
13 sited an additional PM10, PM2.5 air quality monitoring
14 sites. Two in Potrero, one actually that you went by
15 on our tour, although we didn't -- we didn't call it
16 out, but the Wood Muni yard at Minnesota and 22nd, and
17 the Potrero Recreation Center at Arkansas and Madera,
18 and those are in Potrero Dogpatch area. This is so we
19 can better categorize what's in the air now.

20 Two sites in Bayview/Hunters Point,
21 Malcolm X Academy and the Southeast Community Facility.
22 These sites were selected because they're secure sites.
23 We have to be meeting the monitors and reporting back.

24 These will also be identical monitors
25 though those placed at the air quality management site,

1 which is Arkansas and 16th, which I think we also drove
2 by.

3 We will then compare this data to that of
4 the BayCAMP site which is up at Hunters view in Hunters
5 Point.

6 We are also working on a community
7 benefits program, and we have been listening very
8 carefully to you on that, too. In fact, each time we
9 go out to give a presentation, we tweak our plan a
10 little bit and we reflect your input.

11 The candidates that have been the most
12 popular for potential community benefits package
13 include tree planting, low pollen trees.

14 The tree planting program has been
15 occurring in the Bayview/Hunters point now from the
16 Duke settlement money, and the trees are extremely
17 valuable to San Francisco residents.

18 We're also looking at indoor air quality
19 programs. The emphasis that you put back to us is that
20 mitigation has to mean something air quality-wise. It
21 has to make an improvement, and I've been lucky enough
22 to be very educated by Gary Rubenstein in terms of air
23 quality and what these things mean and what are asthma
24 triggers, because we are in an area where many folks
25 and children are affected by asthma.

1 Improved ventilation in the house, carpet
2 cleaning in the house, these are all indoor air quality
3 improvements that could potentially improve pediatric
4 asthma situations.

5 Advanced carpet cleaning with the special
6 ultra ultra filters and education programs. We were
7 lucky enough to begin dialogue with an organization
8 called HERC, which is the Health and Environment
9 Resource Center, and this is an organization that
10 focuses on community health and pediatric asthma, and
11 we're hopeful that we will be able to carve out part of
12 the community mitigation -- community benefit program
13 to be able to work with HERC.

14 They are funded currently by the
15 Department of Public Health.

16 Okay. We've been out a lot. We've been
17 very busy. We've been trying to go to the meetings so
18 that they're convenient for the citizens of San
19 Francisco so we go to their meetings and we try to get
20 on the program to give a brief overview of what the
21 project is, and this details where we've been above the
22 dotted line, and this details where we've been above
23 the dotted line, and we've been trying to be very
24 active, to be out there, to be receptive to be able to
25 hear what's being said.

1 We have a lot of future meetings, as
2 well. And it's not the last time we're going to any of
3 these organizations. I would look at this being very
4 interactive during the entire course of the AFC as well
5 as the construction of the project.

6 We're going to the port shortly, and you
7 can see down below there's a number of different
8 groups, neighborhood special interests, community
9 advisory groups, community leadership groups, and we
10 will be continuing on this circuit.

11 Each of these groups poses questions to
12 us and we try to then circle back and be responsive to
13 those details if we were unable to answer them at the
14 meeting.

15 Also, we are doing focus groups. This
16 has been something that's been of concern to us is that
17 we also capture the citizens that may be too busy to be
18 able to attend -- to be able to attend some of the
19 public meetings, so we're looking at potentially doing
20 in combination with phone survey having particular
21 focus groups where we can talk to them, talk to them
22 about the project, talk to them about the potential
23 benefit of the mitigation programs and community
24 benefits package to be able to discuss the project with
25 them.

1 Because meetings like this where I'm
2 talking at everybody are maybe not as interesting for
3 all of you, we're going to be doing an open house where
4 all of our consultants, all of our technical folks, we
5 bring our poster boards of the project, our details of
6 the project and we have the -- the community be able to
7 stop in from 5:30 till 8:00 two evenings, one in
8 southeast at the Southeast Community Center and one
9 back here, and we will have it set up so if you want to
10 spend two and a half hours talking about air, you can
11 do that.

12 If you want to walk through and hear
13 about the entire project or if you want to just talk
14 about solar and not talk at all, we will have a lot of
15 information there to be able to share with the
16 community and to be able to get input from the
17 community.

18 So those are two very exciting
19 opportunities for more folks to be able to come in,
20 drop in and ask questions.

21 Our schedule. Our schedule has -- it was
22 a very big day on the 25th of March when we finally got
23 to file our supplement, the AFC supplement to the CEC.

24 It was a very exciting day for the
25 project team. It was a lot of work. A lot of work

1 went into that, a lot of dedication with our project
2 group.

3 This period is also a landmark on our
4 schedule. The workshops, the site visit, the data
5 requests.

6 We are currently, as I said, in the
7 throws of trying to put the mitigation plan together.
8 That will then be committed to the CEC in June.

9 We have our fingers on the back of Bay
10 Area Air Quality Management District to be able to get
11 our -- our preliminary determination out June 14th, and
12 that looks very solid, and we will be continuing and
13 aiming at hopefully having CEC licensing approximately
14 February next calendar year.

15 Then we would be looking for City
16 approvals to go through City Process, which would
17 include the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission,
18 the San Francisco Port Commission, Municipal
19 Transportation Authority, the Board of Supervisors,
20 several readings.

21 At that point, we would look to have all
22 costs locked down, a solid power purchase agreement,
23 contractors lined up for the design build, contractors
24 lined up for the operations and maintenance and really
25 having all the costs fixed where we're going forward to

1 be able to have an approval that the board would be
2 able to sign off on.

3 The overall project schedule lists some
4 of our littler details that we're doing. In-house
5 we're working extremely hard, technical sites to move
6 forward with RFPs for contractors.

7 Project financing could not occur until
8 we do have approval from the Board of Supervisors.

9 We would then look at doing some of the
10 pre-construction compliance work so that we can ensure
11 what we'll be mitigating for during construction,
12 construction period lasting approximately fall through
13 summer 2007. So starting October of 2006 running
14 through June 2007 with commercial operation in June
15 2007.

16 And release of the Reliability Must Run
17 for Potrero number 3. Following that, the very first
18 of the calendar year 2008, and with that, that's the
19 end of my presentation.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. VALKOSKY: Thank you, Ms. Kubick.

22 Stan?

23 MR. PHANNER: I see a lot of familiar
24 faces from last year doing this. For you folks, I'm
25 going to try to keep this very minimal. For the new

1 faces, this is going to seem like a lot of information
2 coming at you, and I just want you to know that the
3 presentation I have here is available on a handout, and
4 please talk to me after the meeting if you have a
5 question.

6 So my name is Bill Phanner. I'm the
7 project manager with the Energy Commission processing
8 the application for certification for the supplemental
9 project. I'll basically go over the Energy
10 Commission's role.

11 We have committee authority over thermal
12 power plants of fifty megawatts or greater for
13 facility. So goes the transmission lines, water supply
14 systems, natural gas pipelines, waste disposal,
15 facility, access roads, all come under the umbrella of
16 our jurisdiction, and for those of you who are familiar
17 with CEQA, the Energy Commission does a CEQA equivalent
18 process.

19 So you might ask well, when is the EIR
20 going to be done? That's basically what we're doing.
21 We do the CEQA process at the end.

22 So there's a three step licensing process
23 that I will touch on briefly here. The first step is
24 data adequacy, which defines the minimum requirements
25 for acceptable application, and with the initial

1 application, we found that the application was data
2 adequate, and we are at the -- with the supplement at
3 the staff discovery and analysis stage which involves
4 data requests, which we are -- once we discuss at a
5 workshop after this hearing and the staff assessment.

6 The third step is to evidentiary hearing
7 and decision which the committee holds the evidentiary
8 hearings.

9 The committee members produce the
10 presiding members proposed decision or the PMPD, and
11 the final decision is made by the full commission.

12 So in -- in a graphic sense, during
13 this -- this phase we're in right now where it's the
14 staff discovery and analysis, the Energy Commission
15 staff is kind of the hub and we have the spokes going
16 out to the intervenors, the public, the applicant
17 local, state and federal agencies, and we also note
18 here that this is the Public Advisor's Office and their
19 role is to facilitate public involvement to work with
20 the community and we do have a representative of the
21 Public Advisors's Office, Mike Monosmith, who's in the
22 building today, and he also would be a good person to
23 talk to after this meeting as to how do we become
24 involved and who's become involved in the process.

25 At the discovery stage, supplement A was

1 reviewed for completeness, data requests prepared for
2 needed information, and the applicant, City and County
3 of San Francisco, has thirty days to submit responses,
4 and that's what we're doing right now.

5 The second step is the staff's analysis
6 and we determine if the project complies with laws,
7 ordinances, regulations and standards -- or LORS, as we
8 call them.

9 We conduct engineering and environmental
10 analysis to identify issues, evaluate alternatives,
11 identify mitigation measures and make a recommendation
12 on conditions of certification.

13 And this -- the areas that are
14 specifically dealt with in this -- this review are air
15 quality, alternative projects, biological resources,
16 cultural resources, environmental justice, hazardous
17 materials, land use, public health, economics.

18 So it's water, traffic and
19 transportation, trail and transmission line safety,
20 visual, waste and public -- worker safety and
21 environmental protection. Next slide.

22 So on the areas of engineering, then,
23 that our engineer staff looked at, there's the
24 efficiency of the project, facility design, including
25 seismic safety, geology, noise and vibrations,

1 facility, reliability, transmission system engineering,
2 and within the TSE umbrella, there's such things as
3 local system effects, systems reliability and
4 coordinating with the California Independent System
5 Operator, Cal ISO. Next slide.

6 We coordinate closely with local, state
7 and federal agencies. Staff will be working with such
8 local entities as the City and County of San Francisco
9 Planning and Public Works Departments, Bay Area Air
10 Quality Management District, BCDC state level, and the
11 San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, Air
12 Resources Board, Department of Fish & game and federal
13 level of US Fish & Wildlife.

14 There are a variety of entities, but I
15 just listed a few of them here.

16 So when we go on to the third step, which
17 is the evidentiary hearing process, that is when the
18 committee is the hub here and we are the spoke.

19 So staff is one of the -- provides
20 testimony to the committee, the intervenors provides
21 testimony, the public provides comment, local agencies
22 provide comment and the applicant gives testimony,
23 also.

24 And the evidentiary hearing and decision
25 involves the committee receives the testimony from

1 parties at the hearing. The committee issues the PMPD
2 and that contains findings relating to environmental
3 impact, public health, engineering and the project's
4 compliance, LORS, and it recommends conditions and
5 certification and the committee recommends whether or
6 not to approve the project.

7 This is a full commission making the
8 decision, then, and the commission staff monitors
9 compliance and all conditions, a certification for the
10 life of the project, including the closure of the
11 facility.

12 So a little bit about the public process
13 here. It is an open public process. We conduct
14 workshops and hearings. Typically we try to hold them
15 in the community and we notice ten to fourteen days in
16 advance through mailing lists and through electronic
17 mailing server lists.

18 Documents are available for public review
19 at the San Francisco Public Library, the Civic Center,
20 Potrero and Bayview; also at the Energy Commission,
21 Sacramento Library, Los Angeles, San Diego, Fresno and
22 Eureka.

23 The docket's at the Energy Commission and
24 they can provide information, and since most people
25 have Web access, this is a good connection to know and

1 it's on the handout of where all information related to
2 the project is put on the Web.

3 So ways that you can participate is
4 providing oral comments at public meetings and submit
5 written comments and statements to the commission or
6 you can provide written comments on the PSA, the
7 preliminary staff assessment, the final staff
8 assessment where the PMPD become a formal intervenor,
9 in which case you can contact the Public Advisors's
10 Office, and you can directly contact me or contact the
11 hearing office or the Public Advisor's office or any
12 time you have questions regarding the project.

13 So we're currently identifying issues,
14 and staff has identified some issues that are in a
15 report which we will be discussing later at the
16 workshop.

17 I'm just touching on them now briefly for
18 background for the committee and this will be discussed
19 in the workshop.

20 And the purpose of this is to inform the
21 participants of potential issues, early focus and
22 resolution of issues, and the criteria we use are what
23 are the issues identified are? Are there any impacts
24 that may be difficult to mitigate? Is compliance with
25 the LORS going to be a problem? Is there any

1 potentially contentious issues? Maybe there's
2 something that could have schedule problems, or are
3 there concerns to the community that we really need to
4 get out there?

5 And we did hold community group meetings
6 last year in June and July to try to focus on what the
7 concerns were of the community, and I'm reiterating
8 those today because they will apply to the same project
9 that we're looking at.

10 So the potential issues that we looked at
11 with our identification report is an air quality.
12 We're looking at an air quality monitoring strategy,
13 trying to come up with one that accurately identifies
14 where the monitoring location should be taking place,
15 cumulative impacts with the project and the
16 construction related impacts.

17 In cultural resources, our staff has
18 identified issues relating to native American
19 consultation, historic buildings and historic districts
20 and how to protect those and protection of
21 archeological resources.

22 Environmental Justice has identified
23 concerns of public outreach, the cumulative impacts to
24 the community and local mitigation measures and Public
25 Health identified health impacts and again local

1 mitigation measures specific to the community.

2 So we -- as I mentioned before, we have
3 met with community groups. In June 9th of 2004, we met
4 with CBE, Green Action and the Dogpatch and the Potrero
5 Boosters neighborhood groups.

6 On June 16th we met with Californians For
7 Reliable Energy, and on July 19th, we met with Bayview/
8 Hunters Point Community Advocates.

9 These were very worthwhile meetings.
10 Their concerns have been folded into our issue
11 identification report and the staff's analysis of the
12 project.

13 So community concerns that came out in
14 the workshops are air quality, looking at local
15 monitoring stations, local mitigation measures, the
16 health impacts, asthma, breast cancer, community health
17 patterns in the region, hazardous materials, what about
18 the transportation of hazardous materials associated
19 with the project and the treatment of -- of wastewater,
20 what impact to the community, land use, had conflicts
21 between planned residents that are going into this area
22 or may be coming, and industrial development and the
23 noise level index to sensitive resources, the
24 transition system engineering and local reliability
25 issues, understanding how the transmission system will

1 work in association with the closure of the Hunters
2 Point Power Plant.

3 Alternatives. Looking at a range of
4 alternatives at site for technologies to meet the
5 objectives of the project.

6 So our schedule is a little bit different
7 than the applicant's. They're pretty close, though,
8 and the difficult thing on putting something down on
9 paper is that then people say, "Oh, well it's exactly
10 going to happen that way."

11 I can only advise people you have to keep
12 involved with the system, because there are always
13 things that happen and don't read the date here and say,
14 "Oh, I know the PSA is coming out exactly on that day."

15 But for our purposes here, in a perfect
16 world, everything is looking good to process. Along
17 with this -- this process, we are currently holding the
18 data response issue resolution workshop, which will be
19 again after this meeting, and that will be a time when
20 individuals can have specific questions.

21 The next step is the -- the data. The
22 agency provides their responses to the comments. The
23 key date of the preliminary staff assessment we're
24 looking at July 25th.

25 Staff would then conduct workshops

1 approximately August 10th. The final staff assessment
2 October 3rd. Hearings November 1st. Committee files,
3 proposed decision January 6th and the commission
4 decision, approximately February 17th.

5 So again, keep involved with the process
6 and that will be the best way to keep up with the
7 schedule.

8 Okay.

9 MR. VALKOSKY: Thank you, Mr. Phanner.
10 Any presentations from the intervenors?
11 Mr. Sarvey, Mr. Brown or Mr. Boss? Do you have any
12 presentations at this time, Mr. Sarvey? No. Mr.
13 Brown?

14 MR. BROWN: No.

15 MR. VALKOSKY: I see Mr. Boss.

16 Okay. With that, are there any questions
17 from members on -- members of the public on the organic
18 process?

19 Sir, if you could come up and we'll get
20 you a microphone. Announce your name and spell your
21 last name for the record, please.

22 MR. DeCOSTA: My name is Francisco
23 DeCosta. I'm here representing the first people of
24 this area, the Muwekma Ohlone people, and I'm also the
25 director of the Environmental Justice Advocacy.

1 I have over thirty years of experience in
2 infrastructure and technical issues. I came here so
3 that I could see for myself during this tour if
4 empirical data and facts were represented to the
5 commissioners and the people on the bus.

6 And what I saw was a dog and pony show.
7 Let me explain to you.

8 First of all, when the first meeting was
9 held, it was held and focused about a particular site.
10 As you know, the site has been changed now.

11 No mention was made of liquefaction. In
12 1989, huge chunks of earth fell into the bay very close
13 to the area that we went. No mention was made of
14 archaeological sites.

15 As you know, this land 300 years ago was
16 pristine land. Eighteen treaties signed between the
17 tribes and the government were never kept. Eighteen
18 treaties.

19 The Muwekma Ohlone tribe proposes placing
20 the three combustible turbines in this area, and I say
21 that because I, Francisco DeCosta, participated in the
22 deliberations regarding the Jefferson Martin
23 transmission line. I sat down with Commissioner
24 Loretta Lynch and the San Bruno Mountain Watch and we
25 made things easy.

1 We said if you have the Jefferson Martin
2 transmission line in place, we have the underground
3 transmission line from the Martin to the Hunters Point
4 to the Mission -- transmission line in place, and
5 hopefully by the year 2012, we have the transmission
6 line from Pittsburg to Myerson Place. We really do not
7 need any power plants.

8 But here, we have people wanting to place
9 three combustable turbine -- turbines into our area
10 using very, very, very, very expensive fossil fuel
11 which are not really going to emit PM2.5s, but
12 pathogens into the air.

13 They're going to be using secondary
14 afterwards or treated sewage.

15 Now, if you look into this area or you
16 look at this area, we already have the high proportion
17 of infants who are dying, infants. Some do not even
18 survive two, three, four months, and they come out
19 dead. One of the reasons are the PM10s.

20 Doctors who really are experts in
21 respiratory diseases say it's from the power plants,
22 but I also say it's from the diesel.

23 Now we went to this site, and no mention
24 was made about the proposed Illinois Bridge. This is a
25 brand new bridge, so most of the traffic that

1 supposedly would go on Third Street will go on Illinois
2 Bridge. That's something new.

3 This aspect or this element has to be
4 taken into the cumulative. We need to look at the
5 cumulative impacts of what this project will do. It
6 hasn't been looked at.

7 This had to be mentioned in this tour so
8 that you guys or you, commissioners or you very learned
9 so-called experts would -- would know something.

10 If you look at this audience here -- we
11 have a population of about 42,000 in this area. Most
12 of them are minorities. If you look at this audience
13 here, you will see we have a lot of brown-skinned
14 people, a lot of Mexicans here and a lot of African-
15 Americans here.

16 They're all listening to you guys. We
17 haven't had commissioners one single meaningful
18 dialogue with the community. How can they have it?

19 The project, the ball keeps moving. The
20 target keeps moving. How can we have a meaningful
21 dialogue if on the spur of the moment we are produce
22 some sort of diatribe but not empirical data? This is
23 wrong.

24 Finally, let me tell you, my dear
25 friends, before God you need to address quality of life

1 issues. You need to pay attention and ponder for a
2 moment the death of our infants.

3 They cannot cop come here and speak. We
4 have many seniors who cannot come here and speak. No
5 meaningful dialogue has been done in the community.
6 Our seniors, for example, have not been consulted.

7 The Task Force, the Bayview Advocate,
8 Reaction, these are people that have been bought out.
9 I can go into an explanation. I do not receive a
10 single dollar from the City, state or federal. I
11 refuse to. I'm independent, because that's my
12 advocacy.

13 But again, as a representative of the
14 Muwekma Ohlone tribe, I tell you Commissioners in a
15 very forthright manner we do not need this spewing
16 toxic combustion turbines in our area.

17 Thank you very much.

18 MR. VALKOSKY: Thank you for your
19 comments, Mr. Decosta.

20 I would note for the record that future
21 hearings on this project will cover almost two dozen
22 technical disciplines in sometimes agonizing depth.

23 Those disciplines include, I believe,
24 everything you mentioned regarding environmental
25 justice, cumulative impacts, public health, cultural

1 and geotechnical concerns. So please keep in mind that
2 this is just the very, very beginning of the process.

3 And it does under state law give quite
4 extensively later on.

5 Are there any other public comments at
6 this time? Okay. Seeing none, I'd like to --

7 MR. GEESMAN: In the transmission system
8 engineering topic area, I pose the question to both the
9 applicant and the staff as to how you intend to address
10 the impact of the project on the prospective -- I'm not
11 certain of the name here, but I believe it's the
12 Transbay Cable Project being sponsored by the City of
13 Pittsburg.

14 Specifically I would like to know if the
15 project as designed would in any way inhibit the
16 Transbay Cable Project, and on the other hand, I'd be
17 interested in your views of -- at some point in this
18 process as to whether our decision on this project and
19 its design should perhaps encourage that project as it
20 would interconnect to the PG&E system in San Francisco.

21 MS. KUBICK: Karen Kubick, San Francisco
22 Public Utilities Commission.

23 We actually do coordinate on a regular
24 basis with the Transbay Cable folks and we have three
25 representatives from that project.

1 I believe we sat down about a week ago
2 and they did attend and we travel in the same circles.

3 Our project will not prohibit or inhibit
4 or cause any difficulty. They would be grounding a
5 different location.

6 The -- from my understanding as a
7 description of the project, the cable would be routed
8 along the -- basically out the Delta along the bay and
9 then come up near the same area and they would be
10 looking at sites slightly north of us.

11 And that would be a transmission project.
12 We're doing is of course a generation project, but they
13 are complementary, and all of us -- many of us in the
14 room have been participating in the stakeholder
15 meetings with PG&E, Cal ISO and currently the models
16 that are being run are evaluating CT cable,
17 alternatives against a few other alternatives, assuming
18 the CTs are in place.

19 That's looking at 2011-2018 time frame.

20 Did you want to add anything?

21 MS. HALE: Barbara Hale, SFPUC, general
22 manager for power. I would just like to add to Miss
23 Kubick's comments that the SFPUC did have a
24 representative at the Cal ISO public meeting where they
25 were discussing whether staff time should be dedicated

1 to looking at evaluating the transbay cable project,
2 and we spoke up on behalf of -- in support of looking
3 to a full discussion of the trans bay cable project.

4 We think it's prudent for the City and
5 County of San Francisco's reliability to look at all
6 the options.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. PHANNER: I will just add -- I think
9 people are can hear me -- that the Energy Commission
10 staff is aware of the transbay cable project. It will
11 be addressed in the preliminary staff assessment, and
12 this will be reiterated as a concern for the committee.

13 MR. VALKOSKY: Sir.

14 MR. MARCULIS: My name is Isray Marculis
15 and I represent the American Industrial Center. We are
16 the -- I guess the only building that fronts the PG&E
17 power plant area.

18 It's the old American Can buildings. It
19 stretches from 20th to 23rd Street.

20 If this project will move the power plant
21 further away from the 2,000 some odd people that work
22 in our buildings everyday, I think they'll be very
23 happy to have that, notwithstanding graveyards or
24 anything else.

25 My concern is one issue that I hope will

1 be addressed. That's to do with EMS, both above-ground
2 and underground.

3 Many of my tenants and people that work
4 in our buildings ask me these questions. I don't know
5 how to answer them. When affect is their health?
6 Obviously what you see is what bothers you the most.

7 Some years ago, we had a testing lab that
8 came out with a geiger counter and was measuring EMFs
9 that were coming up out of the ground.

10 The power line that's going to be put
11 underground for the sake of -- I don't know for what
12 good is. Let's say it gets it out of sight, at least.
13 That's maybe a good thing on one hand, but does it
14 really shield humans from -- from things that can cause
15 diseases and health issues?

16 These are the things that I hope we'll be
17 consulted with, about, and the way that we can explain
18 in plain English to people to put their minds at ease.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. VALKOSKY: Thank you, sir.

21 I note for your information that our
22 staff in its analysis routinely includes a topic area
23 called transmission line safety and nuisance which is
24 focused on exactly what you're describing, the electro-
25 magnetic fields, both the existing ambient field and

1 any changes in the field caused by the addition of
2 a --- of a new transmission line.

3 I -- Mr. Phanner, I assume that will be
4 done in this case.

5 MR. PHANNER: Yes. There is a separate
6 chapter in the PSA on that topic.

7 MR. VALKOSKY: So if -- if you have any
8 concerns or any areas where measurements should be
9 taken, I suggest contact Mr. Phanner and work something
10 out.

11 Anything else from members of the public
12 or public agencies before we turn to a brief scheduling
13 discussion?

14 MR. BOYD: Let me get back to what Mr.
15 Decosta said, just to further reiterate what -- what
16 Mr. Valkosky, our hearing officer said.

17 That today is but the first teeny step is
18 what is a long process in terms of revealing facts and
19 information, and the point made very early in this
20 session about the committee having to make decisions
21 based on the record is a very relevant point because
22 the record as provided by the applicant and the record
23 as provided by the Energy Commission staff who are in
24 effect legally intervenors and can deal with us as
25 anyone else can in the record that the decisions are

1 based on.

2 While the dog and pony show, as the
3 gentleman called it earlier today, the bus tour was
4 really only intended to show people the site and not be
5 an in-depth discussion of the issues.

6 All those issues will be discussed in the
7 documentation that is generated, introduced and
8 evaluations made by the staff and what have you.

9 And I just ask you to stay -- stay tuned,
10 so to speak, and keep up with information.

11 And just so you don't think you're the
12 only one who can say "liquefaction," that question
13 entered my mind immediately based upon the description
14 I heard of bay fill upon bay fill.

15 And I for one made a note that that's
16 something that I would very definitely be interested
17 in, the -- the seismicity issues, the geological issues
18 and what have you of this particular site knowing the
19 fragility of all the bay fill issues and observing what
20 happened to a much nicer part of the City, quite
21 frankly, as a result of one earthquake sometime ago.

22 So in any event, I hope we satisfy you to
23 some degree if not completely in the process that's
24 carried out.

25 Some people think it takes government way

1 too long to make decisions. Well, one of the reasons
2 the process is long is to try to get all the facts out
3 on the -- on the table.

4 And Commissioner Geesman and I have been
5 around a while and pretty well understand the processes
6 and the questions that should be asked, so I just hope
7 I give you some assurance that we just don't drop down
8 here today and you'll never see us again.

9 It will be a long series of hearings to
10 try to answer a lot of these questions.

11 MR. VALKOSKY: Sir.

12 MR. MOSS: My name is Steven Moss. I
13 live down the street and also work with San Francisco
14 Community Power.

15 I just wanted to mention that part of the
16 reason why there are not more people in this room
17 because in working with the City, Cal ISO and to a
18 certain extent the Energy Commission, as you've gotten
19 to know for years about power development process in
20 San Francisco -- and many of us that have concerns
21 about this power plant has to do with having all the
22 generation in our neighborhood, and as you know from
23 the City's presentation, the plan is to close the
24 existing power plants and open these new CTs in part to
25 do that.

1 The only reason people are not angrier
2 about this is because of that. I just want to make
3 that very clear. I understand the Energy Commission
4 doesn't have authority over closing power plants. In
5 fact, no one seems to, really.

6 I wanted to point that out that as part
7 of the City's plan, the RMR is released from Potrero 3,
8 but Murant can still do what they want. Murant owns
9 the power plant.

10 I just want to sort of emphasize to you,
11 and I know you don't have authority over this, but you
12 probably go to the same parties as some of the other
13 decision-makers that do have some authority over
14 this -- and maybe you see Murant on occasion -- that we
15 really need to have the Potrero complex closed, and I
16 want to emphasize that it would be an historic occasion
17 for a neighborhood in San Francisco to not oppose a
18 power plant much less accept it. It would be historic.
19 It would be breathtaking.

20 This is an opportunity to do that. I'm
21 not saying we do support it or that we don't oppose it,
22 but I do say -- I am saying that it is definitely
23 contingent on the existing facilities which have been
24 open far too long to be closed.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. VALKOSKY: Thank you, Mr. Moss.

2 Anything else?

3 Okay. Scheduling-wise, and I think this
4 will be a very brief discussion. You'll have another
5 chance for public comment.

6 MR. BOYD: Don't be bashful.

7 MR. VALKOSKY: Scheduling-wise -- and
8 I'm only speaking through issuance of the FSA or the
9 final staff assessment. It seems to me there's a
10 couple of key dates.

11 One, staff has scheduled June 3rd as the
12 date for applicant's data responses.

13 Is that a good date?

14 MS. SOLE: That's acceptable.

15 MR. VALKOSKY: Okay. Again, Applicant,
16 you have indicated the 14th of June for the preliminary
17 determination of compliance.

18 Is that rel -- what's your degree of
19 confidence in that?

20 MS. SOLE: I believe we're fairly
21 confident. We've had conversations with the Bay Area
22 Air Quality Management District and that date is based
23 on those conversations.

24 MR. VALKOSKY: Okay. So about mid-june.

25 So then Mr. Phanner, I take it

1 irrespective of the exact date, it will take staff
2 thirty days past release of the PEOC to issue their
3 preliminary staff assessment.

4 Is that correct?

5 MR. PHANNER: That's correct.

6 MR. VALKOSKY: All right. Then
7 understanding that the final determination of
8 compliance will of course depend on the preliminary
9 determination of compliance, it's about roughly nine
10 weeks following issuance of the PSA issuance of the
11 final staff assessment.

12 Is -- is that correct?

13 MR. PHANNER: Yes.

14 MR. VALKOSKY: Again, just taking it in
15 general terms.

16 What this all means for members of the
17 audience is that a preliminary staff assessment you can
18 look forward to, and again approximately the middle of
19 the summer.

20 That will have the initial staff review
21 of the various technical areas that will be followed by
22 a series of workshops, and then in early fall, staff
23 will have a polished up version of that preliminary
24 staff assessment.

25 This will happen before the committee

1 attempts to schedule any preliminary conference or any
2 evidentiary hearing. So there's -- there's going to be
3 a couple -- a couple cuts at the analysis for the
4 parties and for all the members of the public that
5 are -- that are interested in this case.

6 Okay. Are there any questions from any
7 members of the public? Agencies? Okay. Final
8 statements on behalf of Applicant.

9 MS. SOLE: I just wanted to say on
10 behalf of Applicant in the case of the schedule --
11 first of all, we appreciate staff's willingness to put
12 forward a really aggressive schedule.

13 As you mentioned, it is based on the
14 issuances of the PD, OC and the FDOC, and we do hope
15 that the commission will remain open to accelerating
16 the schedule to the extent that those documents come
17 out early, but we stand ready to work with the
18 commission and with the public to make sure that we
19 have a very thorough review, but also a prompt review
20 so that we can site the plants in time to get Potrero's
21 RMR eliminated by 2008.

22 MR. VALKOSKY: Okay. Anything else on
23 behalf of the applicant? Miss Sole.

24 MS. SOLE: I think we just want to thank
25 the committee again for visiting us.

1 MR. VALKOSKY: Good. Any one second,
2 Mr. Decosta.

3 Any final statement on behalf of staff?

4 MR. PHANNER: No.

5 MR. VALKOSKY: Mr. DeCosta, would you
6 like to speak again?

7 MR. DeCOSTA: I think I'll be remiss if
8 I didn't make this statement.

9 I would like the attorneys to look at our
10 population, and if you really want to do outreach to
11 our population, they should get information in their
12 own languages.

13 This is a standard form in the City and
14 County of San Francisco, and I'm sure the commissioners
15 will agree with me that we need to look at the
16 diversity of the community and the best way to do
17 outreach to them is to address the main elements of
18 this project in their own languages so that they can
19 give you some feedback.

20 I really do not appreciate anybody coming
21 over here and making general statements that, you
22 know -- about the power plants or whatever.

23 Each individual has their own take on
24 this matter. Our seniors, our youth, if the attorney
25 and the people are really interested in what I've

1 stated previously about quality of life issues, you
2 will find out that we have a very high percentage of
3 youth in this community, in the southeast sector.

4 The youth should be made part of the
5 deliberation.

6 Thank you very much.

7 MR. VALKOSKY: Thank you, sir.

8 Mr. Sarvey?

9 MR. SARVEY: I'm Bob Sarvey. I'm
10 intervenor on the project.

11 I'm sure most people on the bus tour
12 noticed as we went through the neighborhoods how many
13 industrial plants and how many polluting industries are
14 located in this area, and I think that the City needs
15 to take a look at this, and I'm sure i've seen in their
16 environmental justice section in their first
17 application that they were quite aware that this area
18 has been overburdened, and I believe that closure of
19 the Potrero plant is a noble endeavor, but it shouldn't
20 affect the City's decision to leave this area.

21 And I think the larger issue is that this
22 project should be located at the airport and I think
23 the City needs to stop polluting this neighborhood, and
24 I don't -- I don't support this because it would close
25 Potrero down because I don't think the City has any

1 control over closing potrero down.

2 And in fact, the document they cite is if
3 demand were to increase in the City and County of San
4 Francisco, Potrero would still not be released from its
5 reli -- reliability contract. So I think that's a
6 misstatement.

7 The public should be aware of that, and I
8 think the large point here should be not to site this
9 plant here at all, because this community is
10 overburdened.

11 You can just see it on this bus ride we
12 just took, and I think people of moral values would say
13 hey, we've done enough to these people. Let's put this
14 project somewhere else and let's close Potrero down, as
15 well.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. VALKOSKY: Thank you, sir.

18 Ma'am. Certainly.

19 MS. KAISER: I had a question about the
20 stormwater runoff.

21 MR. VALKOSKY: Would you identify
22 yourself, please?

23 MS. KAISER: My name is Chris Kaiser.
24 I'm with the California Energy Circuit, and I had a
25 question about the representative for the City and for

1 the public commission said the stormwater now goes
2 directly into the bay and it would be diverted into the
3 combined sewer outflow of the City.

4 I just wanted to find out more about
5 that.

6 MS. KUBICK: I'll start, and if I'm not
7 clear, Russell can augment.

8 City and County of San Francisco has a
9 combined sanitary and stormwater system, so we treat
10 street runoff as well as sanitary and wastewater close.

11 We would be collecting that and conveying
12 it to the Southeast Water Pollution Control Facility
13 which treats to secondary level, then discharges out to
14 the bay.

15 I just want to just ask Russell if he has
16 anything to add to that.

17 MR. STEPP: No.

18 MS. HALE: Russell, identify yourself,
19 please.

20 MR. STEPP: Please correct me if I've
21 misspoken here.

22 I believe currently -- Russell Stepp,
23 SFPUC.

24 I believe currently that both the trailer
25 staging area, which is identified as the construction

1 laydown area, that I'm pretty confident drains directly
2 into the bay just rain water coming out down there, and
3 I believe that the site, the four acre site that we
4 identified likewise does the same, but during
5 construction, all of the stormwater and any groundwater
6 will be controlled and not discharged into the bay, and
7 when the site is complete, it will be -- it will
8 consist of a lot of -- of -- probably a lot of asphalt,
9 paving and things and all of that stormwater at that
10 time will be collected, as any improved facility would,
11 and it will be combined with the collection system that
12 the Muni Metro facility to the west would have, and
13 then it would all discharge into the City combined
14 sewer system.

15 Is that correct, Steve?

16 MR. BROCK: Yeah. One small --

17 MS. KUBICK: Steve, why don't you come
18 up and speak here.

19 MR. BROCK: Steve Brock. I'm with PB
20 Power, the consultant on the project, and Russell was
21 pretty correct. The one caveat I would offer is that
22 during construction, we will use the best methods to
23 prevent silt and other things going into the bay, but
24 we would not alter current construction the stormwater
25 that we collect on the site.

1 After construction, all the stormwater
2 will go into the combined sewer system. So it will be
3 a net four acres that would now go into the storm water
4 collection system of the sewer that's currently going
5 into the bay. So the construction is the only
6 difference.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. VALKOSKY: Thank you, sir.

9 Does that clarify things?

10 MS. KAISER: Yeah, but I guess the
11 another location, I guess near Seattle and so forth,
12 there have been problems with overflow when -- with the
13 combined sewer and storm water systems, and I'm
14 wondering, is this a potential, rather than -- on the
15 face of it, it looks like it would be cleaner than just
16 allowing the stormwater to go straight into the bay,
17 but if it causes an overflow of the system and that --
18 that dirtier water gets discharged into the bay, I was
19 just wondering about that.

20 MS. KUBICK: Thank you. Karen Kubick,
21 San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

22 The City and County of San Francisco
23 currently is engaging in a Wastewater Master Plan where
24 we're looking at comprehensive evaluation of the
25 capacity of the system and of various transport boxes.

1 We have large storage boxes that
2 basically hold what flowed combined with the sanitary
3 flows until they can then be pumped and brought to the
4 treatment plant, but yes, there are overflow points
5 with that.

6 We are similar to other systems such as
7 Seattle, because you do hit peak rain flows and our
8 collection system can then be overwhelmed.

9 But the -- the objective is that our
10 rain -- rain water that's running off pavement picks up
11 hydrocarbons and pollutants, and rather than put that
12 into the bay, which is our precious resource, we want
13 to be able to collect that and treat it.

14 The overflow locations are specific and
15 designated and permitted, and on this side of the City,
16 I believe it's into Isles Creek where the stormwater
17 overflow location is.

18 MS. KAISER: So basically this is all
19 part of a larger master plan that the City's planning?

20 MS. KUBICK: This is a comprehensive
21 master plan.

22 At the end result of this Wastewater
23 Stormwater Master Plan, because we do treat both, is
24 going to be probably something to the tune of a two
25 plus billion dollar capital program that would occur

1 over the next twenty to possibly even fifty years of
2 dealing with a lot of things, including rising
3 elevation of bay water, of global warming, all kinds of
4 things, different kinds of treatment, how we handle
5 floods.

6 This is a whole other meeting that we
7 will have, and I'd be very happy to give you the name
8 of the project director for the Wastewater Master Plan
9 so that you can talk in-depth.

10 MS. KAISER: Yeah, because also I'm sure
11 you're familiar with. I'm sure you're aware what the
12 Bush administration has proposed in the Clean Water Act
13 in that regard.

14 MS. KUBICK: We don't do that here. We
15 treat our stormwater and our wastewater and we take
16 very -- very great pride in cleaning up the wastewater.

17 Previously the program had been called
18 the Clean Water Program, but the wastewater engineers
19 take great pride in San Francisco that we're cleaning
20 up wastewater.

21 I'd be very happy to hook you up with
22 them if you want to see the plant or talk with our
23 biologist. We monitor fish life, marine life and we
24 really take pride in what we do with wastewater.

25 MR. VALKOSKY: Good. Thank you.

1 Mr. Brown.

2 MR. BROWN: Yes. My name is Lynne Brown
3 and I've been in Bayview/Hunters Point for ten years.
4 You couldn't tell it to just look at me now, but
5 anyway, I don't understand this. The peakers will not
6 change this, what we're charging back here on my
7 PG&E bill.

8 This bill is for \$370. I'm low income
9 and we don't have any kind of renewables, any kind of
10 energy efficiency out in the Hunter Points projects,
11 but now what's going to happen you guys are going to
12 sell us energy and PG&E is going to add it on to my
13 bill? I cannot afford it.

14 It will be different if you put some
15 solar panels out there. Then I can have a quality
16 facility out there, also.

17 Thank you very much.

18 MR. VALKOSKY: Thank you, sir.

19 Is there anything else from anyone before
20 we adjourn?

21 I'd just like to advise those of you
22 that -- that we'll remain. Staff will be commencing a
23 workshop in ten minutes or so, and with that, the
24 committee would like to thank you for your attendance
25 and participation.

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

We're adjourned. Thank you.

(The meeting concluded at 3:16 PM)

---o0o---

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I was the
5 court reporter in the proceedings in the within-entitled
6 cause.

7 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
8 attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing
9 arbitration and caption named, or in any way interested in
10 the outcome of the cause named in said action.

11

12

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
14 hereunto set my hand this
15 day of ,
16 2005.

17

18 Mark I. Brickman CSR No. 5527

19

20

21

22

23

24

25