Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2023060769

Project Title: PG&E Power Asset Acquisition Project

Lead Agency: San Francisco Planning Department

Contact Name: Julie Moore/Monica Huggins

Email: CPC.PGEPowerAssetsEIR@sfgov.org

Phone Number: (628) 652-7566

Project Location: Various Locations in San Francisco and San Mateo Counties, City of Brisbane, City of Daly City

City *County*

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The City and County of San Francisco (the "City") is proposing to purchase Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)-owned electrical transmission and distribution assets (the "Assets") in San Francisco and San Mateo County that are needed to provide electricity service to customers within the city (the "project"). After the City completes its acquisition of the Assets, the City would own, operate, and maintain the electricity grid in San Francisco, most of which is currently owned by PG&E. This project does not include the purchase of PG&E's natural gas facilities; thus, PG&E would continue providing natural gas services to customers in San Francisco.

While a change in ownership itself would not result in physical changes to the environment requiring environmental review, construction would be necessary to physically separate PG&E's existing electric system into two separate systems (generally divided along the San Francisco/San Mateo county border), to allow both systems to be safely, reliably, and independently operated by the City and PG&E. The City would provide electricity service to city customers; PG&E would continue to provide electricity service to its customers outside of San Francisco. The EIR focuses on these areas where physical changes to the environment would occur as a result of the project.

The portion of the project requiring new construction or modifications to existing facilities would primarily be in the southern portion of San Francisco and along the county border in the northern portions of Brisbane and Daly City. The City would modify the existing Martin Substation (or construct a new substation, which is analyzed in the EIR as a new substation variant), construct new underground express distribution feeders, and modify the existing distribution infrastructure. The distribution express feeders alignment would be approximately 3.8 miles long and generally installed within streets, sidewalks, and other publicly owned land. It would extend from near Arch Street in the west, south to Brotherhood Way and Sagamore Street, east along Sickles Avenue, northeast along Huron Avenue and Alemany Boulevard, and southeast along Geneva Avenue to the Martin Substation in Brisbane. Disconnecting and connecting distribution lines between overhead poles and underground vaults could occur either above- or below-ground, and would be performed in small, discontinuous areas generally located near the county border. Construction associated with the project would take approximately 3 years after the purchase and transfer of the Assets.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

Implementation of the project may result in potentially significant impacts related to temporary increases in ambient noise during construction of the distribution express feeders (associated with trenchless construction), Martin Substation separation or new City Substation (project variant), and permanent increases in noise near the operations and maintenance service yards.

The EIR determined that the project would result in significant impacts related to noise and vibration, air quality, cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, biological resources, and paleontological resources which could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of mitigation for all topics except for noise, which would be significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

As discussed in greater detail in EIR Chapter 1, Introduction and Background, the City and PG&E have frequently disagreed about whether PG&E or the City is entitled to serve specific customers and whether PG&E's terms of service are reasonable. The following are areas of known controversy for the project:

- While the project proposes the acquisition of PG&E's electrical assets needed to provide electricity services to end-users in San Francisco, PG&E has rejected the City's two most recent offers of non-binding indication of interest to purchase the assets and stated that the assets are not for sale
- The Coalition of California Utility Employees has stated its members are concerned with projects that can result in serious environmental harm without providing countervailing economic benefits such as decent wages and benefits

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

- California Public Utilities Commission
- Regional Water Quality Control Board #2
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control
- California Coastal Commission
- Caltrans District #4
- San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- San Mateo County
- City of Daly City
- City of Brisbane
- Bayshore Sanitary District