

Memorandum

TO: Honorable Mayor &
City Council Members

FROM: Lee Price, MMC
City Clerk

SUBJECT: The Public Record
May 18-24, 2007

DATE: May 25, 2007

ITEMS TRANSMITTED TO THE ADMINISTRATION

ITEMS FILED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

- (a) Letter from Peter Kutras, Jr. County Executive to Mayor Reed and City Council dated May 3, 2007 regarding Las Plumas Household Hazardous Waste Facility.
- (b) Notification of Application Filing by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG & E) to State, County and City Officials dated May 11, 2007 for approval of cost of Capitol Proposal (COC).
- (c) Letter from TMobile to City Clerk Lee Price dated May 14, 2007 regarding OCI Site Number SF15077/San Jose, CA 95113.
- (d) Copy of letter from Diane Booth to Mayor Reed and City Council received May 21, 2007 regarding Santa Clara County Foster Care.

Lee Price, MMC
City Clerk

LP/np

Distribution: Mayor/Council
City Manager
Assistant City Manager
Assistant to City Manager
Council Liaison
Director of Planning
City Attorney
City Auditor
Director of Public Works
Director of Finance
Public Information Officer
San José Mercury News

Library

County of Santa Clara

Office of the County Executive

County Government Center, East Wing
70 West Hedding Street
San Jose, California 95110
(408) 299-5105



May 3, 2007

Honorable Mayor and City Council
200 East Santa Clara Street
San Jose, California 95113

Dear Mayor Reed and City Council Members:

Subject: Las Plumas Household Hazardous Waste Facility

This letter confirms my discussion with the City Manager that the County of Santa Clara supports the proposal by the City of San Jose to establish a Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) facility as part of its Service Center at 1608 Las Plumas Avenue in San Jose.

The County of Santa Clara currently maintains a contractual agreement with the City for managing the collection and disposal of household wastes, but the County has been operating at temporary locations until a permanent site could be constructed. The County would benefit from a permanent facility because it would be less expensive to operate and provide for more security than the temporary locations.

Also be advised that the County of Santa Clara currently leases office space at 1670 and 1690 Las Plumas Avenue, near the proposed HHW facility. The County queried the Departments of Facilities and Fleet, Occupational Safety and Environmental Compliance, Mental Health, and Social Services to ascertain concerns about the proximity of the HHW facility. There are no concerns to report.

County staff will be monitoring City progress of this development, and offer testimony and support as necessary. For additional information, please contact Greg Van Wassenhove, the Agriculture and Environmental Management Director, at 918-4646 or Sylvia Gallegos of my staff at 299-6408.

Sincerely,

Peter Kutras, Jr.
County Executive

c: Leslie R. White, City Manager
John Stufflebean, Director of Environmental Services
San Jose Planning Commission

*cc: Council
Lee Price*

TO: STATE, COUNTY
AND CITY OFFICIALS
May 11, 2007

Public Record b

**NOTIFICATION OF APPLICATION FILING BY
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (PG&E)
FOR APPROVAL OF COST OF CAPITAL PROPOSAL (COC)**

On May 08, 2007, PG&E filed an application with the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), in which PG&E asks for authority to increase its authorized COC for its electric and gas utility operations for test year 2008. If approved by the CPUC, PG&E's electric COC revenues would increase bundled customer (a customer who receives electric generation as well as transmission and distribution services) rates by \$32.4 million or 0.3 percent, and its gas COC revenues¹ would increase by \$7.1 million, or 0.2 percent.

In addition, PG&E proposes that the CPUC adopt an automatic adjustment mechanism called an Annual Cost of Capital Adjustment Mechanism (ACCAM). New to this proceeding, ACCAM would provide an adjustment mechanism (formula) for PG&E's authorized cost of capital based on changes in benchmark (standard) interest rates, in lieu of an annual COC proceeding for the period 2009 to 2013. This proposal is the result of a COC workshop where attendees that included CPUC staff, an Administrative Law Judge and a Commissioner, expressed interest in considering an alternative to filing a COC application each year.

Cost of Capital is a financial term defining how much a corporation is allowed in rates as a return on its invested capital. In this proceeding, the Commission will determine PG&E's reasonable costs of long-term debt, preferred stock and common stock that are part of the authorized COC. The authorized COC adopted in this application will be applied to capital investment authorized for PG&E.

Summary of PG&E's Key Reasons for Its Cost of Capital Request

- PG&E believes that approval of this request is necessary to attract capital to meet its obligations to serve its customers safely and efficiently.
- PG&E believes that approval of PG&E's cost of capital proposals will assist the company in maintaining an investment-grade credit rating, thereby reducing overall financing costs and contributing to PG&E's ability to perform its traditional role of procuring power for its customers.
- PG&E's authorized cost of capital determines the compensation for those who invest in PG&E.
- The ACCAM will remove the costs and burdens associated with an annual COC proceeding.

How Our Cost of Capital Request May Affect Revenues Collected as Rates from Customers

If the CPUC approves PG&E's electric proposal, a typical bundled residential electric customer using 550 kWh per month would see an increase in their average monthly bill of 0.1 percent or \$0.09, from \$71.99 to \$72.08 per month. A customer using 850 kWh per month (roughly twice baseline) would receive an increase of 0.4 percent or \$0.61, from \$149.55 to \$150.16 per month.

If the CPUC approves PG&E's proposal, the bill for a typical residential gas Customer using 45 therms per month would increase \$0.11, or 0.2 percent, from \$62.24 to \$62.35. Individual bills may differ. PG&E will provide an illustrative allocation of the proposed electric and gas 2008 rate increases among customer classes in a bill insert to be mailed to customers in May and early June.

The CPUC Process

The CPUC's independent Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) will review this application filing, analyze the proposal and present an independent analysis and recommendations for the CPUC's consideration. Other parties may also participate.

The CPUC may hold evidentiary hearings where the parties of record present their proposals in testimony and are subject to cross-examination before an Administrative Law Judge. These hearings are open to the public, but only those who are parties of record can present evidence or cross-examine witnesses during evidentiary hearings.

After considering all proposals and evidence presented during the hearing process, the CPUC will issue a draft decision. When the CPUC acts on this application, it may adopt all or part of PG&E's request, amend or modify it or deny the application. The CPUC's final decision may be different from PG&E's proposed application filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

For more details call PG&E at 800.743.5000
Para más detalles llame 800.660.6789 • 詳情請致電 800.893.9555
For TDD/TTY (speech-hearing impaired) call 800.652.4712

You may contact the CPUC's Public Advisor with comments or questions as follows:

Public Advisor's Office	415-703-2074 or 866-849-8390 (toll free)
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2103	TTY 415-703-5282 or TTY 866-836-7825 (toll free)
San Francisco, CA 94102	E-mail to public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov

If you are writing a letter to the Public Advisor's Office, please include the name of the application to which you are referring. All comments will be circulated to the Commissioners, the assigned Administrative Law Judge and the Energy Division staff.

¹ Revenue is the technical term used to describe the total amount of money customers pay in rates for the gas and electric service they receive.

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

2007 MAY 21 P 12:15

■ ■ ■ T ■ ■ Mobile ■[®]

Public Record C

RECEIVED
San Jose City Clerk

2007 MAY 21 P 12: 33

May 14, 2007

City Clerk:
Lee Price
200 East Santa Clara St.
San Jose, CA 95113

Re: OCI Site Number SF15077/ San Jose, CA 95113

Dear Ms. Price,

General Order 159-A (GO-159-A) of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) requires cellular carriers to send a notification letter of a utility's intent to construct a cellular facility to CPUC's Safety and Enforcement Division within 15 business days of receipt of all requisite local land use approvals. The notification letter shall state that such approvals have been received, or that no land use approvals are required.

As set forth in GO 159-A, copies of the notification letter are required to be served concurrently by mail on the local governmental agency. Where the affected local governmental agency is a city, service of the notification letter to the city shall consist of service of separate copies of the notification letter upon the City Manager, the City Planning Director and the City Clerk. In order to comply with these requirements, I have enclosed a copy of the notification letter for our project within your city limits.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Rod De La Rosa at (925) 521-5948.

Sincerely,



Renee Davis
Compliance Consultant
Omnipoint Communications Inc.

Attachments



April 6, 2007

Safety & Enforcement Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: OCI Site Number SF15077/ San Jose, CA

This is to provide the Commission with notice pursuant to the provisions of General Order No. 159A of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("CPUC") that:

(a) The cellular company has obtained all requisite land use approval for the project described in Attachment A.

(b) That no land use approval is required because _____.

A copy of this notification is also being provided to the appropriate local governmental agency for its information. Should there be any questions regarding this project, or if you disagree with any of the information contained herein, please contact Rod De La Rosa at (925) 521-5948 of Omnipoint Communications, Inc. dba T-Mobile, USA corporate identification number U-3056-C.

Very truly yours,

Renee Davis
Compliance Consultant

C: City of San Jose

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Location:

Site Identification Number: SF15077
Site Name: Public Storage
Site Address: 88 Blossom Hill Rd
County: Santa Clara
Site Location: San Jose, Ca. 95123
Assessor's Parcel Number: 690-01-0043
Latitude: NAD 83 N37 15 15
Longitude: NAD 83 W121 48 14

2. Project Description:

Number of Antennas to be installed: 6
Tower Design: Roof Top
Tower Appearance: N/A
Tower Height:
A) Building Height 34 ft
B) Structure Height 40.5 ft
C) Top of Antenna Height **40.5 ft**

Lease Area:

3. Business addresses of all Governmental Agencies

**City of San Jose
200 E Santa Clara St.**

4. Land Use Approval:

Building Permit

No: 2006-035844-C1

Issued: 4-24-07

5. If Land Use approval was not required: Explain reason for exemption and attach documentation from the jurisdiction (i.e. copy of ordinance) that officially states exemption:

Public Record d.

DIANE BOOTH

#21621 – 1424 COMMERCIAL DRIVE

VANCOUVER, B.C. CANADA

V5L 3G2

778-329-6100

VIA FACSIMILE: 916-445-4633

**Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, CA 95814**

RE: VINCENT BOOTH - JD11110 – SANTA CLARA COUNTY FOSTER CARE

Dear Governor Schwarzenegger:

You helped me get my son his Christmas presents I sent to him when the social workers refused to cooperate. They finally did release the laptop computer to my son, thanks to your help.

Unfortunately, I need to ask for your help again. I recently sent my son his presents for his 14th birthday, including a small printer for his laptop, a small digital camera, and several books on the Weather, as he is very interested in becoming a meteorologist. Again, the social worker is playing games and refuses to give my son his birthday presents.

This is a violation of State and Federal law and felony theft by county workers.

Please help my son again. All we have is each other, and the only love I am able to show him is twice a year when I am allowed to send him birthday and Christmas presents. But each time, the County makes an evil game out of it, and makes me fight tooth and nail just to give my son the presents he has a right to receive.

I have contacted the County Ombudsman and will file a police report for theft by a county employee. However, your intervention will make a huge difference for a little happiness for my son, who has been wrongfully imprisoned for 8 years in an institution in Santa Clara County. I am in the process of my sixth appeal for denial of my due process rights to an evidentiary hearing.

Below are the contact names and phone numbers for the social worker's involved:

QUYEN LUU – E 411

373 W. JULIAN ST., SAN JOSE, CA 95110

408-975-5428

SUPERVISOR:

GRACE JIMENEZ – 408-975-5495

I would truly appreciate any help you can give us.

Regards,

Diane Booth

Diane Booth

cc: Curt Hagman

Brohne Lawhorne

Laura Metune, Legislative Director
Office of Senator Carole Migden

Rep. Mike Honda

Rep. Zoe Lofgren

Senator Elaine Alquist

Senator Ellen Corbett

Chuck Reed, Mayor of San Jose

San Jose City Council