

ED16-SDGE 07/17/2015 Response
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 16 Dated July 10, 2015
ED16-SDGE Questions 1-6

Please note that an attachment in response to Question 6 contains information considered confidential pursuant to PUC Section 583 and G.O. 66-C and also under the North American Electric Reliability Corporation's Rules of Procedure, Section 1500 et seq. and other applicable Federal and State Laws and Regulations

SDG&E has reviewed the questions and is providing the following responses based on conceptual desktop review of existing corridors to provide timely responses. Substantial amount of detailed engineering analysis, field reviews and calculations will be required to confirm the responses provided to this data request.

		SDGE Response Please indicate IF response is CONFIDENTIAL Attachments MUST be appropriately marked confidential.	
Source Ref	Description/Data needed		
1	<p>Data Request #14, Q1; Data Request #15, Q2</p> <p>Per SDG&E's request, the map in Attachment 1 indicates the area described in item #2 below from Data Request #15.</p> <p>"Describe and provide preliminary engineering to show how SDG&E would construct the Mission—Peñasquitos 230-kV Project following the Mission-San Luis Rey line corridor north to the approximately location of the Miramar Wholesale Nurseries and then heading east along an existing power line corridor to connect to the TL23013 corridor north of Miramar Wholesale Nurseries above Governor Drive and east of Interstate 805."</p>	<p>Clarification: Construction of Mission to Peñasquitos 230kV project would require heading West instead of East as stated in the question to connect to the TL23013 Corridor North of Miramar Wholesale Nurseries above Governor Drive and East of Interstate 805.</p> <p>In order to construct a new line between Mission and Peñasquitos, SDG&E would likely bundle TL23004 on the east side to create a vacant space on existing lattice towers. In locations where TL23001 and TL23001 are on H-Fame wood poles these poles would need to be replaced with steel H-Frame poles of similar configuration capable of handling bundled conductor in the existing right-of-way (ROW) Corridor. In addition, new ROW would need to be acquired to head west to connect to the TL23013 corridor where the existing TL23013 circuit is currently split bundled. The TL23013 Circuit would be bundled on the east side of existing structures to create a vacant spot for the new Mission – Peñasquitos Circuit.</p> <p>The tap between TL23001/04 to TL23013 corridors for the new Mission to Peñasquitos circuit could tentatively be made south of Governor Drive. The option of overhead versus underground for this tap (approximately 0.25 miles) is yet to be determined and would require modifications of existing structures on both circuits to make the connection.</p> <p>Modifications would need to be made at the Mission and Peñasquitos substations to rearrange rack positions as needed to allow the new circuit to be energized.</p>	

ED16-SDGE 07/17/2015 Response
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 16 Dated July 10, 2015
ED16-SDGE Questions 1-6

Please note that an attachment in response to Question 6 contains information considered confidential pursuant to PUC Section 583 and G.O. 66-C and also under the North American Electric Reliability Corporation's Rules of Procedure, Section 1500 et seq. and other applicable Federal and State Laws and Regulations

			Cross sections identifying the existing structure configurations in the corridor for TL23001/04 (from Mission to Miramar Wholesale Nurseries) and TL23013 (from Miramar Wholesale Nurseries – Peñasquitos) are included as Attachment DR16-Q1.
2	Data Request #15, Q5	<p>In following up to SDG&E's response to Q5 (<i>Bundling the wire on the east side of Segment C preserves the ampacity between the Mission and San Luis Rey Substations once TL23001 and TL23004 are consolidated to make room for the new SXPQ 230kV transmission line</i>), provide the existing wire size for circuit 23004 between structures Z519809 and Z226547 and Z226548.</p> <p>In the Encina Hub re-routing previously provided to the CPUC circuit TL23004 shows the existing conductors on one side of Structure Z519809 being "bundled together. On the other side of Structure Z519809 the conductors are not bundled. Preserving the ampacity between Mission and San Luis Rey implies that the existing wire on one side of Structure Z519809 has twice the ampacity as on the other side. Since Structure Z159809 appears to be a tangent structure this does not seem immediately intuitive or logical. Refer to mark-up in Attachment 2.</p>	<p>The existing wire size for the conductor on TL23004 between structures Z519809 and Z226547 and Z226548 is single – 1033.5 ACSR/AW 45/7 “Ortolan” (Dia – 1.212”, Unit Weight – 1.134 Lbs/Ft).</p> <p>This conductor is not proposed to be bundled at this time for this project. The ampacity is preserved on this tower line since the second circuit TL23001 on the tower also has the same conductor in existing conditions.</p>
3	N/A	<p>Provide identification information for the steel H-frame located just west of the Peñasquitos Junction (as shown in Attachment 3) and identify whether or not it will be utilized, abandoned on place, or</p>	<p>The steel H-Frame in question is an approximately 70-foot structure installed on June 2, 2015, to provide adequate clearance between the crossing below of TL13804 and TL6906. This structure will be removed as part of the Proposed Project because TL6906 will be relocated to the new pole line and will no longer be crossing under TL13804 once the Proposed Project is complete.</p>

ED16-SDGE 07/17/2015 Response
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 16 Dated July 10, 2015
ED16-SDGE Questions 1-6

Please note that an attachment in response to Question 6 contains information considered confidential pursuant to PUC Section 583 and G.O. 66-C and also under the North American Electric Reliability Corporation's Rules of Procedure, Section 1500 et seq. and other applicable Federal and State Laws and Regulations

		<p>removed as part of the Proposed Project. Additionally, would this H-frame structure be utilized, abandoned on place, or removed as part of Alternative 1 (LPCP Mercy Road; refer to SDG&E preliminary engineering in response to Data Request #8)</p> <p>For the Proposed Project, it appears that the transfer of the 138 kV line to the right hand side of the lattice tower and stringing of the 230 kV line on the left hand side of the lattice tower could be done such that there is sufficient ground clearance through this area, thereby eliminating the need for the steel H-frame.</p>	<p>The removal of this structure was not part of the original CPCN filing and PEA analysis because the structure was recently installed to mitigate clearance violations. GIS data for this structure and anticipated work areas for removal of this structure has been included as Attachment ED16 – Q3(a) and a map depicting the structure location and work are has been provided as Attachment ED16 – Q3(b). All work areas are assumed to be within existing impact areas that were created during installation in SDG&E's existing ROW.</p>
4	N/A	<p>Please review and provide any project work area changes to the attached draft EIR Project Description (Attachment 4) that SDG&E would like to make including track change edits in the MSWord file and GIS data for any revised work space limits (e.g., stringing sites, staging yards, access, temporary work areas, retaining wall locations).</p> <p>A copy of the current project description detailed maps and the work space GIS data are provided in Attachment 4 for SDG&E to use in your review. Please note that the Torrey Santa Fe staging yard is currently included in the proposed project description; however, if written permission to consider the site for staging is not</p>	<p>As discussed during the conference call with Energy Division on July 8, 2015, SDG&E identified potential reductions in impacts to habitat for Covered Species^[1] during the recent <i>SDG&E Subregional Natural Community Conservation Plan</i> (NCCP) audit conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (collectively, Wildlife Agencies). SDG&E sought to ensure that the Proposed Project's impacts to habitat for Covered Species would not result in exceeding the NCCP's take coverage authorization under the federal and California Endangered Species Acts.</p> <p>SDG&E's goal was to reduce potential impacts to habitat for Covered Species to a reasonable amount in consideration of the level of engineering complete to date for the Proposed Project. Attachment ED16 – Q4(a) contains revised GIS data representing the revised work areas described above, and Attachment ED16 – Q4(b) contains edits to the Project Description in the draft EIR to reflect the work area</p>

^[1] The habitat for Covered Species includes all NCCP habitat types except the following: bare ground, eucalyptus forest, agricultural, developed, landscape/ornamental, disturbed, and non-vegetated flood channel.

ED16-SDGE 07/17/2015 Response
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 16 Dated July 10, 2015
ED16-SDGE Questions 1-6

Please note that an attachment in response to Question 6 contains information considered confidential pursuant to PUC Section 583 and G.O. 66-C and also under the North American Electric Reliability Corporation's Rules of Procedure, Section 1500 et seq. and other applicable Federal and State Laws and Regulations

	<p>provided to the CPUC, this site will be removed from the project description as the only written correspondence that the CPUC has on file to date from the landowner indicates that the site is not available to SDG&E.</p>	<p>revisions. Attachment ED16 – Q4(c) contains a mapbook highlighting work area revisions. SDG&E reduced anticipated impacts to habitat for Covered Species to approximately 29.41 acres, as reported to the Wildlife Agencies.</p> <p>As part of the process of reducing anticipated impacts, SDG&E reviewed vegetation mapping and the extent of anticipated project impact areas (staging yards, stringing sites, substation sites, work areas, etc.). The reduction of anticipated impacts reflects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Reshaping and reducing the size of work areas and staging yard boundaries to avoid habitat for Covered Species; 2) Reducing the size of structure removal sites to use only existing disturbed areas (i.e., work pads); and 3) Identifying over-estimates of impact areas for habitat for Covered Species and refining those estimates. <p>SDG&E will track all deviations in impacts to NCCP “natural areas” from the approved Project footprint due to changes in final engineering or non-compliance incidents. Deviations will be reported in the regular MMCRP report to the CPUC.</p> <p>San Diego Gas & Electric Company is in discussions with Kilroy Realty, owner of the approximate 18 acre collection of finished commercial lots. SDG&E will only need up to five acres for its temporary construction yard. SDG&E anticipates receiving a decision from Kilroy Realty shortly.</p>
--	--	--

ED16-SDGE 07/17/2015 Response
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 16 Dated July 10, 2015
ED16-SDGE Questions 1-6

Please note that an attachment in response to Question 6 contains information considered confidential pursuant to PUC Section 583 and G.O. 66-C and also under the North American Electric Reliability Corporation's Rules of Procedure, Section 1500 et seq. and other applicable Federal and State Laws and Regulations

5	Data Request #14, Q6	Provide focused survey results and GIS data for the proposed Poway Unified School District staging yard site including presence/absence of special-status plants, western burrowing owl, and a wetland delineation. In addition, provide the GIS data for the vegetation mapping shown in the Chambers Group Biological Survey Memo dated June 22, 2015.	Refer to Attachment ED16 – Q5.
6	Data Request #14, Q6	Provide a copy of the supplemental records search results for the five previously recorded sites identified in the ASM Affiliates Supplemental Survey dated June 9, 2015 (only two of which are illustrated in the survey report figures). In addition, provide the field observation results for P-37-011744 which occurs within the pedestrian survey area but is not mentioned at all in the survey report.	Refer to Attachment ED16 – Q6_Records (CONFIDENTIAL).