

9. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

9.1 INTRODUCTION

Prior to construction, the CPUC must issue a CPCN for the proposed Miguel–Mission 230kV #2 Project under Public Utilities Code Section 1001 General Order No. 131-D. Because the CPUC’s decision on whether to issue the CPCN or not is discretionary, the proposed project is subject to CEQA review. In accordance with CPUC Rule No. 17.1, and to assist the CPUC to comply with CEQA, SDG&E has prepared this PEA.

Prior to filing this application, SDG&E developed and instituted an outreach program for the project to ensure that appropriate members of the public and federal, state, and local agencies are contacted, consulted, and given ample opportunity to generally understand the project and to comment on the proposed route. This section describes the agency and public scoping process, the public information program, and the issues and concerns identified in routing reviews performed to date.

SDG&E’s agency consultation is ongoing with the CPUC, the USFWS, the CDFG, and others, as necessary. In addition, SDG&E has conducted meetings with key community groups and applicable planning agencies, as summarized in the following section, for which letters of correspondence are attached in Appendix E. These include meetings with the planning agencies of the City of San Diego, the City of Santee, and with San Diego County.

9.1.1 Agency Scoping Process

Initial contacts were made from February through June 2002 to describe the project to appropriate agencies associated with the project area. Follow-up calls were made to the agencies to address any questions. The following agency representatives received letters and/or e-mail correspondence and follow-up calls.

Agency / Representative	Date of 2002 Response
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service / Sandra Marquez	May 22 (e-mail)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers / Shannon Bryant	(voice mail)
California Department of Fish and Game / Dave Mayer	June 21 (letter)
San Diego County / David Hulse	May 24 (letter)
City of Santee / Keith Till	June 6 (letter)
City of San Diego / Patty Boekamp, Jayme Bradford, Jim Madaffer	(pending)
Marine Corps Air Station Miramar / Catherine Flores-Rynerson	May 23 (phone call)
Native American Heritage Commission / Rob Wood	June 26 (letter)

Summary of Agency Issues and Concerns

Correspondence with agencies regarding issues and concerns about the project are included in Appendix E.

As noted above, letter responses were not received from the USFWS, ACOE, or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar. However, these agencies did respond via e-mail or voice-mail message or a telephone conversation. The following is SDG&E's understanding of those responses.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The USFWS acknowledged by e-mail that:

- The list of species for which focused surveys would be conducted was complete.
- The agency understood that the species surveys to be conducted would be protocol-level surveys.
- A Section 7 consultation under the ESA may be necessary if the project is likely to affect listed species on Marine Corps Air Station Miramar. If the project is “not likely to adversely affect,” then a concurrence could be issued on a “not likely to adversely affect” and the remainder of the project would be covered under SDG&E's NCCP.
- If the project is “likely to adversely affect” species on Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, a BO would be prepared based on the project description for the entire project, but the “Terms and Conditions” under the BO would apply only to the Miramar portion of the project and the remainder of the project would be covered under SDG&E's NCCP.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The ACOE acknowledged by voice-mail message that:

- It had no specific concerns about the project at this time, but would be concerned about any potential impacts to wetlands or drainages resulting from project construction. Affect to any such jurisdictional drainages as a result of project activities (e.g., road crossings) would require an ACOE permit. It is possible that a Nationwide Permit could be issued to cover project activities. If multiple crossings were necessary, a single Nationwide Permit could be employed.

Marine Corps Air Station Miramar

In a telephone conversation with Jesse Sandoval, SDG&E senior account executive—federal accounts, Catherine Flores-Rynerson, real estate specialist for Miramar, discussed the project. She also:

- indicated that she will research the easement, access, and right-of-way and base-access restrictions before turning the project over to Miramar's environmental and utility specialists for their review and comment.
- requested that SDG&E continue to provide her with project information, such as the construction schedule and the name(s) of the contractor and all on-site personnel, as it becomes available.

9.1.2 Planning Committee Scoping Process

The scoping process involved meetings with the following planning communities.

Planning Group / Chairperson	Date of 2002 Response
Valle de Oro Community Planning Group / Jack Phillips	April 14 (letter)
Crest/Dehesa/Granite Hills / Tim McMaster	April 30 (letter)
Lakeside Planning Group / Richard Hensle	April 17 (letter)
Mission Trails Regional Park / Paul Kilburg	June 27 (letter)
Sweetwater Community Planning Group / John Hammond	May 15 (letter)
Tierrasanta Community Council / Deanna Spehn	(personal conversation)

Summary of Planning Committee Issues and Concerns

Correspondence with planning committees regarding issues and concerns about the project are included in Appendix E.

As previously noted, no letter response was received from the Tierrasanta Community Council. However, the council did respond verbally. Its chairperson, Deanna Spehn, indicated an interest in the project schedule and construction crew access to the transmission corridor, particularly in close proximity to residences. A project presentation has been scheduled for the Tierrasanta Community Council on July 17, 2002 at Ms. Spehn's request.

