

Appendix C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

Agency	Date	Issues Discussed
Federal Agencies		
U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, Cleveland National Forest	October 3, 2006 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed the need, and process, for Amending the 2005 (currently a draft and not adopted) Cleveland National Forest Land Management Plan. A copy of the Plan was also provided on CD. It was noted that the current Plan assumes the continuance of the transmission facilities although there are no designated utility corridors through CNF. • Because the 1982 Plan is in transition to the 2005 Plan, initiating an amendment to the new Plan would be delayed until March 2007. • A desire to co-locate linear facilities to minimize loss of open spaces was explained. • The CNF has compiled an "Inventory of Roadless Areas" (IRA) and indicated that maps of these areas are available. The 2001 IRA regulations allow maintenance of existing authorized facilities and may allow the use for the construction of a new transmission line. • Discussed potential fire risks associated with the Project and alternative routes including SDG&E's "D" route and a route that parallels the Southwest Powerlink (SWPL). • Explained the status of SDG&E's efforts to consolidate its 60-80 Forest permits and noted that most approvals had expired. An EA is being prepared to allow the reissuance of the permits. • It was noted that numerous sensitive species exist (22 listed and 45 sensitive including golden eagles) in Boulder Canyon along the proposed "D" route. • The stated major issues for CNF were summarized as: private in-holdings in CNF make it problematic to simply approve an alignment through CNF; any lighting that may be required by the FAA on the towers could be problematic as it could violate Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIO); the project's 110'-160' transmission poles would be out of scale for CNF; raptors could be adversely affected; firefighting abilities could be hampered as they were in the Cedar Fire. • 80,000 vehicles pass through the CNF along I-8 and because of the high volume of traffic, the value of the aesthetic setting is greater. • The CNF has no height limits for transmission poles. • The existing SDG&E right-of-way through the CNF ranges from 20'-30'.
DOD – Miramar Marine Corps Air Station	November 8, 2006 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed MCAS Miramar requirements for NEPA compliance for SRPL components on Miramar land. • SDG&E recently renewed a 50 year lease on one of the SDG&E corridors; request copy from SDG&E. • EIR/EIS team to provide detailed maps, copy of NOP, and fill out NEPA Review Request Form. • New towers or reconductoring would be considered by MCAS to be a "major modification" within existing easements. • Key issues of concern: land disturbance (biology, cultural resources); air operations, and ground training activities. • Proposed use of helicopters would also be a concern due to air operations.

Appendix C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

Agency	Date	Issues Discussed
DOD - El Centro Naval Air Station	November 8, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order not to conflict with air operations in the Desert Range and restricted Airspace R2510, a new transmission line would have to be parallel and in close proximity to the existing (92 kV IID) transmission line through the area, and no taller than the existing towers (approximately 65 feet). • A route along the west side of the valley would not be acceptable if it was within restricted airspace and did not meet the criteria above. • R2510 is Joint Use Airspace, shared with FAA and private pilots. • New restricted airspace is extremely difficult to obtain, so existing space must be maintained. • Military Training Routes (MTRs) are mapped and include areas above 200 feet where flights are made into the R2510 area. Above 200 feet should not conflict with a transmission line or substation, but we will provide location of the potentially expanded San Felipe Substation for El Centro staff to verify. • Final decision regarding use of land and airspace would be made by BLM as the land manager. Navy recommends maintenance of restricted airspace as currently designated.
State Agencies		
California State Parks, Anza-Borrego Desert State Park	October 4, 2006 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that 15-20 meetings had been held with SDG&E and its representatives but the comments/concerns raised by State Parks have not been incorporated into the Project. • Discussed an alternative that transitions the proposed 500 kV line to a 230 kV line at an expanded San Felipe Substation and is then undergrounded in State Route (SR) 78 through the ABDSP. • State Parks would like creative problem solving to develop a routing alternative through ABDSP. • The criteria for designating and undesignating wilderness were discussed and an overview of the 8-12 month process to amend the ABDSP General Plan was provided. It was noted that a General Plan amendment would likely be infeasible because it would not pass the various tests required to make it through the amendment process. • It was explained that the project could not be developed within the existing ROW because the ROW narrows to 24' in some locations. • State Parks inquired regarding information on the status of the IID ROW/easement in ABDSP and indicated that the ROW issue is central to the Project because to date no documentation has been provided to State Parks for review. • State Parks indicated that it was its policy to collocate all utilities in roadways which effectively serve as utility corridors. • The issue of undergrounding the project in SR-78 was discussed and State Parks indicated that some areas (Centinek) could be problematic due to flooding concerns. The road is mostly built on alluvium and fill so bedrock is not expected to pose a major constraint. Traffic control and seasonal restrictions may be required. • State Parks noted that if the line were undergrounded, issues of fire risk, visual, biological would be reduced. A Plan amendment may also not be needed if this alternative was selected. • Information on the size of the ROW needed for undergrounding was provided as follows 6' in depth and 2 duct banks 10' feet apart. Vaults would be needed in the roadway approximately every 1,000'. • Wells in Angelina Springs and other areas may be affected if blasting/pile driving were required due to fracturing of bedrock. • A cultural preserve may be established in Grapevine Canyon depending on the results of the field tests currently underway. State Parks would nominate the area for consideration on the National Historic Register of Places.

Appendix C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

Agency	Date	Issues Discussed
California Dept. of Forestry and Fire Protection	November 9, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDF jurisdiction is the wildland fire department for non-federal lands in California. Jurisdiction is defined by "State Responsibility Areas" (SRAs) and is based on watershed value. • Firefighter safety is #1 priority. • The entire region is high fire risk. • CDF has a MOU with SDG&E for fuel reduction under the SWPL, including a 200-300 foot clearance requirement. SWPL area is very fire prone and lines can arc when thick smoke is in area. MOU identifies specific problem areas where vegetation can be cut, removed, and/or burned. • Border fires used to be a huge issue but are less of a problem where the border fence has been constructed. • Firefighting access along the SWPL is good because Border Patrol & National Guard are building new roads • There is an International Fuel Break (IFB) along the border from Otay Mountain, south of SR94, to the Jacumba Wilderness on the east. CDF would like to expand the IFB so it connects with the SWPL ROW. • Entire San Diego County is high fire risk; cannot say that SWPL corridor has greater risk than proposed route area. • Guidelines for vegetation management are being revised in a new Programmatic EIR (current rules are still from a 1972 Programmatic EIR). • Firefighting aircraft can't drop retardant within ½ mile of a transmission line so they can hamper firefighting in that way. • A new transmission line route needs to have access along its entire length that is adequate for fire engine access and road design that provides for fire fighter safety (safe areas). • The Anza-Borrego area (San Felipe, Narrows) do not have good access to fire fighting equipment; closest fire engines are in Warner Springs. • CDF recommends inclusion of a fuels/fire expert on EIR/EIS team; consult with SD County for a list and talk to Cleveland NF. • There is no "let burn" policy for fires burning in this region; all fires are fought aggressively due to proximity to urban areas. • CDF provided reference to websites and maps on fire hazard zone definition.

Appendix C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

Agency	Date	Issues Discussed
Local Agencies		
County of Imperial Planning & Development Services	October 2, 2006 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested information on the required separation distance from the SWPL if another 500 kV line were to be developed along a parallel alignment. • Want to know why co-location along SWPL was not the preferred route. • Requested information on the tower design in Imperial County and wanted to know if the same type of structures (lattice towers) would be used in agricultural areas? • Has the military provided any comments or been contacted by CPUC/BLM yet? • Will project consider effects on Bullfrog Farms Dairy? • County has been encouraging dairies to move to the area and the project would discourage dairies from relocating to Imperial Valley. • County remains formally opposed to the project due to concerns that it would promote/facilitate additional power generation in Mexicali and the emissions would worsen air quality in Imperial County because Mexican air quality standards are not as stringent as those in California. The Team was directed to the CARB website for additional information on ICAPCD regulations for PM10. • Would like additional information on current import/export of power into and out of Imperial Valley Substation. • How would the project tie-into the renewables including geothermal resources? The County also expressed reservations about the availability and feasibility of tapping into renewables in the County. • How many MW would a 500 kV line be capable of transmitting? • Imperial County is in the process of updating the Energy Element of the General Plan. The draft document is expected to go to the Board of Supervisors on 10-17-06 for approval. • Suggest that the Team contact the Crop Duster Association and the Imperial County Farm Bureau to obtain input. • Imperial County asked to be added to the CPUC "Service List". • Suggest that all SDG&E maintenance roads be paved as air quality mitigation and SDG&E pay a PM10 offset fee to the County to reduce particulate emissions. • County provided history of its involvement and fight against the Intergen Power Plant in Mexicali and indicated it would provide a written summary of the issues.

Appendix C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

Agency	Date	Issues Discussed
County of San Diego, Department of Planning & Land Use	October 5, 2006 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information was requested as to why a line along I-8 was not identified as the project or an alternative. • Project maps should be revised to include all County parks, open space areas and Multi-Species Conservation Program (MSCP) reserves. Impacts to these facilities must be assessed in the EIR/EIS. The County would have a difficult time finding that the project was consistent with the MSCP Implementing Agreement. • Depending on the funding sources for some of these parks, no transmission facilities may be allowed. The County will follow up with this information. • County provided map of County-owned lands and stated that the Preferred Project route would go through or be adjacent to many open space areas and preserves. • County suggested that the EIR/EIS evaluate an alternative that parallels the existing 500 kV line and/or Interstate 8 into the Miguel Substation. • The "D" route alternative was discussed and the County noted its opposition to this location due to numerous sensitive species, MSCP preserves and fire risk. • The County requested that the EIR/EIS analysis quantify impacts by segment and by vegetation type and consider indirect impacts associated with the project such as construction staging areas and maintenance roads. • The County stated its position that the line be located away from fuel sources so that another "Cedar" or "Pines" fire not happen again. • The County asked that cultural resources be evaluated in the EIR/EIS and noted that a Section 106 consultation is going to be required along with SB 18 compliance. • FAA part 77 regulations should be reviewed for compliance with the utilities section around airports. • The County asked that a map be provided that shows all existing 230 kV lines in the County. • The County inquired regarding the status of talks with the military entities potentially affected by the project. • A discussion of project need focused on the status and timing of this determination as well as the general proceeding timeline. It was suggested that the County consider becoming a formal "Party" to the proceeding to ensure their interests are accounted for.
City of San Diego	November 8, 2006 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff asked what City permits would be required for the proposed project. • Staff recommended that the EIR/EIS team review the City's significance thresholds on the City website. • Staff asked about the differences in EMF between overhead and underground transmission lines. • Staff suggested an underground alternative using Black Mountain Road (south of SR52) and Park Village Drive to avoid using the existing SDG&E ROW between homes. • Vernal pool lawsuit terms should be considered because they supersede MSCP policies in San Diego County.

Appendix C-5. Summary of Agency Consultations

Agency	Date	Issues Discussed
San Diego Regional Energy Office	November 8, 2006 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process for developing the 2030 Plan and the Regional Energy Infrastructure Study were discussed. • Discussed the challenges of the current regulatory system, which does not provide financial incentives for regulated utilities to construct renewable energy supplies or to use in-basin generation over transmission. • Discussed feasibility of the Stirling Energy System project. • Much more can be done with energy efficiency; current regulation does not encourage substantial efficiency. • More can be done to expand use of distributed generation, including solar energy and fuel cells. • Need to consider LEAPS as a renewable energy provided to SDG&E. • Solar generation could be built and included in SDG&E's rate base. • Renewable Energy Credits could simplify RPS implementation, possibly allowing meeting goals without needing new transmission.
Special Districts		
Vista Irrigation District	November 9, 2006 (meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VID owns 43,000 acres of land around Lake Henshaw for development of water for City of Vista. Lake is refilled by overland flow and by pumping from groundwater wells on VID land. • Concerns include historic adobe (Warner Ranch House) off S2 (south of SR79) and the Wilson-Kimball Store, also along S2. • Boy Scout Reservation Camp Mataguay is adjacent to the VID land to the west. • Maintaining the rural character of the valley is important to the VID. Water quality and quantity are critical. • SDG&E worked closely with VID in siting of the proposed route across their land and VID is comfortable with its location as minimizing visibility from the valley. • SDG&E would be responsible for vegetation management in the corridor on VID land. • VID water wells are about ½ mile from the proposed route. Wells produce from about 300 feet deep. Project construction unlikely to affect wells.