

**SDG&E 7/30/10 Response**  
**A.09-08-003 East County Substation (ECO) PTC**  
**Energy Division Data Request 10 Dated July 19, 2010**  
**SDGE-ED-010: Q 1-8**

**Water Resources Source**

**Question 1:** Regarding the import of water during the construction phase of the project, please provide written verification from a water agency that they will be able to provide the quantity of water required for construction of the project should groundwater not be a viable source of water.

**SDG&E's Response to Question 1:**

SDG&E is presently working with local water agencies to secure a source of water (other than groundwater) for the ECO Substation Project. While SDG&E has not yet received verification that the quantity of water needed is available, SDG&E expects to receive that verification shortly. Upon receipt of the verification, SDG&E will forward this document to the Commission.

**SDG&E 7/30/10 Response**  
**A.09-08-003 East County Substation (ECO) PTC**  
**Energy Division Data Request 10 Dated July 19, 2010**  
**SDGE-ED-010: Q 1-8**

**Water Resources Source**

**Question 2:** Please provide a groundwater investigation for the proposed project, if available.

**SDG&E's Response to Question 2:**

Per the *Draft Geotechnical Investigation for the East County Substation*, dated January 15, 2010 by URS, no groundwater was encountered during the subsurface exploration. A monitoring well was installed to a depth of 50 feet below ground surface (bgs) in June of 2008 and was periodically observed after installation for the presence of groundwater. No groundwater was observed in the well.

Also, our contractor (Beta Engineering), who is providing the design, procurement, and construction of the substation, authorized URS to produce a groundwater evaluation report detailing the potential for groundwater in the vicinity of the substation site. The report (*Regional Groundwater Evaluation, San Diego Gas & Electric East County Substation*, dated January 15, 2010 by URS) has not been finalized but is attached in draft form. In summary, the substation is located on the eastern margins of the Jacumba Valley groundwater basin where the aquifers are thinner or potentially absent. Based on information obtained from private landowners with wells near the substation site and the limited groundwater recharge sources in the area, the depth to water could be over 500 feet and may only provide an on-site water supply for low-quantity needs (i.e., filling the water tank and temporary irrigation for vegetation restoration on cut and fill slopes).

**SDG&E 7/30/10 Response**  
**A.09-08-003 East County Substation (ECO) PTC**  
**Energy Division Data Request 10 Dated July 19, 2010**  
**SDGE-ED-010: Q 1-8**

**Water Resources Source**

**Question 3:** Please provide water quality/hydrology/drainage studies for the entire study area of the ECO Substation project area. At a minimum, the studies shall address existing conditions (i.e., hydrologic setting, water quality, existing drainage patterns, and peak flows), regulatory framework, potential adverse effects (i.e., post project drainage patterns, increased peak flow or sediment/pollutant loading), and proposed mitigation (detailed description of proposed mitigation measures/best management practices).

**SDG&E's Response to Question 3:**

Final water quality/hydrology/drainage studies have not been completed for the ECO Substation, 138 kilovolt (kV) transmission line, or Boulevard Substation. However, attached is a memorandum report, East County Substation Preliminary Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis, dated June 19, 2009 by Nolte Associates, providing initial hydrologic and hydraulic information for the original ECO Substation site identified in the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA). Also attached are plans (East County Substation Existing Hydrology – 1 Sht. and East County Substation Proposed Hydrology – 3 Shts.) showing the existing hydrology and proposed hydrology for the original substation location.

Additionally, attached is SDG&E's Best Management Practices (BMP) Manual, that will be implemented for this Project, and a draft copy of the erosion control drawings for the original (*Shts. ECO-S-905-PEA through ECO-S-905.4-PEA*) and the revised (*Shts. ECO-S-905-Alt through ECO-S-905.4-Alt*) ECO Substation locations.

An analysis has not been performed for the revised ECO Substation location; however, the revised substation location is within the same drainage basins as described in the attached memo and the proposed mitigation for stormwater flow is similar to the original substation location. Upon Project approval of the SDG&E preferred, revised ECO Substation location, the attached memo report will be updated to include the revised ECO Substation location..

**SDG&E 7/30/10 Response**  
**A.09-08-003 East County Substation (ECO) PTC**  
**Energy Division Data Request 10 Dated July 19, 2010**  
**SDGE-ED-010: Q 1-8**

**Biological Resources**

**Question 4:** Please provide all current GIS data for plant and wildlife species points and polygons with population size attribute data, if available.

**SDG&E's Response to Question 4:**

GIS point data for the burrowing owl that was observed on the ECO Substation site, Quino checkerspot butterflies that were observed in proximity to the 138 kV transmission line during protocol-level surveys, and rare plants that were identified during rare plant surveys have been provided electronically via email. Population data is provided for the rare plants that were mapped as appropriate, though in some cases, the points taken are representative and the estimates of the population sizes are provided in the associated Rare Plant Report, which were previously submitted to the Commission. No other sensitive plant or wildlife data has been collected in GIS format for the Proposed Project.

**SDG&E 7/30/10 Response**  
**A.09-08-003 East County Substation (ECO) PTC**  
**Energy Division Data Request 10 Dated July 19, 2010**  
**SDGE-ED-010: Q 1-8**

**Biological Resources**

**Question 5:** Please provide quantification (number of individuals and acreages) of impacts to species points and polygons.

**SDG&E's Response to Question 5:**

None of the seven Scarlet gilia observed during the rare plant surveys will be impacted by the Proposed Project. Of the 189 Jacumba milkvetch observed, 27 will be impacted by the Proposed Project. The quantity of the other rare plant species identified during the surveys cannot be accurately assessed as counts of the individuals were not conducted due to the large number of species observed. Estimate of the population sizes for these species are provided in the Rare Plant Reports that were previously submitted to the Commission. In addition, the Proposed Project will impact 2.85 acres of Quino checkerspot butterfly critical habitat.

**SDG&E 7/30/10 Response**  
**A.09-08-003 East County Substation (ECO) PTC**  
**Energy Division Data Request 10 Dated July 19, 2010**  
**SDGE-ED-010: Q 1-8**

**Biological Resources**

**Question 6:** Please provide conceptual information regarding proposed habitat compensation for upland communities, wetland communities, and special-status species. At a minimum, please provide information on mitigation approach, location, and resources.

**SDG&E's Response to Question 6:**

SDG&E has been investigating potential options for mitigating impacts to Quino checkerspot butterfly critical habitat and drainages under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). SDG&E expects to purchase land within critical habitat to compensate for Proposed Project impacts to Quino checkerspot butterfly critical habitat and is currently investigating the availability of such land in proximity to the Proposed Project. SDG&E has been coordinating with the USACE on preferred options for mitigating for impacts to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and expects to provide an in-lieu fee to the USACE for such impacts.

**SDG&E 7/30/10 Response**  
**A.09-08-003 East County Substation (ECO) PTC**  
**Energy Division Data Request 10 Dated July 19, 2010**  
**SDGE-ED-010: Q 1-8**

**Visual Resources**

**Question 7:** It was requested that a viewshed analysis be provided for the ECO Substation project components; consequently, please prepare a viewshed analysis for the following:

- ECO and Boulevard Substations out 3 miles each
- 138 kV transmission line out 2 miles.

Please provide a high resolution .jpg file for this analysis.

**SDG&E's Response to Question 7:**

SDG&E will provide this information on August 20.

**SDG&E 7/30/10 Response**  
**A.09-08-003 East County Substation (ECO) PTC**  
**Energy Division Data Request 10 Dated July 19, 2010**  
**SDGE-ED-010: Q 1-8**

**Visual Resources**

**Question 8:** Please provide high resolution .jpg files for the following visual simulations provided by SDG&E for preparation of the EIR/EIS:

- Viewpoint 4 (immediately after construction and landscaping at 8 years maturity) - *View from I-8 looking southeast towards the East County Substation Site*
- Viewpoint 7 (immediately after construction and landscaping at 8 years maturity) - *View from Old Highway 80 looking east towards the East County Substation Site*
- Viewpoints 31a and 31b (immediately after construction and landscaping at 8 years maturity) - *View from Old Highway 80 looking south towards Boulevard Substation (31b is a panoramic view from the same location)*
- Viewpoint 18 - *View from Old Highway 80 in Jacumba towards the 138 kV transmission line*
- Viewpoint 22 - *View from Old Highway 80 looking northwest towards the 138 kV transmission line*
- Viewpoint 26 - *View from Jewel Valley Road looking north towards the 138 kV transmission line*

**SDG&E's Response to Question 8:**

High-resolution .jpg files for the simulations requested have been uploaded to Dudek's FTP web site.