

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



September 2, 2011

Mr. Kevin O' Beirne
Regulatory Case Administrator
San Diego Gas & Electric
8330 Century Park Court,
San Diego, California 92123-1530

Subject: Data Request No. 8 – San Diego Gas & Electric (“Applicant”), South Bay Substation Relocation Project (CPCN Application No. 10.06.007)

Dear Mr. O' Beirne:

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has identified additional information required to complete our analysis of the South Bay Substation Relocation Project. Please provide the information requested in *Attachment A*. We would appreciate your response to this data request no later than September 14, 2011. This will help us maintain our schedule for analysis and processing of your application.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or need additional information, please contact me at 415.703.5484 or jensen.uchida@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Jensen Uchida
Energy Division, Room 4A

Att: Attachment A – Data Request No. 8

ATTACHMENT A

Data Request No. 8

ATTACHMENT A
Data Request No. 8
South Bay Substation Relocation Project

1. **GIS Alternative:** Section 2.1 of the GIS Substation Alternative Description and Preliminary Impact Analysis (May 2011) includes a description of the proposed transmission line interconnections that would be required with implementation of the GIS Substation Alternative. Please provide a map of the location of all transmission line interconnections that would be required with implementation of the GIS Substation Alternative. Please be sure to identify transmission infrastructure that would differ from the improvements identified under the Proposed Project (Air Insulated Substation).
2. **Onsite Seasonal Ponds:** Please clarify the number of seasonal ponds located on the Proposed Project site. Both the June 22, 2010 Biological Resources Surveys Summary memorandum and the 90-Day Report for the Listed Branchiopod Wet-Season Survey indicate that 16 seasonal ponds are located onsite, however; in the Executive Summary and Section 5.0.0 (Seasonal Wetlands) of the Biological Resources Technical Report (May 2011) text indicates that 17 seasonal wetlands are located onsite. Please indicate whether the identification of 17 seasonal wetlands is a typographical error or, if not, please explain why only 16 of the 17 seasonal ponds/wetlands were surveyed.
3. **San Diego Fairy Shrimp:** Please provide a status update regarding the results of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol-level dry-season soil sampling surveys that were scheduled to be completed by July 2011.
4. **Wetland Jurisdiction Determination:** Please provide a status update as to whether SDG&E has received any written correspondence from the USACE, RWQCB, CDFG, CCC and/or the City of Chula Vista regarding whether the permitting agency will be taking jurisdiction of wetland and non-wetland water features within the Proposed Project limits.
5. **Projected Load Growth:** Section 2.1.3 of the SDG&E South Bay Substation Relocation Project Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) (June 2010), identifies the load growth in the South Bay region is forecasted to be approximately nine megawatts (MW) by 2016. Further, the PEA states redevelopment growth in the South Bay Region is expected to further impact ultimate load growth by 80 MW beyond 2016. Please clarify whether the above statements accurately reflect the load growth in the South Bay region.
6. **Substation Site Alternatives:** Section 5.2.5 of the SDG&E South Bay Substation Relocation Project PEA (June 2010), provides an overview of the feasibility for an Air Insulated Substation at the Broadway and Palomar Site. Please indicate whether

ATTACHMENT A

construction of a Gas Insulated Substation (GIS) would be feasible at this alternative site location. Please be sure to identify whether the GIS alternative would be feasible with consideration given to technical feasibility and legal and regular feasibility.

7. **Bayfront Enhancement Alternative:** SDG&E has requested the Environmental Impact Report being prepared for the Proposed Project consider the feasibility of the Bayfront Enhancement Alternative. As defined by SDG&E, the Bayfront Enhancement Alternative includes a five-million-dollar fund that would be used to provide direct environmental benefits within the Chula Vista Bayfront area. Possible projects identified by SDG&E include creation, restoration, and/or enhancement of wetlands; enhancement of coastal resources, protection and preservation of biological resources, water quality improvements, and aesthetic enhancements, such as landscaping and lighting improvements. In order for the CPUC to determine the feasibility of the Bayfront Enhancement alternative, a more defined program of actual projects, responsible parties, environmental and permit requirements and timing needs to be developed. In lieu of a more defined program, please indicate programs that are currently in place where these funds could be contributed that will result in improvements such as those provided above. A defined program where SDG&E contributions can be contributed may include a program such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Coastal Wetland and Enhancement Project for the South San Diego Bay. Please also indicate whether these funds would be included as part of a potential endowment to manage wetland mitigation sites for project-related wetland impacts or if these funds would be in addition to the endowment required for the wetland mitigation sites.
8. **Public Access Restrictions:** Please provide a description of how both existing fencing and proposed fencing will impact public access to areas located adjacent to the perimeter screening wall within the current limits of the South Bay Power Plant Property fencing. Identify whether access restrictions such as fencing and signage will be placed between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife National Wildlife Refuge and the proposed Bay Boulevard Substation screening wall. Please be sure to indicate whether the current fencing between adjacent properties and the Bay Boulevard substation will be retained and maintained by SDG&E and how public access will be controlled upon project implementation.
9. **Visual Simulations – Gas Insulated Substation Alternative – Data Request #7** identified that SDG&E should clarify why no landscaping improvements were included in the Gas Insulated Substation Alternative visual simulations. Please identify why no landscaping improvements have been included in the Gas Insulated Substation Alternative visual simulations.