

**A.13-09-014 SDG&E 10/14/14 Response
Salt Creek Substation Project PTC
Energy Division Request #18 on 9/18/14
ED-SDGE-018**

Please note that the items highlighted in **yellow** are confidential pursuant to CPUC Section 583, General Order 66-C and any applicable Non-Disclosure Agreements; Confidential Non-Public Information exempted from disclosure under federal and state law.

#	Data Request #13	SDG&E Response
1.	<p>During our site visit on September 12, 2014, SDG&E discussed the double-circuit alternative that was considered for the 69-kV power line between Miguel Substation and the proposed Salt Creek Substation. SDG&E indicated that there was preliminary engineering for the double-circuit alternative.</p> <p>a) Please provide that preliminary engineering. b) Please also provide the calculations that were used to determine the double-circuit alternative would require an additional 30 feet of right-of-way.</p>	<p>a) See attached feasibility study for the double circuit options considered early in the project in 2011 (attachments DR018.1-1 and -2). Note that this was a preliminary analysis that was used as a starting point ultimately arriving at the proposed solution to install the new tieline on the east side of the utility corridor.</p> <p>b) For the 69 kV poles soldiered to the 230 kV structures option the feasibility study identified a need for an estimated additional right-of-way (ROW) ranging from 0.4 to 47.7 feet to account for 69 kV blowout from west-bound winds (reference attachment DR018.1-2). Based on results of the analysis, SDG&E engineering concluded that an additional 30 feet of ROW would account for the majority of the blowout. While it is not standard to design for blowout, it was considered for this proposal given the proximity of homes and business along the corridor in order to account for future changes that would interfere with the double circuited line during blowout (an extra story on a home, an antenna, etc.). Reference the attached map for a visual interpretation of the soldiering study results (attachment DR018.1-3). Note that this map does not depict changes in elevation, particularly when the homes are at higher elevations than the utility corridor as shown in the example photos below.</p>

**A.13-09-014 SDG&E 10/14/14 Response
Salt Creek Substation Project PTC
Energy Division Request #18 on 9/18/14
ED-SDGE-018**

Please note that the items highlighted in **yellow** are confidential pursuant to CPUC Section 583, General Order 66-C and any applicable Non-Disclosure Agreements; Confidential Non-Public Information exempted from disclosure under federal and state law.



**A.13-09-014 SDG&E 10/14/14 Response
Salt Creek Substation Project PTC
Energy Division Request #18 on 9/18/14
ED-SDGE-018**

Please note that the items highlighted in **yellow** are confidential pursuant to CPUC Section 583, General Order 66-C and any applicable Non-Disclosure Agreements; Confidential Non-Public Information exempted from disclosure under federal and state law.



For the conventional pole spotting option the feasibility study showed 230-69kV wire to wire violations ranging from 0.2 to

**A.13-09-014 SDG&E 10/14/14 Response
Salt Creek Substation Project PTC
Energy Division Request #18 on 9/18/14
ED-SDGE-018**

Please note that the items highlighted in **yellow** are confidential pursuant to CPUC Section 583, General Order 66-C and any applicable Non-Disclosure Agreements; Confidential Non-Public Information exempted from disclosure under federal and state law.

		<p>10.8 feet (reference Table 1 in attachment DR018.1-1) likely requiring the poles to be shifted a like distance of approx. 11 feet. This was preliminary engineering and possibly more could be necessary; no further analysis was conducted because the preliminary results showed the need for additional ROW.</p> <p>30 feet of ROW was used as a reasonable estimate to accommodate either soldiering or conventional pole spotting based on preliminary engineering as well as to take into consideration potential issues in acquiring additional ROW, e.g. terrain, access, owner's willingness to provide easement, and optimizing the value of the easement acquisition.</p>
2.	<p>SDG&E's response to Deficiency Report #1, Item 15 states that using conventional pole spotting for the double-circuit alternative resulted in insufficient clearance and this would require the poles to be moved westward toward the existing edge of the ROW.</p> <p>a) How far west would the poles need to be moved to provide sufficient clearance?</p> <p>b) Would additional ROW be required if the poles were moved westward, and if so, how much additional ROW would be required?</p> <p>c) Provide the preliminary engineering that was conducted to support this assessment.</p>	<p>Reference the answer to question 1 above</p>

October 14, 2014

**A.13-09-014 SDG&E 10/14/14 Response
Salt Creek Substation Project PTC
Energy Division Request #18 on 9/18/14
ED-SDGE-018**

Please note that the items highlighted in yellow are confidential pursuant to CPUC Section 583, General Order 66-C and any applicable Non-Disclosure Agreements; Confidential Non-Public Information exempted from disclosure under federal and state law.

3.	<p>Under the No Project Alternative, the project would not be implemented. Would SDG&E take any actions as a temporary fix as demand increases?</p> <p>Please provide a description of what actions would be taken if the project were not implemented, if appropriate.</p> <p>If SDG&E would not take any action under a no project scenario, please explain the consequences to reliability, growth, etc.</p>	<p>A temporary solution would be to build out the Proctor Valley Substation to its maximum of four transformer banks (current configuration is two) and construct distribution circuits to the Otay Ranch area to serve new load. It is estimated that these circuits would be approximately 6 to 7 miles long. This option could also reduce the ability to serve load growth in the Proctor Valley area. This temporary solution would not be as effective as building the proposed project and could delay the same results as doing nothing. In addition, this temporary solution could reduce substation tie capacity which could lead to reduced reliability.</p> <p>Telegraph Canyon substation serves the new load area and is at its maximum four-bank transformer configuration with a 92% substation loading forecasted for 2016. Under a No Project Alternative doing nothing could lead to an inability to serve load to future development from the Telegraph Canyon Substation. The No Project Alternative could result in a reduced level of reliability, potentially leading to involuntary load shedding and would not meet the project's objectives as stated in the PEA.</p>