

ED17-SDGE 07/29/2015 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 17 Dated July 21, 2015
ED17-SDGE Questions 1- 4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 6

Q#	Source Ref	Description/Data needed	SDGE Response
1	Data Request #14, Q4	<p>Provide an estimated timeline for the construction of a new 230-kV transmission lines between the Sycamore and Mission Substations, including the re-construction/re-configuration of all of the existing power lines, as depicted in the cross-sections provided in response to DR#14, question #4. In addition, identify the length of any temporary lines (shoo-flies) that would need to be constructed, including the number of temporary structures required and their estimated spacing.</p>	<p>As previously stated in response to Energy Division (ED) Question 4 of Data Request 14, the option of adding a new 230kV circuit between Sycamore and Mission Substations is not electrically equivalent to the approved CAISO project and would not be as effective at mitigating the identified system issues. Penasquitos Substation is located very close to the San Diego load center (as discussed extensively by witness Jontry in his Aug. 6, 2014 testimony at pages 9-10) and the intent of the SX-PQ project is to directly connect the import gateway at Sycamore Canyon with the load center at Penasquitos. Pursuant to Paragraph 9 of the Memorandum of Understanding between the CAISO and CPUC on the CAISO Planning Process, see Appendix A to J. Jontry August Testimony, the Category 1 transmission projects, including SX-PQ, are to proceed directly to the CPCN siting process. While a reasonable range of alternatives to connect SDG&E's Sycamore Canyon and Penasquitos substations is appropriate, a different electric project, which does not connect those substations, would be inconsistent with the MOU.</p> <p>Additionally, as previously stated in response to ED Data Request 14 Question 4, the option of adding a new 230kV transmission line between Sycamore and Mission substations would require replacement of all existing 138kV Lattice towers in sections 1 thru 3 in addition to reconfiguring and relocation of the existing 69kV lines and distribution circuits (where applicable) as depicted in the conceptual cross sections. As previously stated, there is not enough existing ROW from SX to Fanita Junction, (Section 4 - approximately 4 miles) so this option is not feasible with the current ROW and therefore additional land rights would need to be obtained as identified in the cross sections created during the feasibility analysis that are included as Attachment ED17- Q1. The feasibility of acquiring ROW is further compounded by the fact that section 4 of the cross section passes through Marine Corps Air Station Miramar and the Sycamore Landfill.</p> <p>The timelines for potential construction of the SX-MS transmission line as requested involves the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDG&E Transmission Planning review of the need and feasibility of adding a new 230kV Transmission Line between Sycamore and Mission – 3-6 months for SDG&E technical personnel to perform a thorough evaluation of the project, determine feasibility and develop a comprehensive plan of

ED17-SDGE 07/29/2015 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 17 Dated July 21, 2015
ED17-SDGE Questions 1- 4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 6

Q#	Source Ref	Description/Data needed	SDGE Response
			<p>service, all of which are necessary in order to perform detailed engineering design and cost estimates. This information requested in this data request Q1 will not be available until after a detailed engineering analysis is performed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitting Proposal to CAISO for Review and Approval – As previously stated, a new SX-MS line doesn't serve the purpose and need as identified for SX-PQ project; therefore such a project would not be approved by the NERC Planning Authority (CAISO) as a viable alternative for SX-PQ. However, if the CPUC wants the CAISO to consider this alternative, as a part of the 2015/2016 TPP, it would be necessary to submit this project within the CAISO's annual project submission window, and must include a detailed plan of service and cost estimates. Given the amount of time available to develop detailed plan of service and cost estimates, a more likely scenario is that the SX-MS line would fall within the 2016/2017 ISO planning cycle for potential approval in March 2017. <p>Note also that the SX-PQ Project was identified as a policy-driven project with reliability benefits by the CAISO and was consequently subjected to the CAISO's Competitive Solicitation process, as defined by the CAISO's FERC-approved tariff. The SX-MS alternative is not electrically equivalent to the SX-PQ Project and would most likely be subjected to a new Competitive Solicitation assuming it is approved by the CAISO. It typically takes one (1) year from when the CAISO identifies a transmission project as subject to a competitive solicitation to evaluate, select and award a winning bidder, Therefore it is possible that final CAISO approval and bid award for this alternative would not be completed until early 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPUC Permitting Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PEA Submittal to CPUC – 9-12 months (assuming earliest available spring survey window can be utilized) ○ EIR/EIS – 24-30 months ○ CPCN – 2-4 months following FEIR • MCAS Miramar NEPA review (combined with CEQA review) 24-30 months after PEA completed

ED17-SDGE 07/29/2015 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 17 Dated July 21, 2015
ED17-SDGE Questions 1- 4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 6

Q#	Source Ref	Description/Data needed	SDGE Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering and project design – 12 months. • Construction Contract Execution – 2-3 months • ROW/Land Acquisition (MCAS Miramar and private) – 12-24 months after FEIR • Construction – 12-18 Months (depending upon outage constraints) • In-Service – Depending on when the application to CAISO would be submitted, ISD would need to be evaluated and calculated. <p>SDG&E has not considered the option of adding a 230kV circuit between Sycamore and Mission as a part of this Proposed Project since this is not a viable alternative defined in the PEA for the current project or a CAISO approved project. The details requested in the question with regards to specifics on temporary lines, structure quantity and spacing cannot be assessed at this time without more detailed engineering. The level of effort for such preliminary engineering would be similar to that performed on the currently proposed SX-PQ project during the PEA development stage and is estimated at upwards of 9 months to complete.</p>
2	Data Request #14, Q1	What is the existing conductor (wire size and type) on circuits TL23001 & TL23004 south of Peñasquitos Junction? As part of the Sycamore - Peñasquitos 230-kV Transmission Project does SDG&E plan to jumper together the existing conductor on TL23001 & TL23004 south of Peñasquitos Junction and keep these wires energized?	<p>The existing wire size for the conductor on TL23001 and TL23004 South of PQ Junction is single – 1033.5 ACSR/AW 45/7 “Ortolan” (Dia – 1.212”, Unit Weight – 1.134 Lbs/Ft).</p> <p>Yes, SDG&E plans to jumper these circuits together south of PQ Junction (P43) and keep them energized. This was listed in SDG&E’s comments on the project description draft for the EIR that was submitted as part of Data Request 7 as well. Refer to page 35 of ED07 – Q10_Draft EIR Project Description text for additional details as needed.</p>
3	Data Request #14, Q1	Provide the cross-sections for the Mission—San Luis Rey line between Miramar Wholesale Nursery and Peñasquitos Junction.	Attached exhibit “DR17 Q3-MS-SA” identifies the existing corridors between Miramar Wholesale Nursery and Peñasquitos Junction. These were generated based on desktop reviews of existing GIS databases. No field reviews have been completed to confirm the accuracy of ROW corridor information as indicated. These exhibits are preliminary schematics and should be considered as such.
4	Data Request #16, Q2	Explain how the reconductoring and bundling of TL23001 and TL23004 proposed in Segment C	As stated in response to DR15 Q5, bundling the wire on the east side of Segment C preserves the ampacity between the Mission and San Luis Rey Substations.

ED17-SDGE 07/29/2015 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 17 Dated July 21, 2015
ED17-SDGE Questions 1- 4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 6

Q#	Source Ref	Description/Data needed	SDGE Response
		<p>meets the Proposed Project purpose and need. Based on the information SDG&E has provided thus far, there is no electrical need for the proposed reconductoring and bundling of TL23001 and TL23004 in Segment C relative to the Proposed Project purpose. Is there a future connected action that this reconductoring and bundling is intended to serve?</p>	<p>Additionally consolidation of TL23001 and TL23004 creates a vacancy for the SX-PQ 230kV transmission line on existing towers.</p> <p>Refer to page 35 of “ED07 – Q10_Draft EIR Project Description” that was submitted as part of response to DR7 for additional details on the consolidation of existing 230kV lines in Segment C. Excerpt from the same is shown below for easy reference.</p> <p><i>“Consolidation of Existing 230-kV Transmission Lines (San Luis Rey to Mission)</i></p> <p>Two existing 230-kV transmission lines on existing 230-kV steel lattice towers would be bundled and placed on one position of the same 230-kV steel lattice towers. Two 230kV Circuits with single conductor per phase would be consolidated into one 230kV circuit two conductors per phase using jumpers. Consolidation would occur in six steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ┆ Connect two existing 230-kV transmission lines together laterally to create one bundled 230-kV circuit between the San Luis Rey Substation and Carmel Valley Road. ┆ Reconductor (with aluminum conductor and polymer insulators) and bundle approximately 2.19 miles of two existing 230-kV transmission lines from Carmel Valley Road to Peñasquitos Junction to create a vacant position on the west side of the existing 230-kV steel lattice towers. As needed, complete minor structural modifications to existing towers to meet final design loading. ┆ Connect two existing 230-kV transmission lines together laterally to create one bundled 230-kV circuit between Peñasquitos Junction and the Mission Substation. ┆ Split an existing three-terminal line (San Luis Rey-Encina-Palomar Energy) at Encina Hub to create two 2-terminal lines: one connecting Encina Substation and San Luis Rey Substation and the second connecting Palomar Energy Substation and San Luis Rey Substation. ┆ Rearrange the phasing of one of the two transmission lines that run parallel between Mission Substation and San Luis Rey Substation to consolidate the two lines. Each of the three different levels on the tower would be connected laterally at the same level to match phasing so that the phasing would match when connected at each Substation.

ED17-SDGE 07/29/2015 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 17 Dated July 21, 2015
ED17-SDGE Questions 1- 4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 6

Q#	Source Ref	Description/Data needed	SDGE Response
			<p>Replace the existing shield wire located on top of the existing steel lattice towers with new OPGW from the new cable pole (Structure P42) to Peñasquitos Junction (Structure P43).”</p>
5.1	Data Request #16, Q4	<p>The following issues were identified in reviewing the habitat impact acreage changes and rationale provided by SDG&E.</p> <p>1. Identify locations where access road improvements are required – SDG&E has removed access roads from the areas of disturbance associated with the Proposed Project. This does not represent the whole of the project, and is misleading regarding potential direct and indirect impacts of the project. Access roads will be shown and quantified in the EIR tables and exhibits. However, SDG&E must provide a clear and specific description for access road locations where access road “refreshing” or other improvements would be required. SDG&E previously identified the potential for habitat impacts along access roads resulting from “refreshing” activities in its PEA and prior data request responses. The CPUC applied an impact buffer area to all access roads adjacent to natural areas to account for access improvements because SDG&E was unable to provide more specific locations where access edge impacts may or may not occur. Alternatively, SDG&E can determine that no access road improvements would be needed, and the CPUC will adjust its impact analysis accordingly. Either way, the full extent of potential project impacts requires disclosure in the EIR based on the details in the project description. SDG&E needs to be very clear on its proposed project description details.</p>	<p>SDG&E cannot know what the existing access road conditions may be at the time of construction, and exact road repairs (such as road refreshing) also cannot be known at this time. SDG&E agrees that access roads are indeed part of the whole of the Project, and should be included within the Proposed Project description. However, SDG&E’s road repairs are typically limited to the existing roadbed (typically 12-14 feet wide and wider in turns), and as such do not typically result in direct impacts to natural vegetation communities. Any potential impacts to natural communities from repairs and maintenance to existing/historic access roads are covered under the SDG&E NCCP, and such impacts are not required to be mitigated or accounted for in impact calculations that may affect the NCCP Impact Cap. SDG&E manages access road repairs through implementation of the SDG&E NCCP, including NCCP Section 2.1.3.9 (vegetation control in access roads) and NCCP Operational Protocols 41, 42, 44, and 45 which relate to maintenance of existing access roads. Therefore, SDG&E believes that a blanket assumption of impacts to natural communities within a buffer adjacent to all access roads does not accurately describe the Proposed Project or the actual impact the Proposed Project may have.</p> <p>SDG&E would limit road repairs to the existing/historic access road alignment except at those locations specifically identified within the detailed route maps. If any road repairs are required outside of existing/historic access road alignments, SDG&E would conduct the appropriate review required for a deviation from the final engineering footprint and account for any impacts to natural communities during that review.</p>

ED17-SDGE 07/29/2015 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 17 Dated July 21, 2015
ED17-SDGE Questions 1- 4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 6

Q#	Source Ref	Description/Data needed	SDGE Response
5.2	Data Request #16, Q4	<p>2. Provide written confirm from Kilroy Realty that the Torrey Santa Fe site may be considered as a staging yard. SDG&E did not provide confirmation in its data request response that Kilroy Realty is granting permission to consider use of the Torrey Santa Fe staging yard for project construction. Written confirmation must be provided to the CPUC no later than July 29th if this site is to be included in the Draft EIR analysis. Lacking this permission, it is premature to describe the site acreage that would be needed to support project construction. If permission is granted, provide accurate information and GIS data depicting the proposed staging area boundaries. SDG&E's data response identifies use of up to 5 acres; however, this is inconsistent with the Project Description revisions and detailed maps provided which quantify and depict 17.42 acres for staging at this site.</p>	<p><i>PENDING</i> – SDG&E will provide the requested update by July 31, 2015.</p>
5.3	Data Request #16, Q4	<p>3. Confirm project construction at Black Mountain Ranch Community Park. The mapbook provided in SDG&E's response attachment ED16 – Q4(c) removes two segments of underground ductbank within the parking lot at the Black Mountain Ranch Community Park (refer to Attachment A). Please confirm that this is in error or provide an explanation for the change.</p>	<p>The trench sections in question have been added back to project work space layer. The revised layer is included as Attachment ED17 – Q5(pt.3).</p>

ED17-SDGE 07/29/2015 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 17 Dated July 21, 2015
ED17-SDGE Questions 1- 4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 6

Q#	Source Ref	Description/Data needed	SDGE Response
5.4	Data Request #16, Q4	<p>4. Document and justify changes to baseline habitat mapping. SDG&E's GIS response to DR#16 included changes to the baseline habitat mapping at a few project locations with no explanation (refer to Attachment B). Any changes to the existing habitats presented in the PEA biological technical report need to be provided in a supplemental technical report that provides an explanation for the revision and includes representative photographs of the habitat area(s) in question. Furthermore, make sure all habitat type names are consistent with the Holland nomenclature previously used. Lacking clear identification of habitat data revisions, the current baseline information that the CPUC has will form the basis for the CPUC's evaluation of habitat impacts.</p>	<p>Minor revisions to vegetation mapping have been made during ongoing focused surveys conducted along the project alignment, with examples including pages 2 and 3 of DR17 Attachment B. The Vegetation within a portion of the Evergreen Nursery was incorrectly coded (as southern mixed chaparral) in the GIS data, and this was corrected (to be eucalyptus woodland).</p> <p>In addition, during the habitat assessment of the potential Carmel Valley Staging Yard, vegetation mapping was updated for an approximately 0.5 acre area located at the corner of Carmel Valley Road and Camino Del Sur (refer to Attachment ED16 – Q5 [Figure 1]). The areas mapped as disturbed habitat within the proposed Carmel Valley Road Staging Yard (including the area originally mapped as NNG) were characterized by heavily disturbed and previously graded areas interspersed with developed and paved areas. Soils within the yard exhibit various levels of disturbance ranging from tire tracks, scattered rip-rap, man-made surface water control systems, and gravel/crushed rock base. Vegetation appeared previously mowed within disturbed areas as evidenced by lower vegetation height than that in the surrounding areas (typically less than 1 foot in height compared to surrounding areas up to 2-3 feet in height). Dominant plant species observed to occur within these areas included Russian thistle (<i>Salsola tragus</i>), ragweed (<i>Ambrosia psilostachya</i>), filaree (<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>), fennel (<i>Foeniculum vulgare</i>), wild oat (<i>Avena</i> sp.), mustard (<i>Heirshfeldia</i> sp.), and red brome (<i>Bromus madritensis</i>). Sub-dominant species occurring occasional throughout the yard included artichoke thistle (<i>Cynara cardunculus</i>), crab grass (<i>Digitaria</i> sp.), cheeseweed (<i>Malva parviflora</i>), smooth cats ear (<i>Hypochaeris glabra</i>), and in areas accumulating water, salt cedar (<i>Tamarix</i> sp.). Occasional native species such as coyote bush (<i>Baccharis pilularis</i>) and needle grass (<i>Stipa</i> sp.) occur, primarily within small fragmented patches immediately adjacent to the paved areas, possibly due to previous landscaping as they are intermixed with non-native wattle trees (<i>Acacia</i> sp.). The habitat evaluation was not only limited to species composition and diversity, but also to land use and functionality. The surrounding (eastern) non-native grassland areas were largely composed of similar plant species, but did not display the same intensity of previous land use. This information will also be provided within a technical memorandum anticipated to be submitted by July 31, 2015.</p> <p>The vegetation classification was also changed for an approximately 4 acre portion</p>

ED17-SDGE 07/29/2015 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 17 Dated July 21, 2015
ED17-SDGE Questions 1- 4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 6

Q#	Source Ref	Description/Data needed	SDGE Response
			of the Stonebridge staging yard. SDG&E committed to using up to the full extent of the 4 acre portion of the Stonebridge site, which is a graded flat, recently disturbed area that has continuously been used for construction staging, materials storage, and other similar activities. SDG&E has utilized this area in the past, and this area is considered an existing feature (with existing fenced perimeter and access to Stonebridge Parkway) and would not be considered an impact to sensitive biological resources under the NCCP.
6	Data Request #16, Q3	Provide a detailed description of how the steel H-frame pole will be removed without impacting surrounding habitats or revise Attachment ED16 - Q3(b) to accurately show the work space required for pole removal. The work space area depicted in Attachment ED16 - Q3(b) is a portion of the existing access road located roughly 30 feet away from the steel H-frame pole.	The steel H-frame structure would be removed utilizing the same work areas that were utilized to install the structure. Attachments ED17 – Q6(a)_R49a Overview Map, ED17 – Q6(b)_Photos, and ED17 – Q6(c)_GIS data provide documentation of the proposed work areas for the removal of the steel H-frame structure.
7	Data Request #16, Q5	Provide a wetland delineation for the Carmel Valley Road Staging Yard including the extent of the wet meadow/seep. In particular, construction staging is depicted right up to the mapped limit of this habitat; therefore, the extent of the wet meadow/seep needs to be more accurately defined if this resource is to be avoided by construction staging as proposed in SDG&E's data response.	<i>PENDING</i> – A technical memorandum documenting the results of the focused wetland delineation of the Proposed Carmel Valley Road Staging yard is being prepared and is anticipated to be submitted by July 31, 2015.