Rebecca Giles
Regulatory Case Manager
San Diego Gas and Electric Company
8330 Century Park Court
San Diego, CA 92123-1530

January 25, 2016

Reg.12-10/A.14-04-011
SDG&E Sycamore-Penasquitos
230kV Transmission Line CPCN

Sent Via Electronic Mail Only

Billie Blanchard
Project Manager
Energy Division, CEQA Unit
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

Re: SXPQ ED20-SDGE Partial Response 1: Question 1, 3-5.

Dear Ms. Blanchard:

Attached is SDG&E's Partial Response 1 to ED's Data Request 20 issued on January 8, 2015, Questions 1 and 3-5. This completes the utilities' response to these questions of the data request. The response to Q 2 or an update on the status is expected to be provided by January 29.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact me by phone: (858) 636-6876 or e-mail: *RGiles@semprautilities.com.*

Sincerely,

Signed

Rebecca Giles
Regulatory Case Manager

Enclosures

cc:
Allen Trial – SDG&E
Elizabeth Cason - SDG&E
Bradley Carter – SDG&E
Central Files – SDG&E
Richard Raushenbush – SDG&E
Christopher Myers - ORA
Jeff Thomas – Panorama Environmental Consulting
Susanne Heim – Panorama Environmental Consulting
Mary Jo Borak – CPUC Infrastructure Permitting and CEQA
Molly Sterkel - CPUC Infrastructure Planning and Permitting
Darryl Gruen - ORA

ED20 SDGE 01/25/2016 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 20 Dated January 8, 2016 Q 1, 3-5
Pending: Q2

Q#	Reference Source, Page #	Data Need	SDG&E Response
1	N/A	**Provide records of correspondence with the City of San Diego regarding installation of the 230-kV transmission line in Carmel Valley Road bridge. Such correspondence should verify the feasibility of using the Carmel Valley Road bridge for underground installation of the 230-kV transmission line.** The City of San Diego indicated during a phone call with the CPUC that they have concerns about installation of power lines with voltages higher than 69-kV in City-owned road bridges. If the Proposed Project cannot be installed in the Carmel Valley Road bridge as currently proposed, SDG&E will need to provide the CPUC with an alternative design for the crossing, as well as for EIR Alternatives 3 and 4 where attachment to bridges was anticipated.	SDG&E engineering staff met with City of San Diego staff on January 22, 2016. Meeting notes from this meeting have been attached as ED20 – Q1(a)_2016 Meeting Minutes (2016). The meeting notes were prepared by SDG&E and reviewed and approved by both SDG&E and the City of San Diego. A list of attendees at the meeting is included within the attached meeting notes. The ultimate conclusion from the meeting (as documented in the attached meetings notes) are as follows: 1) the City of San Diego does not have a strict voltage limit or prohibition for the installation of electric distribution, power, or transmission lines within City-operated bridge structures; 2) the City recognizes that substantial precedence exists for the installation of high voltage lines, with appropriate engineering mitigations, within City operated bridge structures; and 3) the City will review specific requests for installation of high voltage utility lines within bridge structures. SDG&E has also attached its internal summary and notes from previous (2015) meetings the SDG&E engineering team conducted with City of San Diego staff during the preliminary engineering phase for Segment B of the Proposed Project. This meeting summary is Attachment ED20 – Q1(b)_2015 Meeting Summary.
2	FAA Advisory Circular	**Provide results of SDG&E's investigation into potential need for lighted marker balls along the Proposed Project alignment as described in the recently revised FAA Advisory Circular on Obstruction Marking and Lighting.** In December 2015, the FAA revised their Advisory Circular on Obstruction Marking and Lighting pertaining to lighting and marking of structures including transmission and power lines. The new guidance recommends the use of lighted markers for high voltage lines (69-kV or higher). The CPUC is uncertain whether lighted marker balls will be required for the Proposed Project. Please coordinate with FAA and provide information regarding the type of marker balls that you expect FAA will require for the Proposed Project.	***Response Pending.***
3	Public Comments on Draft EIR	**What is the feasibility of locating the two 69-kV power lines and the Proposed Project 230-kV transmission line underground in the Alternative 4 alignment along Carmel Mountain Road? Please evaluate space constraints due to**	SDG&E has conducted a preliminary feasibility study for the potential option of locating two 69kV power lines along with the proposed new SX-PQ 230kV transmission line in an underground position from location P48 to the Penasquitos Substation. This alignment was included within the DEIR as Alternative 4.

Q#	Reference Source, Page #	Data Need	SDG&E Response
		presence of existing utilities and factors such as potential heat loss. As part of the feasibility analysis, identify any component modifications that would be needed to accomplish this scenario (if feasible).	This option was found to not be feasible due to limited space within the box girder bridge located along Carmel Mountain Road.
4	Public Comments on Draft EIR	**What is the feasibility of locating the Proposed Project 230-kV transmission line underground in the Alternative 4 alignment in lieu of the two 69-kV power lines?**	SDG&E has conducted a preliminary feasibility study for the potential option of locating the proposed new SX-PQ 230kV transmission line in an underground position from location P48 to the Penasquitos Substation. This option would place the 230kV transmission line underground in lieu of the two 69kV power lines that were proposed for this underground alignment within the DEIR as Alternative 4. Based upon currently available information and the preliminary review that has been completed, the option of placing the 230kV transmission line underground along the DEIR Alternative 4 alignment is not feasible. As with the option of placing both the 230kV and the 69kV lines underground along the Alternative 4 alignment, there is not sufficient space within the Carmel Mountain Bridge to install the 230kV transmission line. The bridge currently contains one 12kV distribution line, which would have to be relocated in order to install any new lines within the bridge structure. Under DEIR Alternative 4, the two existing 69kV power lines would be installed underground, mainly within Carmel Mountain Road, between location P48 and the Penasquitos Substation. At the Carmel Mountain Road bridge crossing, the 69kV lines would be co-located with the existing 12kV distribution line. SDG&E believes that this would be very tight, and would require the relocation of the 12kV line, but is considered feasible. With respect to the 230kV line however, SDG&E has found that there is insufficient space to co-locate the 230kV line within the existing 12kV line. Underground installation of the 230kV line would require six 8-inch ducts and four 2-inch ducts; whereas installation of the two 69kV lines would only require six 6-inch ducts and one 4-inch duct. In addition, SDG&E cannot confirm that the 230kV line could be located within the existing dirt access road (between Structure 48 and Carmel Mountain Road) due to the increase turning radius requirements that 230kV lines have in comparison to the 69kV power lines included under DEIR Alternative 4. SDG&E notes that additional engineering review could potentially yield design or construction options that could render this option feasible. However, as stated above, the current data and review cannot support a positive feasibility for this option.

ED20 SDGE 01/25/2016 Partial Response 1
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 20 Dated January 8, 2016 Q 1, 3-5
Pending: Q2

Q#	Reference Source, Page #	Data Need	SDG&E Response
5	SDG&E Comments on Draft EIR	**The following information is needed for the four new staging yard locations identified for Alternative 5:** 1. **Records of correspondence with staging yard owners stating that the staging yard may be potentially used for construction.** 2. **Specific acreages that would be used within each staging yard location. If feasible, locate within the general areas where the staging yards could be situated.** 3. **Maximum daily truck/vehicle trips into and out of each staging yard and the type of uses that may occur at each staging yard.** 4. **Potential routes between the staging yards to the Alternative 5 construction areas.** **5. Existing traffic counts and LOS data for roadway intersections along the preferred routes from the staging yards to the Alternative 5 alignment.**	1. No response has been received from the land owners. SDG&E will continue to reach out to the property owners and will forward the results of such discussion to Energy Division. 2. SDG&E anticipates that approximately 3-4 acres would be required if only one site is used. However, if two sites were used (for example one each on the east and west sides of the alignment), each yard would need approximately 2 acres, resulting in 4 acres total. 3. Refer to Attachment ED20 – Q5_Stagng Yard Traffic Memo 4. Refer to Attachment ED20 – Q5_Stagng Yard Traffic Memo 5. Refer to Attachment ED20 – Q5_Stagng Yard Traffic Memo