



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

February 5, 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 ED22 - SDGE Response to Questions 1 & 2

Dear Ms. Blanchard:

Attached is SDG&E's Response to ED's Data Request 22 Questions 1 and 2 issued on January 28, 2015. Also attached are the preliminary results of SDG&E's review of potential staging yard sites along DEIR Alternative 5, including updated staging yard site maps, GIS data, and site photographs. This completes the utilities' response to these questions of the data request.

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

ED22 SDGE 02/04/2016 Response
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 22 Dated January 28, 2016

Q#	Reference Source, Page #	Data Need	SDG&E Response
1	DR#20, Item 4	<p>Information provided by SDG&E for Question #4, in Partial Response #1 to Data Request #20 (ED20 1/25/2016), requires further clarification regarding the potential feasibility of locating the new SX-PQ 230-kV transmission line in an underground position along the Alternative 4 alignment. SDG&E states: "SDG&E has found that there is insufficient space to co-locate the 230kV line within the existing 12kV line."</p> <p>1. The phrasing "within the existing 12 kV line" is confusing. Please explain this statement and/or clarify if this statement was intended to say "within the Carmel Mountain Bridge."</p> <p>2. Clarify if SDG&E's evaluation of locating the 230-kV line within the bridge included relocating the existing 12-kV line, as was the case for evaluation of the 69-kV underground.</p> <p>3. Clarify if SDG&E's feasibility assessment only considered locating all of the 230-kV underground within the existing bridge or if attachment of some portion of the 230-kV underground to the outside of the bridge was also considered, as the City of San Diego has indicated to the CPUC that this may be permissible.</p> <p>4. If attachment of a portion of the 230-kV underground to the outside of the bridge was not considered, please determine if this option makes locating the new SX-PQ 230-kV transmission line in an underground position feasible.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarification: As there currently are no vacant bridge cells within the Carmel Mountain Bridge, SDG&E has found that there is insufficient space to co-locate the 230kV line within the existing bridge cell containing the 12kV duct package based on required 230kV duct size and allowable bridge cell space. 2. SDG&E's evaluation of the 230kV line within the Carmel Mountain Bridge did consider re-locating the 12kV to co-locate with the 230kV line within the bridge cell, in the same manner as the 69kV evaluation. However, the dimensions of the 230kV/12kV co-located package would exceed the allowable geometry of current bridge attachment standards. 3. Attachment(s) to outside of the bridge were not considered during SDG&E's assessment of the potential 230kV underground version of DEIR Alternative 4. This decision was based on advice from structural bridge engineers, as further explained under response 4 below. 4. Although the option of installing attachments on the outside of the Carmel Mountain Bridge for the 230kV line has not been determined to lack feasibility based on in-depth structural and electrical calculations, bridge experts have determined exterior attachments based on the existing bridge design would be difficult to permit and likely not meet structural requirements.

ED22 SDGE 02/04/2016 Response
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 22 Dated January 28, 2016

Q#	Reference Source, Page #	Data Need	SDG&E Response
2	DR#20, Item 5	<p>The CPUC has reviewed the Traffic Information Memo prepared by KOA Corporation (January 21, 2016). Please provide a revised memo that addresses the following comments and questions regarding the traffic analysis contained therein:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It does not appear that the proposed Location #2 laydown entry (West of Camino Ruiz off of Carroll Canyon Road) leads anywhere as a riparian corridor separates this entry point from the adjoining quarry site where staging might occur. Additional information is required to understand how this entry point will be used. 2. The daily trips appear to be taken from the Draft EIR for Proposed Project Segment A (developed by the CPUC's consultant team). Segment A is an overhead alignment, not an underground alignment; therefore, the construction daily trips would be different. Use of this daily trip data needs further justification and proper notation. 3. Provide justification for the PCE values shown in Table 1. They appear to have been calculated. 4. Check and provide justification the PCE Subtotal per Day shown in Table 1 as the CPUC's consultant team calculated different values. 5. Under Table 2, Mira Mesa Boulevard: Black Mountain Rd to I-15, this segment has 6 lanes, not 4. 6. The "Lanes/Class" for Carroll Canyon Road: Black Mountain Rd to I-15 is not consistently identified under Tables 2 and 3 and the Appendices. Revise Table 3 to "4C". 7. Check for consistency throughout the document for "Lanes/Class" of each roadway segment. 8. The Mira Mesa Boulevard and Miramar Road: Black Mountain Rd to I-15 should be identified as a "Primary Arterial" rather than "Major Arterial". 9. In attachment 2, revise the 6 Lane Freeway LOS for C, D, and E under the City of San Diego 	<p>See Attachment ED22 – Q1(a)_Response Explanations and Attachment ED22 – Q2(b)_ Updated Traffic Memo.</p>

ED22 SDGE 02/04/2016 Response
A.14-04-011 SXPQ 230kV Transmission Line CPCN Project
Energy Division Data Request 22 Dated January 28, 2016

Q#	Reference Source, Page #	Data Need	SDG&E Response
		Roadway Capacity Standards Table. 10. Revise the Street Classification of "Prime Arterial" to "Primary Arterial".	