SDG&E TL 6931 FIRE HARDENING / WIND INTERCONNECT PEA DATA RESPONSE NO. 1

MARCH 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

A1 – Air Quality Technical Report
A2 – Adjusted Fugitive Dust Emissions
B1 – Biological Technical Report
B2 – 2010 QCB Report
B3 – 2011 QCB Report
B4 – Arroyo Toad Report
C – Confidential Cultural Resources Report
D – Noise Data

FIGURES

ATTACHMENT A
Data Request No. 1 – January 14, 2013
Completeness Review
Application No. 12.12.007
SDG&E Transmission Line 6931 Fire Hardening/ Wind Interconnect Project

GENERAL

1) The list of agencies, other interested parties, and land owners electronically in Excel format (Application Appendices C and H). For land owners, please include all parcels within 300 feet of any project component with the following data: assessor parcel number (APN), owner mailing address, and parcels' physical addresses.

The requested information is included on the CD provided with this data response.

2) Agency and public involvement contacts and correspondence to date, including names, addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses.

The table below provides the requested information for agency and public involvement contacts to date.

Date	Name of Agency or Member of the Public	Contact Type	Address	Phone Number	Email address
Correspondence to SDG&E					
2/11/2013	Gary Hoyt	Letter	2052 Flying Cloud Pl. Boulevard, CA 91905		
1/18/2013	Donna Tisdale	Email			donnatisdale@hughes.net
1/17/2013	Donna Tisdale	Email			donnatisdale@hughes.net
1/16/2013	Donna Tisdale	Voicemail			donnatisdale@hughes.net
12/16/2012	Gwendolyn Prada	Voicemail			lp13boots@aol.com

ATTACHMENT A
Data Request No. 1 – January 14, 2013
Completeness Review
Application No. 12.12.007
SDG&E Transmission Line 6931 Fire Hardening/ Wind Interconnect Project

Date	Name of Agency or Member of the Public	Contact Type	Address	Phone Number	Email address
Correspondence from SDG&E					
12/12/2012	Supervisor Dianne Jacob County of San Diego	Email			Dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov
	Donna Tisdale, Chair Boulevard Community Planning Group	Email			donnatisdale@hughes.net
	Jack White, Chair Campo Community Planning Group	Email			Jdwhitehouse1@aol.com
	J. R. Terry, Chair San Diego Rural Fire Protection District	Email			rterry@sdrfire.org
	Ralph Goff, Chair Campo Kumeyaay Nation	Email			rgoff@campo-nsn.gov
	Eric LaChappa, Chair La Posta Band of Mission Indians	Email			elachappa@lptribe.net
	Leroy Elliott, Chair Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation	Email r			ljbirdsinger@aol.net

ATTACHMENT A
Data Request No. 1 – January 14, 2013
Completeness Review
Application No. 12.12.007
SDG&E Transmission Line 6931 Fire Hardening/ Wind Interconnect Project

Date	Name of Agency or Member of the Public	Contact Type	Address	Phone Number	Email address
	Gwendolyn Parada, Chair La Posta Band of Mission Indians	Email			lp13boots@aol.com
	Patricia Cannon, CEO Alpine-Mountain Empire Chamber of Commerce	Email			pat@alpinechamber.sdcoxmail.com
	Assemblyman Brian Jones 77th California Assembly District	Email			Gail.ramer@asm.gov
	Senator Joel Anderson 36th California Senatorial District Congressman	Email			Edward.sprecco@ca.gov
	Duncan D. Hunter 52nd Congressional District	Email			Rick.terrazas@mail.house.gov
2/07/13	Jacumba Community Services	Phone & Email			Debby Troutt
2/27/13	City of San Diego	Voicemail			
2/26/13	Rough Acres Ranch	Phone			John Gibson

ATTACHMENT A
Data Request No. 1 – January 14, 2013
Completeness Review
Application No. 12.12.007
SDG&E Transmission Line 6931 Fire Hardening/ Wind Interconnect Project

Date	Name of Agency or Member of the Public	Contact Type	Address	Phone Number	Email address
2/27/13	Live Oak Springs Water District	Phone			
Meetings with Agencies					
1/15/2011	USFWS	Meeting	6010 Hidden Valley Rd, Suite 100 Carlsbad, CA 92011	760 431-9440 ext. 285	Eric_Porter@fws.gov
6/24/11	USFWS	Meeting	6010 Hidden Valley Rd, Suite 100 Carlsbad, CA 92011	760-431-9440	Joel_Pagel@fws.gov
2/16/11	BIA	Meeting	8315 Century Park Court 21-335 San Diego, California 92123-1550	916-978-6051	John.Rydzik@bia.gov
12/5/12	USFWS	Meeting	6010 Hidden Valley Rd, Suite 100 Carlsbad, CA 92011	760 431-9440 ext. 285	Eric_Porter@fws.gov

3) Supporting technical reports/data for resource sections (e.g., air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geotechnical report, noise).

The following technical reports/data are appended to this data response:

a) Air Quality Technical Report – Appendix A1and A2

b) Supporting Biological Reports – Appendices B1 through B4

c) Confidential Cultural Resources Report – Appendix C

d) Noise data – Appendix D

An analysis of the noise data in Appendix D is included in Section 4.11 responses 2 through 5.

A geotechnical report was not prepared prior to the submission of the TL 6931 Fire Hardening/Wind Interconnect Project PEA, but will be completed once the final foundation design is complete.

4) A list of persons and their qualifications responsible for compiling the detailed information for each area of environmental concern in the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA).

List of Preparers				
Preparer	**Professional Position**	**Years of Experience**	**Education**	**PEA Section**
SDG&E Personnel				
Tom Carr	Project Manager	35	B.B.A Finance	Project Description
Beverly Blessent	Principal Environmental Specialist	26	B.A. Botany M.A. Landscape Architecture	PEA
Flynn Ortiz	Transmission Designer	35	A.A.	Project Description: transmission system design
Francisco Pena	Sr. Designer	15	A.A Architecture	Project Description: grading access roads and construction /maintenance pads
Richard Miller	P.E.; Principal Civil Engineer	15	B.S.C.E	Project Description: access and grading

ATTACHMENT A
Data Request No. 1 – January 14, 2013
Completeness Review
Application No. 12.12.007
SDG&E Transmission Line 6931 Fire Hardening/ Wind Interconnect Project

List of Preparers				
Preparer	**Professional Position**	**Years of Experience**	**Education**	**PEA Section**
ESA Team (consultant to SDG&E)				
Robert Prohaska	Energy Group Director	27	B.A. Geography, M.S. Environmental Health Science	ESA team Project Manager
Charles Cornwall	Principle, Environmental Vision	26	B.A. Conservation and Natural Resources, M.S. Landscape Architecture	4.1 Aesthetics
Marsha Gale	Managing Principle, Environmental Vision	30	B.A. Landscape Architecture, M.S. Landscape Architecture, M.S. City & Regional Planning	4.1 Aesthetics
Cristina Gispert	Senior Associate	7	B.S. Environmental Management and Protection	4.10 Land Use and Planning
				4.11 Noise
Jason Ricks	Senior Managing Associate	15	B.S. Biology, M.S. Environmental Public Health	4.6 Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources
				4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
				4.15 Transportation and Traffic
Joseph Henry	Associate	2	B.S. Ecology & Systematic Biology, M.P.H.	4.4 Biological Resources
Laura Rocha	Managing Associate	7	B.A. Environmental Studies, M.S. Environmental Studies	4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality
Matthew Morales	Senior Associate	7	B.S. Environmental Toxicology	4.3 Air Quality
				4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Madeline Bray	Associate	11	B.A. Classical Archaeology, M.A. Archaeology	4.5 Cultural Resources

ATTACHMENT A
Data Request No. 1 – January 14, 2013
Completeness Review
Application No. 12.12.007
SDG&E Transmission Line 6931 Fire Hardening/ Wind Interconnect Project

List of Preparers				
Preparer	**Professional Position**	**Years of Experience**	**Education**	**PEA Section**
Vanessa Arent	Associate	1.5	B.S., Financial Mathematics and Statistics, M.S. Environmental Science and Management	4.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources
				4.12 Population and Housing
				4.13 Public Services
				4.14 Recreation
				4.16 Utilities and Service Systems
				4.17 Cumulative Analysis
				5.0 Detailed Discussion of Significant Impacts

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)

1) Please provide the following digitally formatted GIS data in the CA State Plane Zone VI NAD83 Feet coordinates/projection:

- **Interconnect route/proposed alignment**
- **Existing Transmission Line (TL) 6931 alignment**
- **Mile markers**
- **Pole locations**
- **Staging areas**
- **Pull sites**
- **Permanent and temporary helicopter pad sites**
- **Permanent 100-foot right-of-way (ROW) and temporary 100-foot ROW**
- **Temporary wood poles**
- **Underground 138 kilovolt (kV)**
- **Temporary 69 kV**
- **Boulevard Substation location**
- **New and existing access roads**
- **Key observation point (KOP) locations**
- **Visual simulation locations**
- **Vegetation communities**
- **Special-status plant and wildlife species**
- **Permanent and temporary impact data**
- **Potential jurisdictional streams**

- **National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) wetlands**
- **Sensitive receptor locations**
- **Roadways listed in Tables 4.15-1 and 4.15-2**
- **Cumulative project points within vicinity of project**
- **I-8 Pavement Rehabilitation transmission line**
- **ECO substation transmission line**
- **Sunrise Powerlink alignment**
- **Alternative power line route(s)**
- **Environmental Data Resources (EDR) search boundary**
- **National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) wind data**
- **California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) locations**
- **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) occurrence data**
- **Watersheds/sub-areas**
- **State parks**

The requested GIS data is provided on the CD appended to this data response. Confidential data is provided on a separate CD labeled "Confidential."

SECTION 1 PEA SUMMARY

1) Section 1.4.0 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Please indicate if the 2010 and 2011 Quino checkerspot butterfly surveys for the Manzanita Wind Project included the transmission line corridor to the Boulevard Substation. Please provide copies of these surveys.

The Quino checkerspot butterfly (QCB) surveys conducted in 2010 included all areas deemed suitable habitat along the transmission line corridor to the Boulevard Substation. The 2010 QCB Report was submitted to the USFWS July 2010 and is included in Appendix B2 (AECOM, 2010). Figure 4 within the 2010 QCB Report exhibits the survey area for the 2010 QCB surveys. The QCB surveys conducted in 2011 did not include the transmission corridor to the Boulevard Substation, because they were limited to the proposed turbine locations of a prior project and northern extent of the proposed transmission line, primarily north of Interstate 8. The 2011 QCB Report was submitted to the USFWS August 2011 and is included in Appendix B3 (Forde, 2011). Figure 3 within

the 2011 QCB Report exhibits the survey area for the 2011 QCB surveys. Surveys for QCB along the currently proposed project ROW will occur in the 2013 flight season and results presented in the survey report prepared at the conclusion of the surveys.

2) Section 1.4.1 Native American Heritage Commission: Please provide the following:

a. A copy of the records found in the literature search. Please provide copies of all site records, reports, and maps.

b. **A copy of all letters and documentation of Native American consultation.**

The information requested is included in the Cultural Resources Report, which is included in confidential Appendix C.

SECTION 2 PURPOSE AND NEED

1) Please explain why the fire hardening work stops at the point where the Shu'luuk Wind Project interconnects and does not continue the entire length of TL 6931.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) currently has a 24 foot wide easement in perpetuity for the single circuit wood portion of TL6931 on Campo Tribal Land. Because the TL 6931 Fire Hardening/Wind Interconnect Project will be built in a double circuit 138kV configuration, additional easement width is needed within Campo Tribal Land to accommodate the proposed 100 foot wide easement. Unfortunately, SDG&E and the Campo Tribe were unable to reach agreement on the land value and terms for SDG&E to purchase additional easement across the Campo Reservation. Consequently, the tribe has elected to interconnect the Shu'luuk Wind Project with SDG&E at the eastern boundary of the Campo Reservation where TL6931 exits tribal land.

2) Please further expand on SDG&E's responsibility to permit and construct the proposed interconnect in relation to California Independent System Operator's (CAISO's) Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)-approved tariff.

Pursuant to orders of the FERC and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), SDG&E has transferred operational control of its transmission facilities to the CAISO and is a Participating Transmission Owner (TO) in the CAISO. The CAISO provides

transmission and generator interconnection services for the CAISO-controlled transmission system on a non-discriminatory basis, pursuant to open access tariffs, including standard form contracts, on file with the FERC and as modified from time to time. SDG&E's responsibility for permitting and constructing the facilities in question stems from Section 5.1.1 of the CAISO's standard form Large Generator Interconnection Agreement. Subject to certain exceptions not present here, that provision specifies as a default rule that "[t]he Participating TO shall design, procure, and construct the Participating TO's Interconnection Facilities, Network Upgrades, and Distribution Upgrades".

SECTION 3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1) Please explain why the proposed project requires 13 new access roads and whether the proposed alignment is identical to the existing TL 6931 alignment. Please show proposed access roads (new and existing) on Figures 3-2 through 3-2D.

It is the intent of SDG&E to access the pole sites using existing roads to the fullest extent possible to avoid unnecessary ground disturbance. When not possible the shortest most direct, practical, and feasible route is identified to connect each inaccessible pole site to the nearest existing access road.

Not all of the new poles will be constructed in the same location as the poles that they are proposed to replace; therefore, new roads are required to access and maintain the new pole locations. For example, Poles 18 through 23 are proposed to replace existing Poles Z44261 through Z44264, however Poles 18 through 23 will be located north of the existing poles and access roads to these locations do not currently exist. No existing roads will be abandoned or unused following completion of project construction.

Thirteen new access roads have been proposed as a result of the project, some of which are spur roads as short as 15 feet in length. From the 13 new roads mentioned, six are completely within the ROW, four are partially out of the ROW, and three are completely outside of the ROW.

The 13 new access roads are illustrated in Figures 3-2 through 3-2T, which have been submitted with this data request.

ATTACHMENT A
Data Request No. 1 – January 14, 2013
Completeness Review
Application No. 12.12.007
SDG&E Transmission Line 6931 Fire Hardening/ Wind Interconnect Project

2) Please illustrate the existing alignment for TL 6931 from the Crestwood Substation to the Boulevard Substation along with the proposed alignment on Figures 3-1 and 3-2 through 3-2E.

The existing alignment is illustrated in Figures 3-2 through 3-2T. Please note that graphics are provided at sufficient scale to discern the proposed alignment from the existing alignment.

3) Please provide description and illustration to scale (similar to Figure 3-2D) of the proposed interconnection from pole number 1 to the Shu'luuk Wind Project. Please illustrate facilities proposed as part of the Shu'luuk Wind Project that TL 6931 would interconnect to.

As described in Chapter 2 of the Shu'luuk Wind Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), the Shu'luuk Wind Project would include an approximately 5-mile 138 kV overhead transmission line that would connect Pole 1 on SDG&E's interconnection line to the Shu'luuk Wind Project's on-site substation. The on-site substation would be constructed as a part of the Shu'luuk Wind Project to collect the electricity generated by the wind facility. Figure 2-8, from the Shu'luuk Wind Project's DEIS is attached and depicts the route traveled by the Shu'luuk Wind Project's 138 kV interconnection line from Pole 1, southwest along the Campo Reservation boundary, to the on-site substation.

4) Please illustrate the new Boulevard Substation configuration on Figures 3-2D and 3-2E that TL 6931 would tie into.

The Boulevard East Substation is illustrated in Figure 3-2S1 through 3-2S3.

5) Please describe and show all proposed modifications to the 12 kV distribution facilities.

SDG&E will be moving two branch 12KV lines to the new TL6931 alignment. Three phase 636 ACSR cables will be installed from existing pole Z44264 then jump over to a new pole to transition to Pole 24 going east to Pole 27. Three phase 636 ACSR cables will also be installed from Pole 27 to Pole 30. The existing 12KV on the exiting poles will be removed after the completion of the re-conductor.

6) In PEA Section 3.4 please describe if SDG&E is acquiring new ROW easements and if yes, approximately how much would be required. Please list properties that may likely require acquisition.

SDG&E will acquire new ROW easements for the proposed project. The square footage acquired from each parcel is listed in the table below with its corresponding Assessor Parcel Number (APN).

New ROW Easement Acquisition	
APN	**ROW required (SF)**
612-082-03	2.72
612-082-20	3.11
612-082-21	3.11
612-090-58	3.07
612-041-04	4.92
612-041-12	0.72
612-041-22	0.71
612-041-23	0.69
612-041-24	0.67
612-082-01	2.80
610-061-03; 610-062-39	5.06
610-062-40	4.45
610-062-41	0.64
610-062-21	0.86
610-062-47; 612-041-01	3.93
609-160-45	1.05
610-050-15	5.11
610-061-03	5.06
609-160-08; 609-160-09; 609-160-10	1.28
609-160-11	0.49
609-160-26	0.24
609-160-45	1.05
609-161-02	8.20

7) Please provide a list of major construction equipment that would be used, number and duration of use, and number of construction vehicle trips.

Please refer to Table 3.7-1: Construction Equipment List, which is attached to this data response submittal. The table indicates construction equipment usage by project phase. Also refer to Table 3.7-2: Construction Worker and Vendor Vehicle Trips Per Day, which provides an estimate of construction worker trips during each day of each construction phase of the project.

8) Please elaborate on the purpose and need for three permanent helicopter landing sites needed to operate and maintain the project. Please show these facilities on Figures 3-2 through 3-2 D. Also, please describe why the acreage for one helicopter staging yard is included in the temporary workspace requirements shown in Table 3-4 if the helicopter sites are permanent.

The three permanent helicopter landing zones are necessary to access pole locations 12, 13, and 14, which do not have existing access roads and currently cannot be accessed by vehicle. The construction of three 30 foot by 30 foot helicopter landing zones would create less ground disturbance than the construction of access roads to each of the three pole locations. Roads were considered as an alternative to helicopter use and it was found that they would create approximately 18,000 square feet of permanent ground disturbance compared to the 2,700 square feet of ground disturbance created by the helicopter landing zones. To minimize the project's overall impact, helicopters are proposed to be used to construct and maintain Poles 12, 13, and 14.

A temporary five acre staging yard will be utilized during the construction phase of the project, which will include an area for helicopter take-offs and landings. The site will be restored to pre-construction conditions following the completion of construction thereby resulting in temporary impacts. The three helicopter landing zones and the helicopter staging yard are illustrated in Figure 3-2H.

9) Instead of an approximate number of poles, please provide the maximum number of poles that are needed for this project. If different than the approximate number of poles in the PEA, please update temporary and permanent impact acreages for project.

The number of poles presented in the PEA is not expected to change through the final design and construction of the project. It is anticipated that 53 double-circuit dull galvanized steel poles and two temporary wood poles will be constructed as described in the PEA.

SDG&E used the word "approximately" to allow for flexibility during the final design and construction phase of the project, when changes are commonly required. SDG&E requests that the CEQA document and Permit to Construct for the project include the flexibility to accommodate minor project modifications and refinements that may be identified during the final design and construction phase.

10) Please provide the approximate diameter of the base and tip of steel pole on Figures 3-4 and 3-5.

The average diameter of the galvanized steel poles will be 4 feet and 1.5 feet at the base and the tip, respectively.

11) Please provide the size and type of conductor used and insulator configuration.

The type of conductor used will be 900 kcmil 54/7 Strands Canary ACSS/AW and the insulators used will be polymer insulators with post, suspension, and dead-end configurations.

12) Please provide the approximate span length between poles.

Pole Number	Ahead Span length (ft)	Pole Number (con't)	Ahead Span length (ft) (con't)	Pole Number (con't)	Ahead Span length (ft) (con't)
1	335	20	423	39	779
2	380	21	382	40	674
3	490	22	334	41	519
4	721	23	311	42	581
5	657	24	525	43	605
6	549	25	450	44	900
7	423	26	445	45	760
8	609	27	465	46	470
9	557	28	355	47	430
10	605	29	315	48	321

Pole Number	Ahead Span length (ft)
11	785
12	410
13	460
14	585
15	440
16	630
17	375
18	480
19	520

Pole Number (con't)	Ahead Span length (ft) (con't)
30	555
31	555
32	650
33	634
34	515
35	536
36	865
37	850
38	407

Pole Number (con't)	Ahead Span length (ft) (con't)
49	274
50	645
51	253
52	451
53	96
54	Substation Rack
52-1	184
52-2	232

13) Please indicate if a temporary source of power is needed at the staging areas. If yes, please describe how the power will be provided to the staging areas (e.g., a temporary power line or a generator).

Temporary power may be required at the TBO staging yard, however, that will ultimately be determined by the construction contractor once an award has been made. There is an existing 12kV line immediately adjacent to the staging yard that could be tapped to provide temporary service. This would likely involve stetting two or three temporary wood poles to bring the service to the staging yard.

14) Please provide detailed information for the underground portion of the 138 kV line into the Boulevard Substation including trench depth and width, methodology used to make trench, cubic yards of soil removed, would engineered fill be used as backfill, underground duct banks (include dimensions and illustration), and type of casing used for the cable. Also, please provide rationale for undergrounding from pole 52 to Boulevard east.

From Pole 52 to the Boulevard East Substation the 138 kV line will be constructed underground, generally under existing roads in a northwesterly direction using open cut trenching techniques. The depth and width of the trench varies depending on the various conditions encountered and conduit configuration where the trench is located. The total length of the trench will be approximately 726 feet, with an average depth of approximately 8

feet, and a width of 3 feet. The trench excavation will require the removal of a total of 787 cubic yards of soil. The backfill material for the trench will include Thermal Duct Bank Concrete. Figure 3.14-1 illustrates the duct banks that will be used at different portions of the trench, dimensions of the duct banks, and the conduit configuration and material. Conduit within the trench will consist of 6 inch PVC pipes with associated bracing and fittings. In addition there will be four 1.25 inch ducts for telecommunications conductor.

The Boulevard East Substation is designed to have a low profile to minimize its impact on visual resources, and to maintain the low profile the 138 kV line was designed to be built underground upon its approach to the Boulevard East Substation.

SDG&E is evaluating other design options and will provide additional information as soon as it is available.

15) Please indicate if any trenchless technologies will be used during project construction. If yes, please show location(s) on Figure 3.2A–3.2E and describe the construction methodology.

No trenchless technology is anticipated to be used during construction.

16) Please provide a description of how the removed components (i.e., wood poles, transmission lines, conductors, and insulators) would be removed from the project site. If anything is disposed of, please indicate what disposal facility would be used.

Pole removal activities will utilize boom and bucket trucks, hydraulic jacks, and a helicopter to remove cross arms, conductors, and poles. Associated hardware, including anchors and old wood poles, will be recycled and/or disposed of at the Otay Landfill.

17) Under Operation and Maintenance the PEA describes the activities required for insulator washing but then indicates this will not be required for the 69 kV/138 kV line as polymer insulators that do not require washing will be used. Is there a possibility that other insulators will be used that require washing? If yes, please provide information about the insulators and the approximate amount of water that would be needed for washing insulators along the 5.2-mile double-circuit transmission line. Does the existing TL 6931 require insulator washing? If yes, how much water is needed? PEA Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality (under question 4.9d), indicates that

there would be no change in water discharge volumes during operations and PEA Section 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems (under question4.16d), states that water is expected to be used for insulator washing and would be similar to what is used now for TL 6931. Please clarify if water use during operations would be the same, less, or more with the proposed project than under existing conditions.

The current insulators on TL 6931 are not normally washed. The new Polymer insulators installed on this Project will not require regular washing.

SECTION 4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 Aesthetics

1) Section 4.12, Methodology. Please describe the KOP selection process – specifically, was the County of San Diego consulted/involved in the selection process?

The twelve photographs shown in Figure 4.1-3a through Figure 4.1-3f document existing visual conditions, as seen from representative public viewing locations along the project route. The location and direction of the 12 photographs are shown in Figure 4.1-2rev. As part of the aesthetics analysis, three of these photographs (viewpoint (VP) 4, VP 7, and VP 10) were selected as key observation points (KOPs) to represent public viewing locations. Selection of simulation viewpoints relied upon professionally accepted criteria including consideration of viewing locations where the project would be most visible to the public, locations where it would be seen by 1) the greatest number of viewers and/or 2) locations where it would be visible from sensitive locations, such as residential areas or community gateways, or designated scenic resources such as scenic vistas or scenic routes. Although the County of San Diego was not directly involved in selection of photograph viewpoints, the selection process involved identification of designated scenic resources including consideration of policies contained in the San Diego County General Plan. The visual simulation from State Route 94 (VP 4) represents the view experienced from a County designated scenic highway and a view seen by the largest number of viewers as well as a viewing location near a group of residences.

2) Section 4.1.3, Existing Conditions (Proposed Project Viewshed). Please provide a graphic that depicts the Proposed Project Viewshed. A graphic is necessary to substantiate the textual claims provided in Section 4.1.3, including the statement that "intervening landform and vegetation will partially or fully screen views of the Proposed Project from many places within the surrounding area." In addition, a graphic will be helpful in determining whether an additional KOP should be located on Old Highway 80 (included in the County Scenic Highway System).

Figure 4.1-2rev is an annotated map graphic delineating a 0.5-mile radius and 1.0-mile radius from the proposed alignment as well as locations of photograph viewpoints that correspond to the set of annotated photographs shown in Figures 4.1-3a through 4.1-3m. Figures 4.1-3a through 4.1-3m present the 12 original photographs (VP 1 through 12) from the PEA Aesthetic Chapter and 14 new photographs (VP A through N) that illustrate typical viewing conditions within the project viewshed, as seen from places along local and regional public roadways in the area. Explanatory captions below each image are also provided. Taken together the set of photographs demonstrates that intervening landscape features fully or partially screen views of the project from many locations in the vicinity.

In addition, attached Figure 4.1-7 is a new simulation that shows a before and after view of the project looking southwest from Old Highway 80 near Live Oak Springs. The existing view was included in the PEA Aesthetics Chapter as Photograph 1 in Figure 4.1-3a. This viewpoint on Old Highway 80 is located at the north end of the project where the proposed project includes a new pole and the route is approximately 1,100 feet (less than one-quarter mile) from the highway. The simulation image shows two replacement poles and one new project pole.

3) Section 4.1.4, Impacts, Question 4.1c:

a. VP -4: Please provide heights for a) wood poles, b) galvanized steel poles, and c) steel distribution pole depicted in Figure 4.1-4. The text states that new poles would be "52% taller than existing poles" but does not provide the heights of either existing or proposed poles. In addition, Table 4.1-2, Summary of Simulation Views, states that two existing wood poles will be "shortened to the

distribution level." Provide the height of the existing poles and the height of the poles once shortened to the distribution level.

Poles 22, 23, and 24 are simulated in VP-4, with Pole 22 depicted on the far right side of the figure, Pole 23 on the right side of the road and Pole 24 on the left side of the road. Pole 22 will be 90 feet tall and will be a new pole location, as a wood pole does not currently exist where Pole 22 is proposed to be built. Pole 23 will be 95 feet tall and the new wood distribution pole proposed to be constructed near Pole 23 will be 35 feet tall. Pole 24 will replace a 62 foot tall wood pole with a 90 foot tall steel pole. See Figure 3-2 for each of the pole's locations. Three of the distribution poles within the residential area will be shortened: two poles will be shortened from 48 feet to 32 feet, and one pole will be shortened from 51 feet to 35 feet.

b. VP-7: Please provide height of a) galvanized steel pole, and b) H-frame wood pole to be removed in Figure 4.1-5.

The existing wood H-frame, shown in VP-7, is 43 feet tall and the new steel pole will be 80 feet tall.

c. VP-10: Please provide height of a) galvanized steel cable pole, and b) existing wood support pole in Figure 4.1-6.

The existing wood pole, shown in VP-10, is 57 feet tall and the new steel cable pole will be 120 feet tall.

4) Section 4.1.4, Impacts, Question 4.1d. The question 4.1d analysis does not discuss glare and reflectivity of galvanized steel poles. Provide information regarding reflectivity and potential glare of galvanized steel pole surfaces. Will dulling the material entirely avoid glare impacts to motorists and residents?

The newly galvanized structures will be treated with chemicals prior to installation, which will dull and eliminate the reflective properties of the poles.

If the poles were not chemically treated prior to construction the amount of time it would take to dull the galvanized poles would vary depending on location; in humid climates

they could take 3 to 4 months to dull, while in dryer climates they could take up to a year to dull. Dulling the poles prior to construction will avoid glare impacts to motorists and residents.

5) Figures: Please provide high-quality individual jpeg images of the photographs included as Figures 4.1-3a through 4.1-3f. Also provide high-quality jpeg images of the photographs and visual simulations included in Figures 4.1-4 through 4.1-6 (existing reproduction quality of images in Figures 4.1-4 through 4.1-6 is relatively poor as existing and proposed transmission infrastructure appear blurry in the hard-copy PEA document).

High quality jpeg images for figures 4.1-3a through 4.1-3m and 4.1-4 through 4.1-6 are provided on the attached CD.

4.2 Agricultural and Forestry Resources

No additional information is requested at this time.

4.3 Air Quality

1) The maximum daily PM_{10} emissions appear to be associated with overlapping days during CalEEMod Phases 5–8 and 10–12 (see "tblConstructionPhase sheet" in CalEEMod inputs in Appendix A). The majority of those emissions are associated with fugitive road dust due to hauling and worker trips. Please explain what activity is associated with those phases as they do not appear to involve haul trucks. According to the CalEEMod report, there would be hauling only associated with transport of 1,930 cubic yards of soil imported during the grading phase.

The CalEEMod output peak daily fugitive dust would occur during the overlapping phases 5-8 and 10-12. As described in response 2, however, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has indicated that daily construction fugitive dust emissions associated with on-road sources in CalEEMod are incorrectly reported as the summation over the entire phase duration and are thus overestimated (SCAQMD, 2013). This model abnormality does not affect on-road exhaust emissions. Haul trucks were assumed to occur during each phase of construction over the duration of the project to

account for water trucks and material delivery, as provided in the construction activity assumptions. Please see response 2 for revised emission estimates.

2) Please provide evidence to support the finding that the maximum daily construction emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would be reduced by 96% and 75%, respectively, as shown in Table 4.3-5. The applicant proposed measures (APMs) for air quality impacts would not be sufficient to provide this level of reduction. For example, watering disturbed areas twice daily, as implemented by CalEEMod, only results in a 55% reduction in fugitive dust emissions. Furthermore, the PM_{10} emissions associated with fugitive road dust due to hauling and worker trips have been reduced by 99%, and the $PM_{2.5}$ associated with these trips have been reduced to zero in most construction phases. No APMs have been proposed that would reduce off-site PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from travel on paved roads.

The SCAQMD has indicated that daily construction fugitive dust emissions associated with on-road sources in CalEEMod are incorrectly reported as the summation over the entire phase duration (SCAQMD, 2013). For this project, this model output error shows all days of on-road fugitive dust as occurring on one day for each phase. This model abnormality does not affect on-road exhaust emissions. Please see Appendix A2 for the construction emissions analysis that adjusts the peak daily emissions based on the number of active days for the various overlapping phases. Also, as noted by the data request, the mitigated scenario does not appear to be supported by incorporated measures and thus the revised unmitigated scenario for on-road fugitive dust will conservatively be used to represent both the unmitigated and mitigated state in the revised Table 4.3-5 below. However, the APM of watering disturbed areas is still incorporated into the Table 4.3-5 mitigated results.

TABLE 4.3-5 (REVISED)
PEAK DAILY CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

	Peak Daily Construction Emissions			
Pollutant	**Uncontrolled Emissions**	**Emissions after APMs[1]**	**Significance Threshold**	**Significant? (Yes or No)**
$PM_{2.5}$	~~4~~32	~~2~~8	55	No
PM_{10}	18~~266~~	18~~11~~	100	No
NO_x	156	156	250	No
SO_x	<1	<1	250	No
CO	91	91	550	No
ROG	21	21	75	No

NOTES: All numbers recorded in pounds per day. **Bold** values exceed the applicable SDAPCD threshold;
APMs = Applicant Proposed Measures

1. The APM of watering disturbed areas was included in the analysis. Peak daily emissions of PM2.5 would occur during year 2014 grading (and thus this APM would reduce emissions), whereas peak daily emissions of PM10 would occur in 2015 and not during grading (and thus this APM would not reduce emissions).

As depicted in the revised Table 4.3-5 (with previously reported emissions in ~~strikethrough~~ and revised emissions in underline), adjusting the CalEEMod emissions outputs to account for the on-road fugitive dust model error resulted in substantially reduced daily peak PM10 and PM2.5 emissions, which would be less than significant without implementation of APMs.

3) While the operational emissions for maintenance and repair have been quantified as shown in Table 4.3-6, please verify whether the operational emissions would increase relative to existing operations. It seems that the operational emissions would be equal to or less than those associated with the existing transmission line as a result of fire hardening.

Emissions shown in Table 4.3-6 would be the same as for existing operations. There would be no change in operational emissions from current conditions compared to when the project is completed. However, since the operational emissions were based on construction phases in CalEEMod and based on the recommendations of the SCAQMD regarding on-road fugitive dust in the CalEEMod construction modules (see responses 1 and 2 above), the emissions estimates in Table 4.3-6 have been adjusted accordingly and are depicted below (with previously reported emissions in ~~strikethrough~~ and revised emissions in underline). Please see Appendix A2 that presents the operational emissions

analysis that adjusts the peak daily emissions based on the number of active days for the various overlapping phases.

TABLE 4.3-6
PEAK DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

	San Diego County		
Pollutant	**Uncontrolled Emissions**	**Significance Threshold**	**Significant? (Yes or No)**
$PM_{2.5}$	1~~7~~	55	No
PM_{10}	10~~58~~	100	No
NO_x	30	250	No
SO_x	<1	250	No
CO	15	550	No
ROG	4	75	No

NOTE: All numbers recorded in pounds per day. **Bold** values exceed the applicable SDAPCD threshold

4.4 Biological Resources

1) Please provide the Biological Technical Report and all supporting focused survey reports used for the development of the PEA (e.g., bat, Quino checkerspot butterfly (QCB), arroyo toad, eagle reports, etc.). Please provide a table of survey conditions, personnel, dates, and times.

The Biological Technical Report, 2010 and 2011 QCB Reports, and Arroyo Toad Report, are attached to this data request in the following appendices:

- Appendix B1 – Biological Technical Report
- Appendix B2 – 2010 QCB Report
- Appendix B3 - 2011 QCB Report
- Appendix B4 - Arroyo Toad Report

Details of applicable survey conditions, personnel, dates, and times are included in the individual reports.

2) Please provide a copy of the wetland delineation, including supporting data sheets and other documentation.

A copy of the Jurisdictional Analysis Memorandum is provided in Appendix B1, attached to the Biological Resources Technical Report.

3) Please provide information for the following:

- **What was the process for determining which species would be surveyed for botanical/wildlife?**

  As described in Section 4.4.2 Methodology of the PEA:

  "Preliminary investigations were conducted by Environmental Science Associates (ESA) and included a review of aerial photographs, United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps, National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps; and literature and database searches that included a review of the San Diego County General Plan, the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan, San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) Subregional Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), and the San Diego County Draft East County Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan (MSCP). Databases queried included the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California and the California Department of Fish and Game's (CDFG) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). These databases were queried for special-status species records in the Live Oak Springs USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle and included the seven surrounding quadrangles (Sombrero Peak, Sweeney Pass, Jacumba, Tierra Del Sol, Campo, Cameron Corners, and Mount Laguna). From these queries, a list of target special-status species was developed for the Proposed Project area. Target special-status species were defined as having a geographic range and habitat similar to those found within the Proposed Project and, thus, have potential to occur on the Proposed Project."

- **Were all areas mapped for plant communities?**

  Figures 4.4-1A through 4.4-1U in the PEA provide detailed mapping of plant communities present within all areas of the Proposed Project.

- **What was the minimum mapping unit for mapping vegetation communities?**

The minimum mapping unit for the vegetation mapping effort was 0.5 acre. Features that were smaller than the minimum mapping unit were not distinguished from surrounding plant communities.

- **What buffer area was surveyed for wildlife species (e.g., QCB, arroyo toad)?**

  As described in the 2010 QCB Report, the QCB surveys included a "100-foot buffer on either side of the easement and a 500-foot buffer at angle points in order to accommodate potential staging areas and pulling sites." APM-BIO-2 addresses portions of the Proposed Project that were not surveyed during previous protocol-level QCB surveys: "APM-BIO-2: SDG&E will conduct protocol-level surveys for QCB prior to construction (including the TBO South 1 and Boulevard staging yards which have not been surveyed for QCB to date). Surveys are not required for the Motocross staging yard, as the area is disturbed and has little potential to support QCB. The surveys of the project area, including the new ROW, will be conducted within the QCB 2013 flight season, or the flight season prior to construction, as designated by the USFWS. Once the surveys have been completed, a 45-day report will be submitted to the USFWS and CPUC. As described in the Arroyo Toad Report, in Appendix B4, the Arroyo Toad surveys included a 100-foot buffer on either side of the alignment, and a 500-foot buffer at angle points.

4) Please include a complete species list. Were there any survey limitations?

A complete Species Compendium is included as Attachment C of the Biological Technical Report, which is in Appendix B1 of this data response. Survey limitations include temporality and seasonality of surveys. The blooming period of 2012 was affected by dry weather. Additionally, two staging yards have not been surveyed for QCB but will be surveyed during the 2013 flight season.

5) Please provide more detail regarding where all temporary impacts associated with conductor installation, wire pulling, and other aspects will occur and the estimated acreage of disturbance to each resource.

Temporary vegetation impacts associated with construction of the Proposed Project are detailed in Table 4.4-5 of the PEA (included below for reference). Additionally, Figures 4.4-1A through 4.4-1U exhibit construction-related temporary and permanent impacts to plant communities within the Proposed Project.

TABLE 4.4-5
TEMPORARY VEGETATION IMPACTS (ACRES)

Proposed Project Component	Coast Live Oak Woodland	Non-Native Grassland	Chamise Chaparral	Upper Sonoran Subshrub Scrub	Big Sagebrush Scrub	Redshank Chaparral	Total
Interconnection/TL6931	0.03	0.00	1.67	0.01	0.25	0.31	**2.27**
Staging Yards	0.17	15.59	0.00	0.00	7.17	0.00	**22.93**
Access Roads/ Landing Zones	0.03	0.00	0.78	0.11	0.00	0.00	**0.92**
Total	**0.23**	**15.59**	**2.45**	**0.12**	**7.42**	**0.31**	**26.12**

6) Please confirm that Tables 4.4-5 and 4.4-6 include all temporary and permanent impacts associated with the proposed project.

As described in the PEA, Tables 4.4-5 and 4.4-6 (included above and below, respectively) detail all anticipated temporary and permanent impacts to vegetation associated with the Proposed Project.

TABLE 4.4-6
PERMANENT VEGETATION IMPACTS (ACRES)

Proposed Project Component	Coast Live Oak Woodland	Non-Native Grassland	Chamise Chaparral	Upper Sonoran Subshrub Scrub	Big Sagebrush Scrub	Redshank Chaparral	Total
Interconnection/TL6931	0.16	0.00	3.74	0.01	8.59	0.70	**13.20**
Access Roads/ Landing Zones	0.06	0.00	0.78	0.16	0.00	0.00	**1.00**
Total	**0.22**	**0.00**	**4.52**	**0.17**	**8.59**	**0.70**	**14.20**

7) Please provide more detail regarding how each type of vegetation will be removed (e.g., process for protecting adjacent vegetation, process for clearing/tracking, treatment of vegetation after clearing, etc.)

As described in the PEA, the Proposed Project will follow the Operational Protocols outlined in the NCCP, including the following: "In order to ensure that habitats are not inadvertently impacted, The Environmental Surveyor shall determine the extent of habitat and flag boundaries of habitats which must be avoided." Additionally, "The

Environmental Surveyor shall check to verify compliance, including observing that flagged areas have been avoided, and reclamation has been properly implemented."

8) Please confirm that no trees will be trimmed or removed as part of the construction of this project. Based on a review of the aerial photographs it appears as though there may be several locations where the project comes in close proximity to tree resources.

Several coast live oak trees within the vicinity of Pole 16 and Pole 36 may require trimming in order to allow for appropriate vertical distance between the transmission line and the tree canopy.

ESA's certified arborist assisted in identifying and avoiding tree resources within the vicinity of the alignment to the maximum extent feasible. In order to minimize impacts to oak trees, the following measures are recommended to minimize impacts to oak trees:

- To avoid damaging roots to oak trees located on the site, a certified arborist should be present during all excavation, grading or trenching that would occur within 10 feet from the canopy of an oak tree. Trenching within 10 feet of the canopy should be achieved with hand tools to the greatest extent feasible. If using hand tools is not feasible, a certified arborist should be present during excavation, grading or trenching that would occur within 10 feet from the canopy, so that proper pruning techniques to roots can be implemented. No roots greater than 2 inches in diameter should be cut without prior approval of a certified arborist. Any major roots encountered should be conserved and treated as recommended by the certified arborist.
- Care must be taken to limit grade change within a minimum of 10 feet from the canopy of an oak tree. Grade changes can lead to plant stress from oxygen deprivation or oak root fungus at the root collar of oaks. Minor grade changes further from the trunk are not as critical but can negatively affect the health of the tree if not carefully monitored by a certified arborist. The grade should not be lowered or raised around the trunks of any oak tree.
- No storage of equipment, supplies, vehicles, or debris should be permitted within a minimum of 10 feet from the canopy of an oak tree.

- No dumping of construction wastewater, paint, concrete, or any other clean-up waste should occur within a minimum of 10 feet from the canopy of an oak tree.
- No temporary structures should be placed within a minimum of 10 feet from the canopy of an oak tree.
- Pruning of oak trees may include the removal of dead wood, stubs, and medium pruning of branches 2 inches in diameter or less and should be in accordance with the guidelines published by the National Arborist Association. No branches greater than 2 inches in diameter should be cut without prior approval of a certified arborist. No more than 20 percent of a tree canopy of an oak tree should be removed. If more than 20 percent of the canopy needs to be removed, annual monitoring for 5 years should be conducted to evaluate the overall health of the tree. If after the monitoring period it is determined that the tree is in severe decline or is dead, SDG&E shall mitigate for the loss of the tree by implementing mitigation standards for impacts to native vegetation from their NCCP. For the loss of a native oak tree, this would require replacement of diameter at a 1:1 ratio.
- After pruning, installation of support cables to prevent future main crotch failures may be necessary based on a certified arborist's determination.
- Grass or ground covers should not be planted beneath the canopy of oak trees.

Additionally, the Proposed Project will follow the Operational Protocols outlined in the NCCP, including the following: "Parking and driving underneath oak trees is not allowed in order to protect root structures except in established traffic areas."

9) Please provide more detail regarding the equipment that will be used to remove and move vegetation.

Equipment used for vegetation removal is expected to include heavy equipment (e.g. excavators, bulldozer, etc.) and hand-held equipment (e.g. chainsaws, weed whackers, etc.).

10) Please consider these comments regarding Table 4.4-2, Special-Status Wildlife Species with the Potential to Occur:

- **Related to San Diego mountain king snake--the Habitat Requirement section refers to the range of the San Bernardino Mountains king snake, not the San Diego mountain king snake, which does occur in the area**

  Table 2 (Special-Status Wildlife Species with the Potential to Occur) within the Biological Technical Report (See Appendix B1) has been amended to include the appropriate habitat requirement and potential to occur (considered high potential to occur) for the San Diego mountain king snake.

- **Golden eagle - observation of eagle in vicinity should increase the potential to occur; the lack of CNDDB points within 5 miles should not be considered as the sole rationale for discounting potential to occur**

  Extensive avian surveys conducted for a project that was previously under consideration resulted in seven Golden Eagle observations, none of which were associated with a known nest. The potential for Golden Eagles to occur as soaring flyovers within the vicinity of the Proposed Project is acknowledged; however, Golden Eagle nesting is not expected within the vicinity of the Proposed Project, as the area does not support the cliffs, trees, or artificial towers of the stature required by nesting Golden Eagles. Additionally, the potential for Golden Eagles to forage within the vicinity of the Proposed Project has been acknowledged, and Table 2 (Special-Status Wildlife Species with the Potential to Occur) within the Biological Technical Report (See Appendix B1) has been amended to reflect a medium potential with respect to foraging.

- **Least Bell's vireo potential to occur should be increased as they are known to occur in smaller patches of habitat**

  It is acknowledged that least Bell's vireo (LBV) has the potential to occur in smaller patches of suitable habitat. However, the riparian habitat within Campo Creek in the vicinity of the alignment is considered of marginal quality, as the area has lower vegetation density and higher human-related disturbance than much of the riparian habitat upstream and downstream of the alignment crossing.

Therefore, the potential for LBV to occur within the vicinity of the alignment is considered low.

- **Please explain why the willow flycatcher and the potential for the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fully Protected species white-tailed kite and ringtail were not evaluated.**

  Table 2 (Special-Status Wildlife Species with the Potential to Occur) within the Biological Technical Report (See Appendix B1) has been amended to include southwestern willow flycatcher (SWFL), which is considered a Covered Species under the NCCP. Potential habitat for the species within the vicinity of the alignment is restricted to Campo Creek and is considered of marginal quality, due to its low vegetation density and high human-related disturbance compared to much of the riparian habitat upstream and downstream of the alignment crossing. Therefore, the potential for SWFL to occur within the vicinity of the alignment is considered low. White-tailed kite was excluded from consideration, as the species requires low-elevation agricultural, grassland, wetland, woodland, and shrub habitats and the entirety of the Proposed Project occurs at relatively high elevations (between approximately 3,400 and 4,000 feet above mean sea level) (Dunk, 1995). Additionally, database queries conducted did not return a recorded observation of the species in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. Ringtail was excluded from consideration since there are no recorded occurrences of the species within the Live Oak Springs, Sombrero Peak, Sweeney Pass, Jacumba, Tierra Del Sol, Campo, Cameron Corners, or Mount Laguna USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle search area. Additionally, the ringtail most commonly occurs at low to middle elevation, within the immediate vicinity of a perennial water source (CWHR, 2005).

11) Please provide more information supporting the claim that the proposed project area does not function as a wildlife movement corridor. Also, it has been noted that the Pacific flyway is a broad-band migration route that encompasses the coast,

mountains, and desert regions of San Diego County - albeit to a lesser degree over the mountainous portion of the county.

While wildlife species are anticipated to utilize the area as a non-migratory corridor (e.g. foraging and dispersal), no identified migratory corridors are within the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Project. There are no major terrestrial migration corridors that are known to cross through the Proposed Project area (SC Wildlands, 2006). As described in the Biological Technical Report, "recognized habitat linkages within the region include the Peninsular-Borrego Connection to the north of the Proposed Project, and the Park to Parque Linkage to the east of the Proposed Project. Both of these regional linkages are well defined, and do not occur in the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Project (SC Wildlands, 2006; CBC 2006). A major avian migration route, the Pacific Flyway, is located approximately 45 miles east of the Proposed Project area, with significant numbers of migratory birds utilizing the Salton Sea during annual migrations. It is estimated that more than 50 percent of Pacific Flyway migratory birds visit the Salton Sea region and its associated marshes each year. Migratory bird surveys conducted for a prior wind project observed modest numbers of migratory birds, indicating that the area is not within a major migration corridor (Bloom Biological, 2012)."

12) Please provide more detail that allows verification that there are no impacts to wetlands, waters, or other areas.

Several features within the vicinity of the project impacts are potentially subject to the jurisdiction of the USACE, CDFG, and the RWQCB. Project impacts under the USACE's jurisdiction are limited to unvegetated channels, which are characterized as drainage features that have a defined bed and bank and a distinguishable OHWM, but lack hydrophytic vegetation, and are connected to a TNW. Areas of CDFG jurisdiction refer to streambeds and associated riparian scrub habitats. All areas mapped as USACE-jurisdictional waters fall within the Section 401 authority of the RWQCB, specifically the unvegetated channels. Several of these potentially jurisdictional features cross existing or proposed Project access roads. Impacts to these areas would be avoided through temporarily spanning steel plates over the drainages for equipment and vehicle access. Potential impacts to 0.069 acre (approximately 3,023 square feet) of areas under the jurisdiction of the USACE, CDFG, and RWQCB would be associated with using the open trench method proposed for undergrounding the 138 kV to the Boulevard

Substation. Additional avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures may be necessary to avoid impacts.

The Jurisdictional Analysis Memorandum is attached to the Biological Resources Technical Report, which is included as Appendix B1.

13) Please confirm that this area does not support QCB critical habitat.

Figure 4.4-13 shows the designated critical habitat of QCB, arroyo toad, and peninsular bighorn sheep in relation to the Proposed Project. As described in Section 4.4.3: Existing Conditions of the PEA, under the subheading Critical Habitat, "Designated critical habitat for QCB occurs approximately 3.5 miles to the west of the Proposed Project area and approximately five miles east of the Boulevard Substation."

14) The impact analysis for wetlands/waters appear to be in conflict with one another (response to County questions 4.4b and 4.4c), please verify that the discussion for both is accurate.

PEA Section 4.4b discusses the potential for the Proposed Project to impact sensitive natural communities, including riparian habitats. Although riparian habitat exists within the vicinity of the Proposed Project (i.e., Campo Creek) there will be no impacts to this community, as the power line will span the entirety of the creek. PEA Section 4.4c discusses the potential for the Proposed Project to impact wetlands. Several potentially jurisdictional drainages (including Campo Creek, which as discussed above, is also considered a sensitive natural community) exist within the vicinity of the Proposed Project. Many of these features within the vicinity of the project impacts are potentially subject to the jurisdiction of the USACE, CDFG, and the RWQCB. Several of these potentially jurisdictional features cross existing or proposed Project access roads. Impacts to these areas would be avoided through temporarily spanning steel plates over the drainages for equipment and vehicle access. Potential impacts to 0.069 acre (approximately 3,023 square feet) of areas under the jurisdiction of the USACE, CDFG, and RWQCB would be associated with using the open trench method proposed for undergrounding the 138kV to the Boulevard Substation. Additional avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures may be necessary to avoid impacts.

The Jurisdictional Analysis Memorandum is attached to the Biological Resources Technical Report, which is included as Appendix B1.

Do the proposed mitigation ratios comply with County of San Diego guidelines for impacts to the various vegetation community types?

The Proposed Project will follow the mitigation ratios presented in the NCCP, rather than the County guidelines. The NCCP requires in-place enhancement of temporary impacts within Preserve lands, or 1:1 mitigation if in-place enhancement is deemed unsuccessful. Permanent impacts to vegetation communities within Preserve lands are required to be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio. The NCCP mitigation ratios are generally more conservative and require more substantial mitigation than the County guidelines for impacts to specific vegetation communities created by the Proposed Project.

15) Some modification to the various APMs may be required (e.g., requiring restoration of all temporary impact areas).

Comment noted. Suggested changes to the APMs will be reviewed as they are received.

4.5 Cultural Resources

Please see Section 1, PEA Summary, Question 2, above.

4.6 Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources

1) Please add relative distance of earthquake events to proposed project area in Table 4.6-2.

TABLE 4.6 2
SIGNIFICANT HISTORICAL EARTHQUAKES

Event Date	Earthquake Name or General Location	Fault Involved (if known)	Magnitude	Distance from Project Site (Miles)
November 24, 1987	Superstition Hills Earthquake	Superstition Hills Fault	6.6	40
November 23, 1987	Elmore Ranch Fault	Elmore Ranch Fault Zone	6.2	45
October 15, 1979	1979 Imperial Valley Earthquake	Imperial, Brawley Fault Zone, Rico Faults	6.4	56
April 8, 1968	Borrego Mountain Earthquake	Coyote Creek segment of the San Jacinto Fault Zone	6.6	35
March 19, 1954	1954 San Jacinto Fault Earthquake	Clark Fault, part of the Anza	6.4	43

Event Date	Earthquake Name or General Location	Fault Involved (if known)	Magnitude	Distance from Project Site (Miles)
		segment of the San Jacinto Fault Zone		
October 21, 1942	Fish Creek Mountains Earthquake	Coyote Creek segment of the San Jacinto Fault Zone	6.6	26
May 18, 1940	1940 Imperial Valley Earthquake	Imperial Fault	6.9	45
March 25, 1937	San Jacinto Fault (Terwilliger Valley) Earthquake	San Jacinto Fault	6.0	51
June 22, 1915	1915 Imperial Valley Earthquake (two strong shocks about an hour apart)	Imperial Fault	6.1 and 6.3	46
May 28, 1892	Borrego Mountains, aftershock of the Laguna Salada Earthquake	Coyote Creek, part of the San Jacinto Fault Zone	6.8	37
February 9, 1890	North end of the Borrego Desert	Assumed on the San Jacinto	6.8	70

SOURCE: SCEC, 2012

2) Please confirm that no other significant earthquakes occurred within a 50-mile radius of the proposed project since 2005. If there are additional earthquakes, please add fault information, magnitude, and distance to the proposed project area to Table 4.6-2.

As defined by the USGS, significant earthquakes are ones that are of magnitude 6.5 or greater or ones that cause fatalities, injuries, or substantial damage (USGS, 2013). No significant earthquakes have occurred within a 50-mile radius of the proposed project from 2005 to present.

4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emission

No additional information is requested at this time.

4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Fire Hazards)

No additional information is requested at this time.

4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

1) **Please provide commitment letter(s) from municipal water agencies confirming availability of 2.3 million gallons of water during the construction period as well as the amount needed during operation for insulator washing.**

SDG&E has contacted water agencies to obtain commitment letters to supply water during construction and will provide commitment letters prior to project construction.

4.10 Land Use and Planning

1) **Section 4.10.3, Existing Conditions, Land Use Designations and Existing Land Uses. The discussion on page 4.10-2 of the PEA regarding General Plan Land Use designations includes land uses established by the 2011 San Diego General Plan; however, the designations depicted on Figure 4.10-1 include old designations. Please revise Figure 4.10-1 with the updated designations. Also, provide a similarly scaled figure with the relevant zoning information.**

Figure 4.10-1 was revised to depict the land use designations established in the 2011 San Diego General Plan. Figure 4.10-2 illustrates the relevant zoning information for the Proposed Project.

2) Please provide a figure (same scale as 4.10-1) identifying the location of residences on parcels traversed or adjacent to the alignment of TL 6931. The text states that the route "traverses 29 privately owned parcels that are primarily vacant and those that are occupied by small, low-density single-family residences or mobile homes." Where are these residences located?

Figure 4.10-3 illustrates the parcels traversed by the TL 6931 alignment and the residences located on the parcels.

4.11 Noise

1) Please include the following in the regulatory background: California Natural Resources Agency (CEQA requirements), CPUC, Caltrans (vibration guidance), and San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) Noise and Vibration

Guidelines. Please also include discussion of County of San Diego impulsive noise thresholds.

CEQA

CEQA, or the California Environmental Quality Act, is a statute that requires state and local agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts of their actions and to avoid or mitigate those impacts, if feasible. The legislative intent of CEQA is to take all action necessary to provide the people of California with clean air and water, enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic, and historic environmental qualities, and freedom from excessive noise (PRC §21001 (b)). In evaluating the significance of the environmental effect of a project, the Lead Agency is required to consider direct and indirect physical changes in the environment, which may be caused by the project. CEQA identifies noise as an example of a physical change in the environment (PCR §15064 (d) (1)). In addition, Appendix G of the California Natural Resources Agency 2012 CEQA Guidelines identifies six noise impact related criteria that are used in the absence of thresholds of significance developed independently by lead agencies. These criteria are listed in the table under Section 4.11.4 of the PEA and were used as the significance criteria in this analysis.

California Public Utilities Commission

The CPUC will evaluate the proposed project's noise impacts according to the requirements of CEQA. CEQA does not specify a threshold for "substantial increase" for noise. The CPUC General Order (GO) No. 131-D, Section XIV B, clarifies that "local jurisdictions acting pursuant to local authority are preempted from regulating electric power line projects, distribution lines, substations, or electric facilities constructed by public utilities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. However, in locating such projects, the public utilities shall consult with local agencies regarding land use matters." Due to this GO, the public utilities are directed to consider local regulations and consult with local agencies; however, the counties and cities do not have discretionary jurisdiction over the Proposed Project.

Caltrans Vibration Guidelines

Caltrans has prepared the 2004 Transportation- and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual, which provides "practical guidelines/recommendations guidance to Caltrans engineers, planners, and consultants who must address vibration issues associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) projects." The 2004 Transportation- and Construction Induced Vibration Manual states that the Manual "is not an official policy, standard, specification, or regulation and should not be used as such. Its content is for informational purposes only."

The Proposed Project is not a Caltrans project and the Caltrans Manual does not address public utility projects. In addition, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in vibration effects to any Caltrans roadway. Therefore the 2004 Transportation- and Construction Induced Vibration Manual is not applicable.

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance—Noise

The County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use / Department of Public Works have developed the 2009 County Guidelines for Determining Significance—Noise, which is used by County staff for the review of discretionary projects and environmental documents prepared by the County. The express intent of the guidelines is to provide a consistent, objective and predictable evaluation of significant effects with respect to noise. The Guidelines "are not binding on any decision-maker and do not substitute for the use of independent judgment to determine significance or the evaluation of evidence in the record." (County Guidelines for Determining Significance, page iii.)

The Proposed Project is not a County project, and the Guidelines do not address public utility projects. In addition, the Guidelines for construction noise and impulsive noise refer to the limits for construction noise and impulsive noise contained in the San Diego County Code. These limits were discussed in the PEA. Therefore the 2009 County Guidelines for Determining Significance – Noise is not applicable and does not provide any additional guidance for the Proposed Project.

Although not referenced in the County Guidelines, the County of San Diego Code expressly authorizes temporary deviations from the strict noise limitations contained in the Code

under certain circumstances. Specifically, Section 36.423 of the County Code expressly allows non-emergency work on a public utility facility to deviate from the noise ordinance based upon a review of the potential impact the noise may have on each property that would be affected, the value to the community of the work being done, and other factors. SDG&E ordinarily confers with the County in instances where a deviation from the strict requirements of the Code are anticipated.

2) Please provide ambient noise levels for sensitive receptor locations closest to the alignment rather than providing a generic range of ambient noise levels. Three measurements should suffice:

- **Receptor property line closest to alignment in vicinity of mile marker 2**
- **Receptor property line closest to alignment in vicinity of mile marker 4**
- **Receptor property line closest to alignment in vicinity of mile marker 5**

A total of three, 15-minute short-term noise level measurements were conducted on January 28, 2013 from 9:40 to 11:06 a.m. to characterize existing ambient conditions. Each measurement was recorded at a different location including:

- The residential property line closest to the alignment in the vicinity of mile marker 2
- The residential property line closest to the alignment in the vicinity of mile marker 4
- The residential property line closest to the alignment in the vicinity of mile marker 5

The maps included in Appendix D shows the location of each noise measurement. Measurement sites were chosen to represent existing noise-sensitive uses along the proposed alignment. The noise surveys were conducted using a Metrosonics Model db-3080 sound level meter, which was calibrated prior to use and operated according to the manufacturer's written specifications. At the measurement site, the microphone was placed at a height of approximately 5 feet above the local grade. The measured average noise level (Leq) and maximum noise level (Lmax), and the sources of noise monitored at the measurement locations are shown in the following table. The sound level meter output is also included in Appendix D. These data support the significance finding regarding the ambient noise environment described in the PEA.

Existing Noise Environments at the Project Site

Location	Date and Time Period	Leq dBA	Lmax dBA	Noise Sources
1. Residential property near mile marker 2	01/28/13 09:40 – 09:55 AM	42.9	61.3	Dogs barking Airplanes flying Birds Distant highway noise
2. Residential property near mile marker 4	01/28/13 10:22– 10:37 AM	65.8	77.1	Wind
3. Residential property near mile marker 5	01/28/13 10:51 – 11:06 AM	54.6	74.4	Dogs barking Distant highway noise

3) Please evaluate impacts based on the applicable criteria. Please note the County's construction noise thresholds apply at the boundary line of the property where the noise source is located or any occupied property where the noise is being received. Therefore, please confirm that the distances from construction activities to sensitive receptor locations were measured to the nearest property line rather than the receptor itself. If not, please revise the analysis accordingly.

The analysis as currently written in the PEA adequately addresses this comment. Distances from construction activities to sensitive receptor locations were measured to the nearest property line.

4) Please quantify the noise and vibration impacts associated with potential blasting activities and disclose noise/vibration levels at the nearest sensitive receptors. These should be compared to all applicable County thresholds (including impulsive noise) prior to introducing mitigation.

Blasting of rocks would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during daytime hours. While noise generated by blasting depends on the amount of charge material used, a typical sound level for blasting, measured at 50 feet from the source, is 94 dBA (Hoover, 1996). The nearest sensitive receptor property line is approximately 50 feet from the alignment. Rock

blasting, if utilized, would substantially reduce construction time at any one location as extensive digging in hard rock would not be required. Blasting would therefore have the effect of reducing potential noise impacts. In addition, rock blasting, if used, is typically performed only once per day and would therefore not exceed the County's impulsive noise standards.

Vibration levels associated with blasting are site-specific and are dependent on the amount of explosive used, soil conditions between the blast site and the receptor, and the elevation where blasting would take place (specifically, the below surface elevation where bedrock would been countered). Therefore, a quantitative assessment of potential vibration impacts from blasting is not provided. Blasting below the surface would produce lower vibration levels at a receptor due to additional attenuation provided by distance and transmission through soil and rock. In addition, with the implementation of the APMs, and the blasting plan (see section 4.11.6), vibration impacts will be less than significant.

5) Please quantify/discuss the residual impacts after mitigation.

All noise impacts will remain less than significant with implementation of the APMs and blasting plan.

4.12 Population and Housing

No additional information is requested at this time.

4.13 Public Services

1) It is our understanding that the Campo Fire Station will not be open year round. Please provide confirmation whether this fire station will or will not be open year round.

The following fire stations are located in or near the Campo community and are staffed year-round:

- San Diego County Fire Authority (SDCFA) Campo Fire and Rescue Station, located at 437 Jeb Stuart Road (staffed by SDCFA volunteers)
- CAL FIRE Campo Fire Station, located at 31577 Highway 94 (staffed by CAL FIRE)

- San Diego Rural Fire Protection District Station 42, located at 29690 Oak Drive (staffed by CAL FIRE)
- Campo Reservation Fire Protection District fire station, located at 36210 Church Road (managed by the reservation)

4.14 Recreation

No additional information is requested at this time.

4.15 Transportation and Traffic

No additional information is requested at this time.

4.16 Utilities and Service Systems

No additional information is requested at this time.

4.17 Cumulative Analysis

1) On page 4.17-5, Agricultural Resources is listed as a resource having the potential to result in temporary cumulative impacts; however, this topic is not addressed in the text. Please provide information regarding the cumulative impacts of agricultural resources.

The Proposed Project includes a five acre staging area that will be located on farmland of local importance adjacent to Poles 6 through 16; however, no other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable probable future projects will be located on this 336 acres of designated farmland and the staging yard will be restored to pre-construction conditions following the construction phase. The nearest cumulative projects are the Sunrise Powerlink Project and the ECO Substation Project, which both cross or are adjacent to Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance approximately 6 miles southwest of the project site; the Proposed Project will not be located on or near enough to this farmland to contribute to the cumulative impact to agricultural resources in the area.

ATTACHMENT A
Data Request No. 1 – January 14, 2013
Completeness Review
Application No. 12.12.007
SDG&E Transmission Line 6931 Fire Hardening/ Wind Interconnect Project

SECTION 5 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS / ALTERNATIVES

1) Please provide a Word file including a list of all the APMs (Table 5-1).

Table 5-1: Applicant Proposed Measures is provided as a Word document on a CD appended to this data request.

2) PEA Section 5.3.1 states that a "system" alternative was analyzed and rejected but offers no information as to what was considered and why it was rejected. Please provide details of the system alternative considered.

The "system alternative" contemplates connection of the Wind Interconnect Project to existing transmission facilities in the vicinity of the Wind Interconnect Project. The only existing transmission facilities in the vicinity of the Wind Interconnect Project is TL6931, a 69 kV transmission line. Because the Wind Interconnect Project gen-tie line will be operated at 138 kV, connection to TL6931 is not possible. Accordingly, the "system alternative" is not feasible and would not achieve the project's objective of providing interconnection facilities for the Shu'luuk Wind Project or a vacant position to allow for the addition of a 138 kV circuit when needed in the future and was eliminated from further consideration.

3) It was noted that in the electronic version of the PEA on SDG&E's website (http://www.sdge.com/sites/default/files/regulatory/Volume%20II.pdf) in the last paragraph on page 5-5, instead of the reference to Figure 5-1 it says "Error! Reference source not found."

A corrected version of the PEA has been uploaded to SDG&E's website.

APPENDICES

No additional information is requested at this time.

REFERENCES

AECOM, Inc. 2010a. *45-Day Summary Report of Focused Surveys for the Quino Checkerspot Butterfly for Manzanita Wind Energy Project*. Prepared for SDG&E.

Bloom Biological. 2012. *Draft Baseline Avian Use and Risk Assessment for the Proposed Manzanita Wind Project*.

California Biodiversity Council (CBC). 2006. *Biodiversity along the Border Committee: Strategies for Consideration.*

California Department of Fish and Game California Wildlife Habitat Relationships System (CWHR). 2005. *Ringtail Life History Account.*

Dunk, Jeffrey R. 1995. White-tailed Kite (Elanus leucurus), The Birds of North America Online (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved from the Birds of North America Online: http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/178.

Forde Biological Consultants (Forde). 2011. *2011 Survey Results: Quino Checkerspot Butterfly, Manzanita Wind Energy Project. San Diego County, California*.

Hoover, R. M., and R. H. Keith. 1996. Noise control for buildings, manufacturing plants, equipment and products. Houston, TX: Hoover & Keith, Inc.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), 2013. Personal communication via email with Michael Krause, Program Supervisor with SCAQMD. January 23, 2013.

South Coast Wildlands (SC Wildlands). 2006. *South Coast Missing Linkages Project: A Linkage Design for the Peninsular-Borrego Connection.*

USGS, 2013. Significant Earthquakes of the World. Accessed February 15, 2013: http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eqarchives/significant/sigequs.php.

ATTACHMENT 1

Wind Interconnect Service List

Name	Title	Firm/Agency	Address1	Address2	City	State	Zip
PUBLIC AGENCIES AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES							
KELLY BROUGHTON	DEPUTY DIRECTOR	THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO	1222 FIRST AVE	MS 501	SAN DIEGO	CA	92101-4155
JAMES GOLDSTENE	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	CALIFORNIA STATE AIR RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD	1001 "I" ST	P.O. BOX 2815	SACRAMENTO	CA	95814
MARK WARKLAW	DIRECTOR	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO DEPT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	5510 OVERLAND AVE		SAN DIEGO	CA	92123
DAVID PALLINGER	CHAIR	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO PLANNING COMMISSION	5510 OVERLAND AVE		SAN DIEGO	CA	92123
ROBERT KARD	DIRECTOR	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT	10124 OLD GROVE RD		SAN DIEGO	CA	92131
AMY BAKER		CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	505 VAN NESS AVE		SAN FRANCISCO	CA	94102
DOCKET OFFICE		CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	505 VAN NESS AVE		SAN FRANCISCO	CA	94102
ROBER OGLESBY	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION	1516 9TH ST	MS 39	SACRAMENTO	CA	95814
GARY CATHEY	DIVISION CHIEF	CALTRANS DIVISION OF AERONAUTICS	1120 N ST	RM 3300	SACRAMENTO	CA	95814
JOHN LAIRD	SECRETARY OF RESOURCES	CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY	1416 9TH ST	STE 1311	SACRAMENTO	CA	95814
WILLIAM TIPPETS	NCCP FIELD SUPERVISOR	CA DEPT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE	3883 RUFFIN RD		SAN DIEGO	CA	92123
RON CHAPMAN	DIRECTOR	DEPT OF PUBLIC HEALTH	1615 CAPITOL AVE		SACRAMENTO	CA	95814-5015
THOMAS HOWARD	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	CA STATE WATER RESOUORCES CONTROL BOARD	1001 I ST		SACRAMENTO	CA	95814
MARY D NICHOLS	BOARD CHAIRMAN	CA AIR RESOURCES BOARD	1001 I ST		SACRAMENTO	CA	95814
RICHARD LAND	CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR	CALTRANS	4050 TAYLOR ST		SAN DIEGO	CA	92110
DAVID W GIBSON	EXECUTIVE OFFICER	CA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD	9174 SKY PARK CT	STE 100	SAN DIEGO	CA	92123-4340
CHARLES LESTER	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	CA COASTAL COMMISSION	45 FREMONT ST	STE 2000	SAN FRANCISCO	CA	94105
MARGARET GOODRO	FIELD MGR	BLM EL CENTRO FIELD OFFICE	1661 S 4TH ST		EL CENTRO	CA	92243
WILLIAM WITHYCOMBE	ADMINISTRATOR	FAA WESTERN PACIFIC DIVISION	PO BOX 92007	WPC	LOS ANGELES	CA	90009
JIM BARTEL	FIELD SUPERVISOR	USFWS CARLSBAD FIELD OFFICE	6010 HIDDEN VALLEY RD	STE 101	CARLSBAD	CA	92011
SHANTI SANTULLI	REGULATORY PROJECT MGR	USACE SAN DIEGO FIELD OFFICE	6010 HIDDEN VALLEY RD	STE 105	CARLSBAD	CA	92011-4213
ROBERT REVO SMITH JR	REGULATORY PROJECT MGR	USACE SAN DIEGO FIELD OFFICE	6010 HIDDEN VALLEY RD	STE 105	CARLSBAD	CA	92011-4213
LEMORE LAMB	NATURAL RESOURCES OFFICER	BIA SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AGENCY	1451 RESEARCH PARK DR	STE 100	RIVERSIDE	CA	92507
RALPH GOFF	CHAIR	CAMPO KUMEYAAY NATION	36190 CHURCH RD	STE 1	CAMPO	CA	91906
JR TERRY	CHAIR	SAN DIEGO RURAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	14024 PEACEFUL VALLEY RANCH RD		JAMUL	CA	91935
DIANNE JACOB	SUPERVISOR	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO	1600 PACIFIC HWY		SAN DIEGO	CA	91901
DUNCAN HUNTER	CONGRESSMAN		1870 CORDELL CT	#206	EL CAJON	CA	92010
JOEL ANDERSON	STATE SENATOR		500 FESLER ST	STE 201	EL CAJON	CA	92020
BRIAN JONES	ASSEMBLYMAN		10152 MISSION GORGE RD		SANTEE	CA	92017
DONNA TISDALE	CHAIR	BOULEVARD COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP	PO BOX 1275		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
JACK WHITE	CHAIR	CMPO/LAKE MORENA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP	29445 YAHWEH LN		CAMPO	CA	91906
PROPERTY OWNERS							
		2300 LIVE OAK SPRINGS	875 ADA ST		CHULA VISTA	CA	91911
		BLACKBURN FAMILY TRUST	PO BOX 1277		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
RICHARD W BOHLANDER			PO BOX 2735		EL CENTRO	CA	92244
		BOULEVARD PROPERTIES PARTNERSHIP	12543 PINE CREEK RD		CERRITOS	CA	90703
		BOWEN FAMILY TRUST	PO BOX 2444		ALPINE	CA	91903
		THOMAS E CALGARO TRUST	PO BOX 1532		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
UTE E CERVANTES			576 BANTA RD		IMPERIAL	CA	92251
EVA C CLARK			4750 70TH ST		LA MESA	CA	91942
ROBERT & CYNDIA CLARK			PO BOX 1393		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
JAMES L DIMAGGIO			2071 ROSS AVE		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
JERI DOKULIL			2132 TULE JIM LN		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
CARSON W EAGLE			2039 JEWEL VALLEY RD		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
SANDRA EVANS			PO BOX 1256		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
ROBERT L FOX			2102 DEERPARK DR		SAN DIEGO	CA	92110
ROBERT L & MELE C FOX			2102 DEERPARK DR		SAN DIEGO	CA	92110
TIM FOX			2102 DEERPARK DR		SAN DIEGO	CA	92110
CANDI FREED			38292 HWY 94		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
GUADALUPE GONZALEZ			4191 MORAFGA AVE		SAN DIEGO	CA	92117
GREGORY G GROSSET			PO BOX 1501		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
SHEILA HASKETT			PO BOX 1312		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
		FRANK & SUSAN HOFSTEE FAMILY TRUST	1491 CURTIS LN		ALPINE	CA	91901
		HOME EQUITY ASSET TRUST	180 5TH ST		ST PAUL	MN	55101
GARY C HOYT			2052 FLYING CLOUD PL		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
CHRISTOPHER B HUBBARD			401 68TH ST		SAN DIEGO	CA	92114
HUFF FAMILY			PO BOX 4243		DIAMOND BAR	CA	91765
HARRY L HURD			38250 HWY 94		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
PATRICIA M & PAUL M ISHAM			PO BOX 1459		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
JOHN P & JULY L KELLY			8845 WHITEPORT LN		SAN DIEGO	CA	92119
ALICE KEYSER			1222 MERRITT DR		EL CAJON	CA	92020
SHIRLEY J & JAMES H KIN			16372 MARUFFA CIR		HUNTINGTON BEACH	CA	92649
		LAIR FAMILY TRUST	2388 VANCOUVER AVE		SAN DIEGO	CA	92104
		CHERYL J LENZ LIVING TRUST	2040 ROSS AVE		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
		LIVE OAK HOLDING LLC	PO BOX 1241		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
LOOKKO FAMILY			16372 MARUFFA CIR		HUNTINGTON BEACH	CA	92649
MIKE & LORI LUONGO			40550 EADY LN		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
		GEORGE N MATESZ FAMILY TRUST	40152 OLD HWY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
JAY M MCCOLL			9144 PARADISE PARK DR		LAKESIDE	CA	92040
JOHN JR & MARY S MCGOVERN			6811 ELMORE ST		SAN DIEGO	CA	92111
DAVID P & MARY P MOMBERG			2126 ROSS AVE		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
STEPHANIE W MONAHAN			29 CARMEL DR		NOVATO	CA	94952
CARLOS J & CLOTILDE NAVA			1404 US HWY 111		EL CENTRO	CA	92243
CHRISTOPHER A NOLAND			8445 GRAVES AVE		SANTEE	CA	92701
JAMES T OCONNOR			37753 OLD HWY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
CRISTINA G & LAURO PRIJOLES			11373 SPIT FIRE RD		SAN DIEGO	CA	92126
GLADYS L PRITCHETT			8645 SOLANA ST		SAN DIEGO	CA	92114
JOHN M ROBINSON			252 NODEN ST		EL CAJON	CA	92020
ESTHER & HUMBERTO RODRIGUEZ			40601 OLD HWY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
LINDA & FRANCIS J SACCO			2385 GRADE RD		ALPINE	CA	91901
		SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	40749 OLD HWY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
DAVID SEMPSROTT			6607 BROADWAY		SAN DIEGO	CA	92114
JAIME & ROSLAYN SERVIN			1621 A ST		BRAWLEY	CA	92227
DOLORES & ENRIQUE SOTO			2033 JEWEL VALLEY RD		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
JOHN HOWARD & SUZANNE STORM			39325 LILLIE LN		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
		TBO REALTY LLC	2246 FEDERAL AVE		LOS ANGELES	CA	90064
JOHN & LUPE VALENZUELA			268 ORANGE AVE		EL CENTRO	CA	92243
MARIA VIZZIELLI			11534 111TH AVE		SOUTH OZONE PARK	NY	11420
AMY & DEBS WEISGER			39235 HWY 94		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
PUBLIC REVIEW LOCATIONS							
		SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	426 H ST		CHULA VISTA	CA	91910
		SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	336 EUCLID AVE	STE 502	SAN DIEGO	CA	92102
		SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	104 N JOHNSON AVE		EL CAJON	CA	92020
		SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	440 BEACH ST		SAN DIEGO	CA	92101
		SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	320 W MISSION AVE		ESCONDIDO	CA	92025
		SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	2604 EL CAMINO REAL	STE B	SAN DIEGO	CA	92008
		SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	2406 PLAZA BLVD		NATIONAL CITY	CA	91950
		SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC	2405 PLAZA BLVD		NATIONAL CITY	CA	91950

ATTACHMENT 2

TL6931 Fire Hardening

ORGANIZATION	INDIVIDUAL	EMAIL	PHONE	DATE and TYPE of CONTACT	COORDINATOR / PARTICIPANTS	COMMENTS
FEDERAL						
Congressman Duncan Hunter	Joe Browning	joe.browning@mail.house.gov	619-448-5201	12/12/2012 - email	RPA	
	Michael Harrison	michael.harrison@mail.house.gov		12/12/2012 - email		
	Rick Terrazas	rick.terrazas@mail.house.gov		12/12/2012 - email		
STATE						
Senator Joel Anderson			619-596-3136		RPA	
	Joel Anderson	Senator.anderson@sen.ca.gov		12/12/2012 email		
	Eddie Sprecco	Edward.Sprecco@sen.ca.gov		12/12/2012 email		
Assemblyman Brian Jones	Brian Jones	assemblymember.jones@asm.ca.gov	619-441-2322	12/12/2012 email	RPA	
Assemblyman Brian Jones	Gail Ramer	gail.ramer@asm.ca.gov	619-441-2322	12/12/2012 - email	RPA	
LOCAL						
Supervisor Dianne Jacob	Dianne Jacob	dianne.jacob@sdcounty.ca.gov	619-531-5522	12/12/2012 - email,	RPA	
COMMUNITY PLANNING or SPONSOR GROUP						
Campo-Lake Morena CPG	Jack White	jdwhitehouse1@aol.com	619-609-8989	12/12/2012 email	RPA	
Boulevard CPG	Donna Tisdale	donnatisdale@hughes.net	619-766-4170	12/12/2012 email	RPA	
NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES						
Campo Band of the Kumeyaay Nation	Ralph Goff	rgoff@campo-nsn-.gov	619-478-9369	12/12/2012 email	RPA	
La Posta Band of Mission Indians	Gwendolyn Parada	lp13boots@aol.com	619-478-2113	12/12/2012 - email	RPA	
Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation	Leroy Elliott	libirdsinger@aol.net	619-766-4930	12/12/2012 - email	RPA	
CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE						
Alpine	Pat Cannon, CEO	pat@alpinechamber.sdcoxmail.com	619-445-2722	12/12/2012 email	RPA	
AGENCIES						
San Diego Rural Fire Protection District	J. R. Terry	rterry@sdrfire.org	619) 669-1188	12/12/2012 email	RPA	

ATTACHMENT 3

Notification List

TAXROLL_APN	OWNER_NAME_1	MAIL_HOUSE_NUMBER	MAIL_STREET_NAME	MAIL_MODE	MAIL_CITY	MAIL_STATE	MAIL_ZIPCODE
6091600800	2300 LIVE OAK SPRINGS	875	ADA	ST	CHULA VISTA	CA	919112635
6091601000	2300 LIVE OAK SPRINGS	875	ADA	ST	CHULA VISTA	CA	919112635
6091600900	2300 LIVE OAK SPRINGS	875	ADA	ST	CHULA VISTA	CA	919112635
6100621600	BLACKBURN FAMILY TRUST 07-29-03		PO BOX 1277		BOULEVARD	CA	919050377
6120400600	BOHLANDER RICHARD W		PO BOX 2735		EL CENTRO	CA	922442735
6100624000	BOULEVARD PROPERTIES PARTNERSHIP	12543	PINE CREEK	RD	CERRITOS	CA	907032046
6100620700	BOWEN FAMILY TRUST 10-02-06		PO BOX 2444		ALPINE	CA	919032444
6120920200	CALGARO THOMAS E TRUST 07-06-06		PO BOX 1532		BOULEVARD	CA	919050732
6091604600	CERVANTES UTE E	576	BANTA	RD	IMPERIAL	CA	922519708
6100621300	CLARK EVA C 02-17-95	4750	70TH	ST	LA MESA	CA	919424558
6120412400	CLARK ROBERT L & CYNDI A		PO BOX 1393		BOULEVARD	CA	919050493
6120813100	DIMAGGIO JAMES L	2071	ROSS	AVE	BOULEVARD	CA	919059695
6120921000	DOKULIL JERI	2132	TULE JIM	LN	BOULEVARD	CA	919059692
6120811100	EAGLE CARSON W	2039	JEWEL VALLEY	RD	BOULEVARD	CA	919059607
6100621400	EVANS SANDRA J		PO BOX 1256		BOULEVARD	CA	919050356
6120410100	FOX ROBERT L	2102	DEERPARK	DR	SAN DIEGO	CA	921101106
6120405300	FOX ROBERT L	2102	DEERPARK	DR	SAN DIEGO	CA	921101106
6120405500	FOX ROBERT L & MELE C	2102	DEERPARK	DR	SAN DIEGO	CA	921101106
6100624800	FOX ROBERT L & MELE C	2102	DEERPARK	DR	SAN DIEGO	CA	921101106
6100624600	FOX ROBERT L & MELE C	2102	DEERPARK	DR	SAN DIEGO	CA	921101106
6100622100	FOX ROBERT L & MELE C	2102	DEERPARK	DR	SAN DIEGO	CA	921101106
6120405900	FOX ROBERT L & MELE C	2102	DEERPARK	DR	SAN DIEGO	CA	921101106
6100624700	FOX ROBERT L & MELE C	2102	DEERPARK	DR	SAN DIEGO	CA	921101106
6120400300	FOX TIM	2102	DEERPARK	DR	SAN DIEGO	CA	921101106
6100623000	FREED CANDI L	38292	HIGHWAY 94		BOULEVARD	CA	919059531
6120814700	GONZALEZ GUADALUPE	4191	MORAGA	AVE	SAN DIEGO	CA	921174516
6100620600	GROSSET GREGORY G		PO BOX 1501		BOULEVARD	CA	919050701
6120813000	HASKETT SHEILA 2005		PO BOX 1312		BOULEVARD	CA	919050412
6120811500	HOFSTEE FRANK & SUSAN FAMILY TRUST	1491	CURTIS	LN	ALPINE	CA	919011438
6120403600	HOME EQUITY ASSET TRUST 2007-1	180	5TH	ST	SAINT PAUL	MN	551012672
6120822100	HOYT GARY C	2052	FLYING CLOUD	PL	BOULEVARD	CA	919059540
6120820400	HUBBARD CHRISTOPHER B	401	68TH	ST	SAN DIEGO	CA	921144412
6091601100	HUFF 07-25-02		PO BOX 4243		DIAMOND BAR	CA	917650243
6100623100	HURD HARRY L	38250	HIGHWAY 94		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
6091604500	ISHAM PAUL J & PATRICIA M		PO BOX 1459		BOULEVARD	CA	919050559
6120811200	KELLY JOHN P & JUDY L	8845	WHITEPORT	LN	SAN DIEGO	CA	921192135
6100620800	KEYSER ALICE	1222	MERRITT	DR	EL CAJON	CA	920206812
6100624100	KIN JAMES H & SHIRLEY J J 06-22-82	16372	MARUFFA	CIR	HUNTINGTON BEACH	CA	926492134
6120811300	LAIR FAMILY TRUST 04-11-02	2388	VANCOUVER	AVE	SAN DIEGO	CA	921045353
6120814100	LENZ CHERYL J LIVING TRUST	2040	ROSS	AVE	BOULEVARD	CA	919059695
6120812900	LENZ CHERYL J LIVING TRUST	2040	ROSS	AVE	BOULEVARD	CA	919059695
6091600700	LIVE OAK HOLDING LLC		PO BOX 1241		BOULEVARD	CA	919050341
6100623900	LOOKKO	16372	MARUFFA	CIR	HUNTINGTON BEACH	CA	926492134
6100610300	LOOKKO	16372	MARUFFA	CIR	HUNTINGTON BEACH	CA	926492134
6120920300	LUONGO MIKE JR & LORI	40550	EADY	LN	BOULEVARD	CA	919059600
6120812000	MATESZ GEORGE N FAMILY TRUST 09-19-96	40152	OLD HIGHWAY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	919059712
6120920400	MATESZ GEORGE N FAMILY TRUST 09-19-96	40152	OLD HIGHWAY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	919059712
6120811400	MATESZ GEORGE N FAMILY TRUST 09-19-96	40152	OLD HIGHWAY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	919059712
6120814500	MCCOLL JAY M	9144	PARADISE PARK	DR	LAKESIDE	CA	920403615
6120814600	MCCOLL JAY M	9144	PARADISE PARK	DR	LAKESIDE	CA	920403615
6120920900	MCGOVERN JOHN JR & MEMORY S	6811	ELMORE	ST	SAN DIEGO	CA	921117524
6120814300	MOMBERG DAVID P & MARY P	2126	ROSS	AVE	BOULEVARD	CA	919059621
6120406000	MONAHAN STEPHANIE W	28	CARMEL	DR	NOVATO	CA	949452390
6120921100	NAVA CARLOS J & CLOTILDE	1404	US HIGHWAY 111		EL CENTRO	CA	922439742
6120412300	NOLAND CHRISTOPHER A	8445	GRAVES	AVE	SANTEE	CA	920714607
6091602600	OCONNOR JAMES T	37753	OLD HIGHWAY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	919059616
6100622200	PRIJOLES LAURO C & CRISTINA G	11373	SPITFIRE	RD	SAN DIEGO	CA	921265525
6120410400	PRITCHETT GLADYS L	8265	SOLANA	ST	SAN DIEGO	CA	921143439
6120811000	ROBINSON JOHN M	252	NODEN	ST	EL CAJON	CA	920206315
6120920500	RODRIGUEZ HUMBERTO & ESTHER	40601	OLD HIGHWAY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	919059561
6120920700	RODRIGUEZ HUMBERTO & ESTHER	40901	OLD HWY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
6120920600	RODRIGUEZ HUMBERTO & ESTHER	40901	OLD HWY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	91905
6120810800	SACCO FRANCIS J & LINDA L	2385	GRADE	RD	ALPINE	CA	919013609
6120810900	SACCO FRANCIS J & LINDA L	2385	GRADE	RD	ALPINE	CA	919013609
6120921300	SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO	40749	OLD HIGHWAY 80		BOULEVARD	CA	919059718
6120921200	SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO						
6120921400	SEMPSROTT DAVID 12-19-00	6607	BROADWAY		SAN DIEGO	CA	921142610
6120412100	SERVIN JAIME & ROSALIND	1621	A	ST	BRAWLEY	CA	922272122
6120820300	SOTO ENRIQUE & DOLORES	2033	JEWEL VALLEY	RD	BOULEVARD	CA	919059607
6120814800	STORM JOHN & HOWARD-STORM SUZANNE	39325	LILLIE	LN	BOULEVARD	CA	91905
6091610200	T B O REALTY L L C	2246	FEDERAL	AVE	LOS ANGELES	CA	900641404
6100501500	T B O REALTY L L C	2246	FEDERAL	AVE	LOS ANGELES	CA	900641404
6100501600	T B O REALTY L L C	2246	FEDERAL AVE		LOS ANGELES	CA	90064
6120905800	TROY MICHAEL P		PO BOX 1347		BOULEVARD	CA	919050447
6090501600	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CAMPO INDIAN RESERVATION						
6120412200	VALENZUELA JOHN & LUPE	268	ORANGE	AVE	EL CENTRO	CA	922432712
6120820100	VIZZIELLI MARIA	11534	117TH	ST	SOUTH OZONE PARK	NY	114202329
6100621200	VORIS JOHN	1730	CLEVELAND	AVE	NATIONAL CITY	CA	919504215
6120400500	WEISIGER DEBS T & AMY C	39235	HIGHWAY 94		BOULEVARD	CA	919059655