

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

March 27, 2007

Mr. Kevin O'Beirne
San Diego Gas & Electric Company
8830 Century Park Court – CP32D
San Diego, CA. 92123**Re: Data Request #9 for the SDG&E Sunrise Powerlink Transmission Project,
Application No. 06-08-010**

Dear Mr. O'Beirne:

The California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) Energy Division has reviewed the documents and materials that SDG&E has provided including the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (dated August 4, 2006), the Application Supplement Materials (dated September 1, 2006), and SDG&E's Response to Data Requests No. 1 through 8. During the analysis of the aforementioned materials and in our preparation of EIR/EIS sections, we have identified additional items that require information from SDG&E. Additional data requests may be necessary to address alternatives and other CEQA/NEPA topics. This letter constitutes Data Request No. 9.

We would appreciate your prompt response to this request, which will allow us to maintain our current EIR/EIS schedule. We request that the response to this request be provided to us by the following dates:

- ALT-76 (tower locations) - April 13, 2007
- ALT-77 (tower locations) – April 18, 2007
- ALT-77 (substations), ALT-78 (access roads), ALT-79 (500 kV underground) – April 20, 2007
- ALT-80 (EMF) and ALT-81 (Coastal Upgrades) – April 24, 2007

Please submit one set of responses to me and one to Susan Lee at Aspen in San Francisco, in both hard copy and electronic format. Any questions on this data request should be directed to me at (415) 703-2068.

Sincerely,

Billie C. Blanchard, AICP, PURA V
Project Manager for Sunrise Powerlink Project
Energy Division, CEQA Unit

Attachment

cc: Sean Gallagher, CPUC Energy Division Director
Ken Lewis, CPUC Program Manager
Steve Weissman, ALJ
Traci Bone, Advisor to Commissioner Grueneich

Nicholas Sher/Jason Reiger, CPUC Legal Division
Lynda Kastoll, BLM
Susan Lee, Aspen Environmental Group

Sunrise Powerlink Transmission Line Project

Data Request No. 9

- ALT-76 Please provide preliminary engineering (tower location) for the following new alternatives, as defined in the March 16, 2007 Notice and in GIS shapefiles to be provided separately to Arcadis.
- **FTHL Eastern Alternative**
 - **SDG&E West of Dunaway Alternative**
 - **SDG&E West Main Canal – Huff Road Modification Alternative**
 - **Overhead 500 kV ABDSP Within Existing 100 Foot ROW** – please explain SDG&E’s conception of the option east of Tamarisk Grove. Would we just assume that the Proposed Project engineering applies to this segment? Please explain any differences in tower design, ROW width, etc.
 - **Santa Ysabel Partial Underground Alternative**
 - **SDG&E Mesa Grande Alternative**
 - **San Vicente Road Transition Alternative.** Note that this alternative does not modify the route of the proposed project, but moves the transition tower a little further west. Please describe whether the tower or access road information would change in this area.
 - **Chuck Wagon Road Alternative**
 - **Interstate 8 Alternative, West Buckman Springs Option**
- ALT-77 Please review the preliminary engineering prepared for the following alternatives, which have been revised based on public or team input as shown in the GIS shapefiles that will be provided to you (please note that future consultation with Cleveland National Forest and the Campo Tribe may result in additional modification to portions of these routes):
- **Route D Alternative**
 - **Interstate 8 Alternative**
 - **BCD Alternative**
- ALT-78 We have identified four substation sites that will be evaluated in the EIR/EIS (listed below). The location of the substations are shown on the GIS shapefiles that will be provided to you. For each substation site, please provide preliminary grading required, location and improvements required for access roads, and locations of the transmission lines that would enter and exit the substation.
- **San Felipe Substation.** The location of this substation is the same as in the response to Data Request ALT-19. This site would be used with the Partial Underground Alternative through ABDSP.

- **Central South Substation Alternative.** Note that this location has been moved several miles south since SDG&E identified the substation site.
- **Top of the World Substation Alternative** (on Vista Irrigation District land). Our visual specialist requests that the 500 and 230 kV lines enter and exit the substation from the north, rather than from the east. Please take this into account in the engineering.
- **Interstate 8 Substation** (southeast of Descanso)

ALT-78 For all transmission line routing alternatives, please provide preliminary definition of access roads and other areas of impact (pull sites, staging areas).

ALT-79 **Interstate 8 Alternative, Buckman Springs Underground Option.** Please provide preliminary engineering for a one-mile underground segment east of the Buckman Springs rest area, with the goal of avoiding conflicts with the Horse Canyon hang gliding and paragliding site (see the description below). We believe that use of solid dielectric cable would be most appropriate for consideration, but request SDG&E's input on design options. Please also present a proposed design for the transition stations and underground cable configuration (separation of phases, width of trenches/disturbed areas).

In a scoping comment (dated February 6, 2007), Tad Hurst, Director of the United States Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association and the San Diego Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association, described the location of the Horse Canyon flying site as follows:

“Horse Canyon: Horse is near the intersection of I-8 and Buckman Springs Road. The launch is on the ridge to the NE of the intersection, and the two landing zones are on opposite corners of the intersection. On the SE corner, in the USFS land is the primary paragliding (PG) landing zone (LZ). On the NW corner, in land owned by a private farmer (Mr. Anderson), is the primary Hang Gliding (HG) LZ. Both of these LZs are vital to the site. The HG LZ is much larger, but further away from the ridge. HG pilots prefer this LZ because of its size. The PG LZ is smaller and slightly closer. It does not require crossing the freeway. It is preferred by PG pilots because paragliders are slower than Hang gliders, and cannot always make the longer trek to the HG LZ. Paragliders can more easily land in smaller places. Pilots often land in other mini-cross country spots, including the crossing point of I-8 and la Posta road, and at Crestwood road and I-8, both to the south-east of the site. 'These two landing areas would also be affected by the i-8 and related alternatives.’”

ALT-80 **EMF Information for Alternatives.** In order for the EIR/EIS to present comparable information on magnetic fields for the alternatives, we need to know the following information for the the 500 kV transmission line, as well as the 230 kV circuits west of the alternative substations. For each circuit modeled, provide the input parameters outlined below which were used in preparing EMF analysis/data for the Project -

1. Line voltage
2. Line current /power flow
3. Conductor Geometry

- i. Subconductor bundle spacing
- ii. Each phase position, both vertical distance above ground and horizontal spacing
- iii. Where parallel circuits were analyzed provide the relative location of the phases for each line.

If the SCE-Fields program was utilized for the analysis, providing a copy of the input files would meet the above request.

ALT-81

In a December 7, 2006 “Request to CAISO to Study Alternative Transmission Upgrades” the Rancho Penasquitos Concerned Citizens identified three basic upgrades that are being evaluated for environmental impacts as “Coastal Link System Upgrades.” We understand that the original concepts of these three upgrades were established in the 2004 Southwest Transmission Expansion Plan report, and these upgrades have not been rejected as a result of recent work by CAISO. In order to analyze the environmental effects of these alternatives, additional detail is needed from SDG&E especially on potential construction activities. In the 12/7/06 filing, RPCC defines the three alternatives to the Coastal Link as follows:

- (1) Place reactors in series with the three overloaded transformers (two 230/69 kV and one 230/138 kV transformer) at Sycamore Canyon substation, and add a 230/69 kV transformer at Miguel substation; or
- (2) Add a 230/138 kV transformer and a 230/69 kV3 transformer at Sycamore Canyon substation, and add a 230/69 kV transformer at Miguel substation; or
- (3) Loop in one or both of the Mission - Miguel 230 kV lines into the Sycamore Canyon substation, and add a 230/69 kV transformer at Miguel substation.

Please provide maps and descriptions of the components that SDG&E would need to build and operate in order to implement each of these three alternatives. Please include the number and locations of any new towers, if necessary. Specifically describe and provide figures of the before and after tower configurations in any corridor that would be affected by these alternatives, including the existing Miguel-Mission corridor or the Miguel-Sycamore Canyon corridor.