SDG&E TL 6975 San Marcos to Escondido Project (A.17-11-010)
Energy Division Data Request #12 - October 17, 2019
SDG&E Response #12 - October 24, 2019

Q1) Provide information to explain whether it would be feasible to co-locate the proposed 69 kV line on the existing tubular steel poles carrying the existing 138kV transmission lines in Segment 2.

SDG&E Response:

It is not feasible to co-locate the proposed 69kV line on the existing 138kV transmission pole lines in Segment 2 as the 138kV pole line is already housing two-138kV transmission lines and considered built out by SDG&E standards.

Q2) Provide information to explain what SDG&E could do to design and engineer the proposed 69kV line as an underbuilt line to avoid the second parallel installation of facilities in Segment 2.

SDG&E Response:

Current SDG&E Transmission standards and specifications for engineering and construction do not allow for the installation of more than two transmission circuits on a pole. In doing so, this would create a reliability risk with a single point of failure for multiple transmission sources and would also create substantial operational limitations in the event of any construction or maintenance activities along the pole line, as an outage would be required on all three lines concurrently to perform work on any of the individual lines.

Q3) Were other design options considered to install the 69kV line in Segment 2? If so, please identify them and provide an explanation as to why the options were not selected for this project.

SDG&E Response:

Alternate design options were not considered specifically for Segment 2. However, SDG&E did consider an option to underground the new line from the San Marcos Substation to the Escondido Substation, an approximately 5.7-mile route that would completely avoid Segment 2. This underground option was ultimately not selected due to the substantial cost increase compared to the Proposed Project (see responses to Data Requests #1 and 2 from Robert H Pack related to Alternative C).

Q4) When is the estimated in-service date for the proposed project?

Q5) Why was this estimated in-service date selected for the proposed project?

SDG&E Response Q4/5:

The estimated in-service date (ISD) was based on two factors, reliability and market congestion. The reliability need was identified using a 2018 base case. As such, an ISD of 2018 was required. But, the CAISO recommended moving the ISD to 2015 to remove market congestion. The current planned ISD is 2021. Note below this congestion was identified by CAISO in 2014:

The ISO identified the TL684 Escondido-San Marcos 69 kV line overloaded for the Category C contingency of Escondido-Talega and Encina-Encina Tap- Palomar 230 kV lines based on the supplemental Post-SONGS base case starting from the 2018 base case. In the history of the ISO day-ahead market, high post-contingency flows on TL684 were identified eleven times since June 2012, which resulted in generation re-dispatched to reduce northbound flow to the LA Basin area or the opening of TL684 to make about 80~100 MW customer loads at San Marcos substation left on a radial feed supplied by a single 69 kV source. SDG&E proposed to energize an abandoned 138 kV line and make it 2nd 69 kV line between Escondido and San Marcos. The ISO also verified that the project will be effective to eliminate the overload and the day-ahead market issue after the Southern California Bulk System mitigation plan is in service. The ISO recommends creating this second 69 kV line no later than June 2018 as a reliability project. The project in-service date can be pushed forward to June 2015 to eliminate the day-ahead market congestion issue for economic and operation benefit (CAISO 2013-2014 Transmission Plan July 16, 2014; http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Board-Approved2013-2014TransmissionPlan_July162014.pdf)