

1. *Regarding the design and engineering of proposed Segment 2, provide information to explain measures SDG&E has taken to address aesthetics of the proposed pole line such as height, spacing, alignment, color, or other attributes related to physical appearance.*

SDG&E Response:

SDG&E has specifically implemented three measures to address aesthetics of the proposed line:

- Soldiering of new 69 kV poles adjacent to existing 138 kV poles to reduce the number of new poles required for Segment 2, which in turn will lessen aesthetic impacts and blow-out concerns.
- Height of new 69 kV poles will be less than existing 138 kV poles.
- New 69 kV poles will be dulled-galvanized steel which will match the look of the majority of existing 138 kV poles.

2. *Are there any additional measures SDG&E could implement in the final design of proposed Segment 2 which could enhance it from an aesthetics standpoint?*

SDG&E Response:

One additional measure SDG&E could implement in the final design of proposed Segment 2 to enhance it aesthetically would be to have the steel poles coated green, potentially blending in with the natural surroundings.

3. *Provide information to explain the approach SDG&E would use in the event CPUC requested a feasibility analysis for undergrounding the proposed 69 kV facilities identified for Segment 2 which are proposed to be installed parallel to the existing Tie Line 13811/13825 138 kV transmission line. Provide a high-level cost estimate to construct this alternative, or a relative range to the proposed alternative.*

SDG&E Response:

In performing a feasibility analysis for the undergrounding of Segment 2, SDG&E would first need to establish an underground path along or parallel to Segment 2. It is SDG&E's best practice and standard procedure to locate underground facilities in City or County streets where there are already established roadways to mitigate potential significant impacts to natural and undisturbed lands. The path would then be studied for any major challenges such as freeway and railroad crossings, federal and restricted properties, and other potentially sensitive areas. Once the high-level alignment has been studied and re-routed as needed, subsurface studies would then be conducted to investigate potential underground utility conflicts. A high-level cost comparison of an underground route along the same alignment to the proposed route on Segment 2 would typically be 2-3 times the cost. This represents the cost difference of construction, and does not consider any additional environmental, regulatory, permitting, easements, and/or potential mitigation measures that may be required to underground Segment 2.

One finding to highlight, in a high-level review of undergrounding Segment 2, it was determined that undergrounding along roadways would amount to approximately 5 miles in length, whereas undergrounding the entire project from Substation to Substation would amount to approximately 5.68-miles in length.

4. *Provide information to explain whether it would be feasible to underground the entire route for a 5.68-mile long 69 kV tie line between San Marcos Substation and Escondido Substation. This refers to the Alternative C route that was disclosed in Section 5.3.4.2, System Alternatives, in the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (pg. 5/10). Provide a high-level cost estimate to construct this alternative, or a relative range compared to the proposed alternative.*

SDG&E Response:

It was determined that there is a feasible path between San Marcos Substation and Escondido Substation. Given the time constraint of the Data Request response, subsurface investigations have not been conducted to determine potential underground utility conflicts along the alignment. A high-level cost comparison of this 5.68-mile underground route to the proposed route would potentially be 2-3 times the cost.