STATE OF CALIFORNIA EDMUND G. BROWN, Governor

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



April 23, 2018

VIA MAIL AND EMAIL

Mr. Tim Lyons Regulatory Case Manager II San Diego Gas & Electric Company 8315 Century Park Court San Diego, CA 92123

SUBJECT: Data Request #1 for the SDG&E San Marcos to Escondido TL6975 69kV Project

**ISMND** 

Dear Mr. Lyons:

As the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) proceeds with our environmental review of San Diego Gas & Electric Company's (SDG&E)'s San Marcos to Escondido TL6975 69kV Project (proposed Project), we have identified additional information required in order to adequately conduct the CEQA review. The CPUC requests SDG&E provide the information below (Data Request #1) by May 14, 2018, but no later than May 23, 2018.

In addition to the aforementioned information, the Energy Division may request additional data, as necessary, to prepare a complete an adequate analysis of the potential environmental effects of the Project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (415) 703-1966 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Lisa Orsaba Project Manager Energy Division, CEQA Unit

cc: Lonn Maier, Supervisor
Marcelo Poirier, Legal Division
David D. Davis, AICP, ESA

Attachment:

1) Data Request No. 1

## Data Request #1 SDG&E San Marcos to Escondido TL6975 69kV Project

- 1. Please provide GIS *shapefiles* for the existing and new rights-of-way and spur roads provided in Appendix 3-A, Power Line Route Mapbook.
- 2. For the benefit of the lay reader, please define such industry-specific terms as A-frame, SF<sub>6</sub> circuit breaker, franchise, etc. To provide clearer guidance, we will send a list of such terms via e-mail.
- 3. For project background, why was the line in Segment 3 de-energized?
- 4. Please provide a pole inventory list in the geographic order from the San Marcos Substation to the Escondido Substation. The PEA Project Description also made references to poles and structures designated by number (e.g., Pole 68, Structure 86). Please include this numbering convention in the pole inventory.
- 5. Please provide more information on the dimension of the new poles. The simulated pole characteristics will need to be representative of the actual design dimensions and other pole characteristics. Information provided to date indicates a range of pole heights throughout the Project alignment. The CPUC requests the heights of each pole [in tabular form], in the same inventory that is request in Item 2.
- 6. Please confirm that micropiles will not be used for the proposed Project. If that is the case, any discussion of micropoles will be removed from the Project Description.
- 7. Please provide a clearer and more detailed Profile Elevation view of the San Marcos substation. That provided in Attachment 2A of Deficiency Response #1 is not clear. To assist, an example view is included as Attachment A. Also, for the visual analysis, the wall enclosing the substation should be shown.
- 8. Please provide the remaining photo views noted in Deficiency Response #1, Attachment 3A, that were not included in Attachment 3B. We would like a full set of photos taken at the sites shown in Attachment 3A.
- 9. Please provide CalEEMod input files to support our use of the newest version of CalEEMod 2016.3.2.
- 10. What is the estimated *width*, *depth*, and *volume* of the pole foundations and the trenches used for installation of any underground conduit? Ranges are provided in the PEA Project Description. If these are to be relied upon, the analysis will assume the worst-case condition.
- 11. What are the contents within the conductors (if any) being removed from the site, as described in Response #12 to Deficiency Letter #2?
- 12. Please provide more information on the nature of the existing equipment or materials that currently require the oil containment wall at the Escondido Substation. We understand the existing oil circuit breaker would be replaced with a gas circuit breaker. Please explain this component and the nature of the gas used.
- 13. Please confirm the potential for the use of a helicopter during construction. The PEA Project Description sometimes characterizes this use "if necessary" and yet states that a helicopter will be used for Segment 2.
- 14. If necessary, provide an estimate of the duration of helicopter use during *operation* activities.
- 15. The type and model of helicopter that will be used during construction.
- 16. Please explain the order of Project construction. We understand that the Project would be constructed in three phases, or passes, along the alignment: 1) new pole installation, 2) moving existing circuits to the new poles, 3) reconductoring/re-energizing. When in the process would substation work occur?
- 17. Are the wooden poles to be removed [chemically] treated? If so, with what?

- 18. What is the current construction phasing schedule? It appears that the project phasing presented in PEA Table 3-10 differs with that presented in PEA Table 3-12. This needs to be consistent, particularly for the efficacy of the air quality model. Please confirm this, as well.
- 19. Type and number of construction equipment that would be used during any one phase, as well as the hours of use.
- 20. Please describe the use and delivery of water during construction (e.g., dust control, port-a-potties, etc.).
- 21. Total number of haul trips per phase and their approximate one-way trip lengths.
- 22. Number of work and vendor daily trips and their approximate one-way trip lengths.
- 23. Location of historic structures near project construction areas, so that any may be considered in the vibration analysis.
- 24. How much dewatering may occur and how much discharge is it estimated to create?
- 25. Will any tree trimming or removal be required as a part of construction?
- 26. Please provide the location of the Kearny and Icon 3PL yards. We will need clearer information as to the use of these yards for this project.
- 27. Will marker balls be used on TL 6975 and, if so, where and what is the status of FAA review?

