DOCKET
11-AFC-1
DATE Dec. 01 2011
RECD. Dec. 09 2011

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
REPORT OF CONVERSATION Page 1 of 2

Energy Facilities Siting and ***Environmental Protection Division***		**FILE:** 11-AFC-01
	Project Title: Pio Pico Energy Center (PPEC) Project	
☒ **Email:**	☐ **Meeting Location:**	
NAMES: Sarah Allred, Energy Commission Cultural Resource Staff	**Date** 12-1-2011	**Time** 12:18 PM
WITH: Maggie Fitzgerald, PPEC Project Manager		
SUBJECT: Energy Commission Cultural Resources Staff's questions regarding the applicant's submittal of "*Applicant's Additional Responses to Staff's Informal Data Requests Regarding Biological Resources*," docketed November 28, 2011 (tn 62998).		

On November 28, 2011, the project applicant, PPEC, LLC, submitted to the Energy Commission Docket Unit, the "*Applicant's Additional Responses to Staff's Informal Data Requests Regarding Biological Resources*" (tn 62998), in response to requests from Energy Commission Biological and Cultural Resources staff, regarding Transmission Line Alternative Route B.

In response to the above-referenced submittal by the applicant, Energy Commission Cultural Resources staff, Sarah Allred, provided the following additional questions to the applicant's Project Manager, Ms. Maggie Fitzgerald, in an email (with a cc to Dave Jenkins, Eric Solorio, Ann Crisp, and Rachael Nixon), dated, December 1, 2011.

Hi Maggie,

Thank you for your phone call yesterday. Here are my questions. We can set up a meeting, if necessary, after you all have had a chance to review my questions.

1. The text of your submittal refers to a "right-of-way," in which both construction and maintenance activities would occur; however, the proposed rights-of-way for the transmission line alternatives are not depicted on Exhibit A. Please provide a revised Exhibit A depicting the extent of the proposed right-of-way on either side of the T-line centerline (for Route B in particular). Also, please provide a text description of the precise widths of the right-of-way along either side of the T-line centerline. Will the right-of-way be equal on either side of the Route B T-line? Will the right-of-way be reduced (narrower) in the area of the easements? Also, will the existing landscape vegetation be permanently or temporarily removed to accommodate an access road?

2. The text of your submittal indicates that the wire-stringing activities will require vehicular and foot access throughout the length of the right-of-way in order to install the conductors from end to end <u>and</u> that the pulling equipment set-up sites require an average area of approximately 100 x 200 feet. The preliminary wire setup areas are described as being within the "Working Areas" depicted on Exhibit A. These Working Areas on Exhibit A appear to be smaller than the required 100 x 200 feet in some cases, and they appear to straddle the perimeter wall that surrounds the Calpine Energy plant, thereby reducing the area available to work due to the wall partitioning the work area. Please describe how it is feasible to perform the wire stringing activities (and any other construction activities) within a working area that is smaller than the 100' x 200' working area that was said to be required for the pulling equipment set-up and wire stringing activities *without imposing upon the easement areas.*

3. The submittal depicts a change in the originally proposed Transmission Line Route B. Instead of a right angle, the proposed Route B now cuts the corner and hugs the perimeter of the Calpine plant. Please indicate whether or not this area was included in the original cultural resources survey area. If it has not been surveyed, a supplemental pedestrian cultural survey would need to be performed. It may be necessary to inquire with the other technical specialists regarding this change in the T-line Route B alternative.

4. The submittal indicates that the construction, operation, and maintenance for Route B would require access "from De la Fuente Court and from within the Otay Mesa Generating Project (OMGP) parcel." It appears that the OMGP parcel includes a good portion of the easement areas (i.e., the southeast corner of the parcel), if I am reading the parcel lines correctly on your Exhibit A. If that is the case, the description of access "from within the OMGP parcel" is too vague. Please describe exact points and routes of access and depict them on the map to ensure that avoidance of the easement areas is feasible.

5. The fire buffer easement is recorded is favor of the County of San Diego; does the consultant for the SDCRFD have the authority to approve encroachment on the easement? Please provide approval to install line and poles within the fire easement from the appropriate County of San Diego authority.

Please let me know if you would still like to meet to discuss this email, and we can set up a teleconference in the near future.

Thank you,
Sarah

Energy Commission Cultural Resources staff received a response on December 6, 2011, from the applicant, Ms. Fitzgerald, stating the following:

Hi Sarah,
We are currently working on compiling the information you requested and expect to have the response ready shortly after we have a chance to review the PSA. Please let me know if you have any questions and we look forward to reviewing the PSA.
Maggie

cc: E.Knight; S.Strattan; M.McGuirt; E.Solorio	**Date:** 12/9/11	**Signed:**
		Name: Sarah Allred