Question 05.b:

One of SCE’s stated purposes of the proposed project is to address a thermal overload on the Serrano–Villa Park No. 2 230-kV Transmission Line caused by an N-1-1 outage of the Lewis–Serrano No. 1 230-kV Transmission Line followed by an outage of the Serrano–Villa Park No. 1 230-kV Transmission Line (“230-kV N-1-1 contingency”). However, the CPUC has insufficient power flow data to substantiate this claim.

Further, the CAISO 2013–14 Transmission Plan states that the Mesa Substation Project would address the N-1-1 scenario involving an outage of the Eco-Miguel 500-kV Transmission Line followed by an outage of the Ocotillo-Suncrest 500-kV Transmission Line, but the Transmission Plan does not state that the Mesa Substation Project would address a 230-kV N-1-1 contingency.

B. If the proposed project is meant to address the 230-kV N-1-1 contingency, provide a rationale for why the CAISO did not make a statement to this effect in the Transmission Plan.

Response to Question 05.b:

CAISO explicitly called out loading concerns of “Serrano–Villa Park #1 & #2 230 kV lines under multiple Category C (L-2) contingencies” on page 126 of their 2013-2014 Transmission Plan. CAISO also stated that the Proposed Project would “alleviate the increased overall loading on transmission facilities in the LA Metro area resulting from the retirement of SONGS and OTC generation as well as long term load growth in the LA Metro and San Diego areas” (Page 99).