

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



June 14, 2016

VIA MAIL AND EMAIL

Mr. Jack Horne
Regulatory Affairs and Compliance
Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

SUBJECT: Data Request No. 3 for the Southern California Edison Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson Subtransmission Line Project

Dear Mr. Horne:

As the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) proceeds with our environmental review for Southern California Edison (SCE)'s Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson Subtransmission Line Project (Project), we have identified additional information required in order to adequately conduct the CEQA review. Please provide the information requested below (Data Request #3) by June 27, 2016. Please submit your response in hardcopy and electronic format to me and also directly to our environmental consultant, Environmental Science Associates (ESA), at the physical and e-mail addresses noted below. If you have any questions please direct them to me as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Connie Chen", followed by a long horizontal line.

Connie Chen
CPUC CEQA Project Manager
Energy Division
505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Connie.chen@cpuc.ca.gov

ESA
Attn: Matthew Fagundes
1425 North McDowell Blvd.
Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954
mfagundes@esassoc.com

Data Request No. 3

Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson Subtransmission Line Project

Project Description

1. SCE has indicated that the Circle City Substation, an unstaffed and automated 66/12 kV low-profile 56 MVA substation, would have a potential capacity of 112 MVA at final build out. Please provide an estimate as to when (i.e., what year) it is anticipated that the Circle City Substation would be built out to a capacity of 112 MVA.
2. SCE has requested that a range of new light weight steel (LWS) poles be described in the project description because the existing LWS poles that are proposed to be utilized by the Project may not meet pole loading requirements.

Given that the poles may need to be replaced as part of the Project, the CPUC will need to analyze that scenario in the EIR, and the GIS data, which is used to make the EIR figures, should be revised to reflect this scenario. Please provide revised GIS layers consistent with this pole replacement scenario. The EIR project description will indicate that the poles would be replaced, but will acknowledge that there is a potential that certain poles could be utilized by the Project.

Also, the current GIS data suggests that 26 existing poles would be used by the Project, but the range of new LWS poles requested by SCE includes an additional 22 poles. Does this suggest that SCE is confident that the existing poles to be used by the Project at Mira Loma Substation would not need to be replaced? In addition, at least one of the existing poles currently proposed to be used by the Project is a tubular steel pole (TSP) (e.g., pole 4787858E). If that pole is replaced, would it be replaced by a TSP instead of a LWS pole?

3. The second paragraph of PEA Section 3.1.3.4 indicates that eight wood poles would be removed and the existing distribution facilities would be transferred to new subtransmission line facilities. This appears to conflict with recent input by SCE that suggests that there would only be two wood poles replaced with LWS poles associated with the Source Line Routes, please clarify.
4. PEA Section 3.1.3.1 indicates a total of 94 new LWS poles would be associated with the Source Lines, but SCE's recent input suggests that there would be 96 new LWS poles. Please clarify.
5. The first paragraph of PEA Section 3.1.3.1 indicates that the Pedley Lines would require two new wood poles; however, SCE's recent input suggests that there would be no new wood poles constructed associated with the Source Lines. Please clarify.

Biological Resources

6. The acreage identified in the text description of PEA Section 4.4.1.1 appears to conflict with the acre amounts described in PEA Table 4.4-7. Please clarify which are accurate for the wetland jurisdictional features and provide updated wetland delineation GIS data that represents the most current and accurate information if applicable.

7. Please provide copies of the following:

- USACE wetland delineation determination letter (if approved);
- 2014/2015 wet season vernal pool fairy shrimp survey report;
- Delhi sands flower-loving fly 2015 and/or 2016 survey reports (if they were conducted for those years);
- Bat habitat assessment; and
- Any other special-status survey reports conducted in 2015 or 2016 (rare plants, riparian birds, etc.).