STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EDMUND G. BROWN, *Governor*

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

July 13, 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. 4 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 #4) by July 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,

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. 4
Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson Subtransmission Line Project

Load and Power Flow Data

The following questions are focused on the load and power flow data provided to the CPUC by SCE in response to CPUC Data Request 1, Questions 1 and 2, as well as our review of PEA Chapter 1 – Purpose and Need.

1. Is the Customer Sub 2 identified in the base case/Draw file also known as the Databank Sub?

2. Referencing the fifth bullet on PEA page 1-1, what substation source load is proposed to be transferred to the Circle City Substation?

3. Referencing the first bullet on PEA page 1-2, please identify the substation source of the relocated 33 kilovolt (kV) distribution circuit. Would the distribution load be re-connected to Circle City Substation?

4. The data indicates that Circle City Substation would have 20 megawatts (MW) of load. Would this load be supported by the six 12 kV circuits, and the 33 kV circuit?

5. The post project case indicates that Chase Substation would have a load reduction of approximately 13 MW (132 MW – 119 MW). Would this be a load transfer or departed load?

6. Would the reduction in load at Jefferson and Chase substations be due to load transfers to Circle City Substation?

7. The post project case indicates that Jefferson Substation would have a load reduction of approximately 8 MW (135 MW – 127 MW). Would this be a load transfer or departed load?

8. Please provide or identify the specific contingencies, if other than those listed in PEA Table 1-2, that cause the Mira Loma-Corona-Jefferson 66 kV line to overload, as identified in PEA Section 1.4.3 and Figure 1-4.

9. For the purposes of screening alternatives, please provide the corresponding contingency files to run on the Positive Sequence Load Flow (PSLF) software (ver. 19) for the base cases provided.

10. Is the 2015 historical load data for the electrical needs area (ENA) substations available? If so please provide.

11. Please provide information on the type and operation of the generators located at Customer Subs 1 and 3 (e.g., co-gen, peaker). Are these two substations also known as Cleargen and Delgen, respectively?

12. What is the planned remedy for the overloaded 220/66 kV transformer banks at Mira Loma Substation?

13. From the base case data provided, the ENA substations (i.e., Chase, Corona, and Jefferson) indicate 436.8 MVA load in the post project case and 456.2 MWA in the pre-project case. The post project case seems to indicate the Max Operation Limit of these three substations would still be exceeded. It is presumed these values are the 1 in 10 or peak demand-criteria projected. Please verify.

Project Description

14. The last sentence of the second paragraph on PEA page 3-18 states that all 66 kV subtransmission line structures would be designed consistent with the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC)'s Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines: the State of the Art in 2006. However, the APLIC's suggested practices for raptor protection on power lines was last updated in 2012. Please confirm that the proposed structures would be designed consistent with the APLIC's most recent suggested practices (i.e., 2012).