February 6, 2009

Susan Nelson, Project Manager
Southern California Edison Company
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770

SUBJECT: Data Request No. 6 for the San Joaquin Cross Valley Loop Project (A.08-05-039)

Dear Ms. Nelson:

As the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) proceeds with our review of Southern California Edison (SCE)’s Application and Proponent’s Environmental Assessment (PEA) for the San Joaquin Cross Valley Loop Project, we have identified additional information required to complete our analysis of the Proposed Project and a reasonable range of project alternatives. Please review the attached PDF that shows the general alignment of Alternative 6 that has been developed by the EIR team. Based on this PDF and the corresponding GIS shape files delivered to you electronically on January 30, 2009, please provide the information requested in items 1 and 2 on the attachment to this letter. This letter is provided to document verbal requests for this information on our January 8 and January 15, 2009 project status conference calls.

Understanding that items 1 and 2 of this data request require the generation of new information, we would appreciate your response to items 1 and 2 by February 27, 2009. However, as items 3 through 6 do not require generation of new data, we would appreciate your prompt response on those items on or before February 20, 2009, which will help us maintain our schedule for analysis and processing of this application.

Please submit your response in hardcopy and electronic format to me and also directly to our environmental consultant, ESA, at the mail and e-mail addresses noted below. If you have any questions please direct them to me as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Jensen Uchida
CPUC CEQA Project Manager
Energy Division
Phone: (415) 703-5484
JMU@cpuc.ca.gov

Environmental Science Associates
Attn: Doug Cover
1425 N. McDowell Blvd., Suite 105
Petaluma, CA 94954
dcover@esassoc.com
Questions and Requests:

1. Please provide GIS shape files differentiating the crop type (e.g., row crop, citrus, walnut/almond, etc.) within the alignment of Alternative 6.

2. Please provide construction schedules and workforce requirements for Alternatives 2, 3 and 6. Recognizing that detailed engineering has not been conducted by SCE on Alternative 6, it is understood that the level of detail for this construction schedule may not be the same as was included in the SCE Application and PEA for the Proposed Project. List any assumptions (i.e., crew size, numbers of crews, work hours, etc.), caveats, or other uncertainties as may be appropriate to explain the construction schedules for Alternatives 2, 3, and 6.

3. For the Big Creek 3, Springville and Vestal Substations, please describe any earth disturbing activities would occur on site as part of the Proposed Project, or confirm that none would occur.

4. For the Big Creek 3, Springville and Vestal Substations provide the dates of initial construction and dates of any substantial modifications. Provide a summary description of the substantial modifications, if any.


6. Please clarify inconsistencies in the crop data submitted to ESA electronically on 01/27/09. For the polygon within the existing ROW near where Alternative 1 begins to traverse east, the data for Alternative 2 delineates walnuts in the eastern half of the ROW, while Alternative 3 data delineates walnuts in the entire ROW, please revise. Additionally, the walnuts mapped just north of the 2 mile marker for Alternative 2 were not included in the Alternative 3 data, please revise.
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