

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



February 23, 2012

VIA MAIL AND EMAIL

Christine McLeod
Project Manager - Regulatory Affairs
Regulatory Policy & Affairs Dept.
Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, Quad 3D, 388L
Rosemead, CA 91770

SUBJECT: Data Request #7 for Presidential Substation Project

Dear Ms. McLeod:

As the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) proceeds with our environmental review for Southern California Edison (SCE)'s Presidential Substation Project, we have identified additional information required in order to complete the Final EIR for the Proposed Project. Please provide the information requested on the page attached to this letter by March 9, 2012. 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,

Juralynne Mosley
CPUC CEQA Project Manager
Energy Division

Phone: (415) 703-2210
JBM@cpuc.ca.gov

ESA
Attn: Michael Manka
1425 North McDowell Blvd.
Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954
mmanka@esassoc.com

Data Request #7 Presidential Substation Project

Response to Comments and Final EIR

The following comments from SCE provided in their table submitted to the CPUC on December 9, 2011, require clarification in order to be incorporated into the FEIR. The comment numbers relate to comments from the SCE table:

1. Comment 1: Pertaining to site acreage. Our understanding is that the Proposed Presidential Substation Site would require SCE to purchase a 5.4 acre parcel. However, the maximum footprint of disturbance would be 4 acres (hence the consistent use of “4-acre site”). This is consistent with the application and construction drawings. Provide either confirmation of this assumption, or additional detail to support disturbance of an area greater than 4 acres.
2. Comment 65: Based on conceptual engineering referenced in comment, please provide a map showing where overhead facilities are expected to occur on both sides of the roadway.
3. Comment 67 (and several others): In regards to Alternative Alignment 3. Please perform and provide the results of a wind loading study for installing a telecommunications line on the existing distribution poles from the intersection of Sunset Valley Road and Read Road east to the Proposed Presidential Substation. If the results of the wind loading study determine that under Alternative Alignment 3, it would be necessary to replace existing 16 kV distribution poles between Sunset Valley Road and the Proposed Substation in order to support the installation of a telecommunications line please provide the following:
 - a. In a latter comment (Comment 182), SCE stated that the telecommunications line would not be installed in the duct bank. Please explain whether this is an engineering constraint or not.
 - b. Describe the types of poles to be installed, including estimated heights.
 - c. Describe the required access road widening and retaining wall construction anticipated.
4. Comment 70 (and several others): Alternative Subtransmission Alignment #3 – Explain the conditions under which the Hilfiker wall widening of access roads would be required and what specific construction components it pertains to, specifically is it associated with undergrounding, or installation of poles. It was previously explained that the access road widening and installation of the Hilfiker wall was associated with the installation of new subtransmission poles and not necessarily associated with the undergrounding activities. For Alternative Alignment 3 Specifically:
 - a. If the existing 16 kV poles did not need to be replaced, would the access road need to be widened? If yes, describe and explain why.
 - b. If the existing 16 kV poles did not need to be replaced, would the Hilfiker wall be required? If yes explain why.
5. Comment 71: SCE comments stating that undergrounding the 66 kV line east of Hwy 23 could be infeasible contradicts with information provided in Data Response #6 (1/6/2011). Response #6 provided details on undergrounding this section. Please describe the engineering constraints associated with radius requirements, topography, and existing water pipeline associated with this alignment for a 66 kV installation compared to a 16 kV installation.

6. Comment 122: Please explain why the Hilfiker wall and widening of the access roads will still be required.
7. Comment 182: Please explain why the telecommunications line could not be installed in the duct bank and would require installation on the distribution poles along this specific route.
8. Comment 328: Please clarify if the suggested revision is for the Proposed Project of an Alternative. If it's for an Alternative, we would need additional information on this Alternative to evaluate it. If so, please provide additional information to support the Alternative.
9. Comment 329: The number of estimated truckloads contradicts the truck capacity indicated in SCE's response to Data Response #3, Question 32 which calculated 7.3 CY per truck. Please explain the change, and describe the truck type used for the revised estimate.