Southern California Edison WODUP A.13-10-020

DATA REQUEST SET A.13-10-020 WODUP ED-SCE-05

To: ENERGY DIVISION
Prepared by: Scott Lacy, P.E.
Title: Project Engineer
Dated: 05/23/2014

Ouestion ALT-5:

Alternatives

Background for ALT-5. The October 2006 Final EIR/EIS for DPV2 included an alternative for the West of Devers corridor called the "Composite Conductor Alternative," described in the Appendix 1, Alternatives Screening Report (Section 4.3.3). According to that discussion, SCE expected this alternative to have higher installed cost, higher life cycle cost, and higher transmission line losses than the Proposed Project (cited to SCE: May 25, 2005). The present analysis of potential alternatives may warrant an updated analysis of an alternative to the Proposed Project using high performance or composite reinforced conductors.

ALT-5 Please revisit Appendix 1 of the 2006 Final EIR/EIS (specifically Section 4.3.3, Composite Conductor Alternative), and provide an up-to-date discussion on whether a design with composite reinforced conductors could be used to satisfy project objectives.

Response to Question ALT-5:

The conclusions reached in Section 4.3.3 of Appendix 1 of the 2006 Final EIR/EIS for the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 (DPV2) Project remain essentially valid today. The use of ACCR conductor, particularly in California, is still quite limited over the past eight years, so not much more tangible experience with constructability, initial and on-going maintenance costs, and long-term operability issues has been gained in that time period.

Because of the hilly topography that is found across the majority of the Project, structure spotting and resultant span lengths are typically governed by available pad locations and ground clearance concerns, as opposed to trying to increase the span lengths to the greatest possible extent. In the flatter areas, while it may be possible to slightly increase the average span length through the use of an alternate conductor, the ideal structure locations are again often dictated by local landmarks such as street crossings and other fixed points such as angle points on the route alignment that would limit the opportunities for reducing the overall number of proposed structures by any significant amount.