| **#** | **Resource Area / Topic** | **Data Request Item** | **Request Date** | **Reply Date** | **Status** | **Follow-Up Request / Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Alternatives – Construction Schedule for Alternative SE-PLR-2 Provided in Response to Data Request No. 2 | Please explain why the construction schedule for Alternative SE-PLR-2 is projected to take longer (10-12 months; refer to the response to Data Request No. 2, Exhibit 2-5a) than the Proposed Project new 70 kV power line (7 months), despite the shorter length of Alternative SE-PLR-2. | 11/13/19 |  |  | Follow up |
| 2 | Alternatives – Construction Vehicle Trip Numbers Provided in Response to Data Request No. 2 | Please explain why the number of days associated with worker and truck trips for construction of PLR-1A (Exhibit 2-8b [pg. 13] in the response to Data Request No. 2) is so much greater than the that for construction of Alternative PLR-1C (Exhibit 2-8c [pg. 14] in the response to Data Request No. 2). For example, Exhibit 2-8b shows 234 days for conductor spreading / pole installation / transfer distribution / pole removal, as well as conductor installation, for the Alternative PLR-1A reconductoring segment; whereas Exhibit 2-8c shows 96 and 72 days, respectively, for these same tasks for the Alternative PLR-1C reconductoring segment. This discrepancy does not align with the construction schedules for these two alternatives, which are identical for the reconductoring segment phase (see Exhibits 2-5b and 2-5c), and our understanding of these two alternatives, which is that the reconductoring segments are identical and the new 70 kV power line segments are quite similar. | 11/13/19 |  |  | Follow up |
| 3 | Alternatives – Impact Area Calculations | Please provide a shapefile showing temporary and permanent impacts for each of the following alternatives: SS-1, PLR-1A, PLR-1C, PLR-3, SE-1, SE-PLR-2. (This could be similar to the shapefile entitled “Project\_Area\_Impacts\_and\_Vegetation\_Removal” which was provided for the Proposed Project as part of the proponent’s environmental assessment [PEA]). The GIS data provided on alternatives to date show different types of temporary and permanent impact areas (e.g., pole work areas, crossing structure work areas, etc.); however, many of these layers overlap and it is difficult to determine the total temporary and permanent impact areas associated with each alternative.  Please also confirm which types of access road types, as identified within the GIS data, would require improvements for construction of different alternatives. The data provided pursuant to Data Request #2 showed access roads for alternatives that fell under the following categories: (1) existing footpath; (2) existing paved; (3) existing unpaved; (4) new unpaved. Please confirm which of these road types would require temporary or permanent improvements as part of alternative construction and/or operation. | 11/13/19 |  |  | New |
| 4 | DRP Data Request ED\_019-Q01-18\_Rev01 | See Questions and Answers 1 through 12. | 9/24/19 | 11/7/19 | Complete | See attached ED\_019-Q01-18\_Rev01 pdf |
| 5 | Estrella project/planned investment full, ultimate 21-kV line build out at 30 MW and 90 MW | a. How many 21-kV lines can be accommodated by the proposed 70/21-kV, 30 MW system (initial system)? The PEA notes that three 21-kV lines will *initially* be served to the proposed Estrella Substation. What is the number at the full 30 MVA capacity?  b. At full buildout, how many 21-kV lines can be accommodated if the 70/21-kV is expanded in the future to full design capacity (90 MW)? | 11/13/19 |  |  | New |
| 6 | Forecast update | Provide the latest IEPR forecast disaggregation results for solar and storage for the Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo, and Cholame DPAs. | 11/13/19 |  |  | New |
| 7 | Cholame DPA data | Refer to PG&E’s response to Deficiency Letter #5 (June 2018) for the types of data requested and received for the PR and SLO DPAs. Provide the same data for the Cholame DPA. See also the request below. | 11/13/19 |  |  | New |
| 8 | DER online dates, Deficiency Letter #5 | In Deficiency Letter #5 (June 2018), we requested the following data. Upon further review, we have determined that the responses to Item 3 were helpful but are missing DER online dates. Please provide the DER type, size and online dates for all DERs in the three DPAs. We intend to prepare a graphic that shows PV and storage adoption in each DPA over time.  ***Geospatial (entire PR and SLO DPAs and Cholame DPA):***  1.    Existing and proposed transmission lines;  2.    Existing and proposed substations;  3.    Current distribution infrastructure and lines (primaries and secondaries);  4.    Service address/location IDs or meter IDs;  5.    Known distributed generation (DG; in front of and behind the meter) with system sizing information, including in front or behind the meter position; and  6.    Bulk Power generation resources (if any) with system sizing information  ***Non-geospatial (entire PR and SLO DPAs and Cholame DPA):***  1.    Service address/location or meter ID and circuit association table for all load;  2.    Identification of any advanced metering infra-structure (AMI) opt-out locations;  3.    DG type, size, online date, and circuit association for all Distributed Energy Resources;  4.    Circuit and transformer association for all circuits;  5.    Transformer and substation association for all transformers; and  6.    Customer class and service location/meter association for all service locations/meters. | 11/13/19 |  |  | Follow up |