

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
5.3.2	Project Description	Page 3-11	<p>The PEA states that the proposed 115-kV conductor would be 954-kcmil stranded aluminum conductor and 4/0 aluminum steel-reinforced conductor would be used for grounding. At locations requiring higher tension, 954-kcmil aluminum steel-reinforced conductor would be used.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the normal and emergency ampacity for the proposed 954-kcmil conductor. Provide the size and type as well as the normal and emergency ampacity of the existing conductor used for each of the 115-kV segments that would be modified as part of the proposed project (115-kV Segments 1 through 8; see attached map). Identify the parameters used to establish the respective ampacities, such as ambient temperature, conductor temperature rise, wind speed, and loading cycle etc. If the rating of the proposed 954-kcmil conductor differs from that existing conductor used for the specified 115-kV segment, explain the reason for the differences. Describe each type of location along 115-kV subtransmission lines that typically require higher tension and, thus, would likely require 954-kcmil aluminum steel-reinforced conductor for the proposed project. 	10/05/12			See attached map showing 115-kV Segment labels
12.9.4.1	Transportation and Traffic	Data Response 12.9.4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Traffic Impact Analysis recommends a Project-Specific Improvement (restripe roadway line) at Mission Trail and Bundy Canyon Road (p. 65). Does SCE plan to propose that this Project-Specific Improvement be included as part of the proposed Alberhill System Project? Page xxxiv of the Traffic Impact Analysis states, "all the intersections analyzed in this traffic study operate at LOS E or better after the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and therefore the proposed Project does not conflict with the Riverside County Congestion Management Program". To which recommended mitigation measures and intersections does the Traffic Impact Analysis refer? Cite the source of the mitigation measures and evidence that the respective intersections now operate at LOS E or better. Clarify why the Riverside County Traffic Commission's (RCTC) Traffic Impact Assessment requirements (http://www.rctc.org/planning/congestion-management) are relevant to the Traffic Impact Analysis requested for the Alberhill System Project. The Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide is maintained by the Transportation Department of the Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency. 	10/05/12			
12.9.4.2	Transportation	Data	A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was requested that assesses	10/05/12			City of Lake Elsinore/Riverside County

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
	on and Traffic	Response 12.9.4	<p>each component of the proposed project (Request 12.9.4 letter "b") including the full extent of the proposed 115-kV subtransmission line routes. The traffic evaluation prepared focused only on staging areas (see TIA p. 1). The intersections of Scott/Bundy Canyon Road and Murrieta Road, Newport and Murrieta Road, Lake Street and Coal Avenue, and 3rd Street and Collier Avenue were not included, for example.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update the TIA to address each component of the proposed project (not just the staging areas). 2. Evaluate and discuss in the updated TIA construction impacts from reconductoring and pole removal/installation on roadways from (A) partial and (B) full roadway closures. It is the CPUC's understanding that partial or full roadway closure would be required for multiple days or weeks during construction of the proposed 115-kV segments. 3. Provide an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) analysis in the updated TIA for roadway segments that operate at LOS E or F (e.g., along Lake Street and Mission Trail) or have the potential to operate at LOS E or LOS F under worst-case conditions or due to construction of the proposed 115-kV subtransmission lines. 4. The City of Lake Elsinore Traffic Engineering Department confirmed that the County of Riverside's Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide (attached) presents the standards that the City requires for TIA's conducted for developments within the city limits. In addition, the County's Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide is still in use for projects in unincorporated Riverside County and in the cities of Wildomar and Menifee, which continue to rely on County planning documents until new ones are created specific to the cities. Confirm that the TIA provided and the updated TIA requested meet the standards described in the latest version of the County's Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide (which is posted on the City of Lake Elsinore's website). An analysis scenario for cumulative traffic impacts, for example, is required by the guidelines. It is assumed that the updated TIA's cumulative analysis will focus on construction-phase impacts. 				<p>Traffic Analysis/Study Guidelines: http://www.lake-elsinore.org/index.aspx?page=479 http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/trans/documents/pamphlets/traffic_impact_analysis.pdf</p>
14.9	Project Description, Alternatives	Ch. 2, Ch. 3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The City of Menifee (attached) submitted a letter to the CPUC that states electrical lines on Murrieta Road between Craig Avenue and Beth Drive are located underground. Discuss the feasibility of installing the proposed 115-kV subtransmission line in (a) existing 	10/05/12			Letter from City of Menifee attached

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			<p>underground conduit and (b) in new underground conduit at this location.</p> <p>2. Discuss the feasibility of spanning the roadway section along Murrieta Road between Craig Avenue and Beth Drive. Include a discussion of the size of 115-kV structures that would be required to allow for spanning.</p> <p>3. 3a. The CPUC assumes that the undergrounded lines along Murrieta Road between Craig Avenue and Beth Drive are SCE distribution lines. Confirm that the underground electrical lines are SCE's and that the local residents financed the undergrounding as specified in the letter from the City of Menifee.</p> <p>3b. If local residents funded the undergrounding of electrical lines along Murrieta Road between Craig Avenue and Beth Drive, discuss the mechanism used by local residents to provide funding. If SCE received funding for undergrounding in this location in some other way, discuss this mechanism.</p> <p>3c. Provide copies of the contract/agreement(s) that documents the arrangement for the lines to be undergrounded, and provide a list of all residential developments included in the arrangement (e.g., Calder Ranch).</p> <p>3d. Provide the dates that the undergrounding of electrical lines along Murrieta Road between Craig Avenue and Beth Drive occurred.</p>				
14.10	Biological Resources	SCE Project Update (August 2012), 2011/12 Bio Surveys	<p>1. The figure, "Proposed 500kV Project Elements Aerial Overview" dated 8/16/2012 by SCE (attached) shows that 2012 biological surveys were conducted in areas along Lake Street north of Walker Canyon Road along the access road to towers R11 and R12, and along Black Powder Road and access roads to towers R4 through R8. Provide GIS survey data for these areas.</p> <p>2. According to the figure, "Proposed 500kV Project Elements Aerial Overview" dated 8/16/2012 by SCE, the area along Hilltop Road [Hill Top Drive] between existing 500-kV towers M13-T2 and M13-T1 was not surveyed. Provide survey data for this area or explain why this area was not surveyed.</p> <p>3. The report titled, "Valley-Ivyglen Subtransmission Line Project-Phase 2 AMEC Biological Survey Methods," dated September 4, 2012 does not include a description of the</p>	10/05/12			8/16/2012 SCE Figure attached

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			<p>results for the surveys described. Provide additional details and discussion, such as the number of individuals/populations found, nesting status, and habitat quality for the following resources, which were observed during surveys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rufous-crowned sparrow (near proposed Alberhill Substation site); - San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit; - All occurrences of smooth tarplant, small-flowered microseris, Coulter's goldfields, and paniculate tarplant; - All occurrences of San Jacinto valley crownscale (federally endangered); and - Vernal pools. <p>4. The report titled, "Results of a 2011 final habitat assessment and follow-up trapping surveys for the federally endangered Stephens' kangaroo rat (<i>Dipodomys stephensi</i>) (SKR) and State Sensitive Los Angeles pocket mouse (<i>Perognathus longimembris brevinasus</i>) (LAPM)," dated August 27, 2011 (SJM Biological Consultants) describes the results of small mammal trapping along the proposed Alberhill System Project 115-kV routes and substation site. Provide GIS data for all locations where Dulzura kangaroo rat (a Western Riverside County MSHCP-protected species) were found in proximity to a component of the proposed project.</p>				
14.11	Biological Resources	SCE Project Update (August 2012), 9/7/12 Emails from SCE	<p>1. Provide GIS data that shows where 2012 survey data could not be collected because it was located on Castle & Cooke land or the land could not otherwise be accessed to complete surveys.</p> <p>2. 2a. It is the CPUC's understanding that the Western Riverside County MSHCP does not apply to certain lands owned by Castle & Cooke (e.g., Pacific Clay and certain Castle & Cooke residential developments). Clarify or revise the following statement (underlined> from the SCE 9/7/12 email.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>"Addressing Castle & Cooke Issues: It should be noted that for the purposes of the proposed Valley-Ivyglen (ALB) which overlaps in part by the proposed Alberhill project, all areas of the Project were accessible by AMEC biologists in multiple years with the exception of Castle & Cooke (C&C) properties in 2012 due to their denial of survey access. Habitat assessments and focused surveys were conducted</i></p>	10/05/12			See attached map showing 115-kV Segment labels

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			<p>on C&C lands between 2006 and 2011 (Refer to Table 1 of AMEC Bio Survey Methods). Access was later denied prior to the 2012 survey year. SCE is involved in ongoing coordination with RCA, USFWS and CDFG (the latter two collectively referred to as Wildlife Agencies) on the best approach to address this issue and review options for obtaining take authorization of federal and state listed species. Per the direction of the RCA and Wildlife Agencies, the likelihood for species to occur on C&C lands shall be assumed based on observations during surveys prior to 2012 as well as the presence of habitat (e.g., clay soils, coastal sage scrub, riparian habitats, etc.) suitable to each of the sensitive species potentially occurring within the project vicinity. <u>Options for take authorization throughout the project area, including on C&C properties, may include the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency Agreement (specific to Stephens' Kangaroo Rat), or Section 7/Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act along with the applicable State ESA equivalent process.</u></p> <p>2b. If the MSHCP does not apply to land owned by Castle & Cooke that would be traversed by components of the proposed project, specify how take for SKR and other wildlife species would be authorized for these areas.</p> <p>2c. Specify on a map or with GIS data which Castle & Cooke properties (including the APNs) would be traversed by components of the proposed project that are not subject to the MSHCP, and cite the documents that provide the exemption for each Castle & Cooke property specified.</p> <p>3. For areas where take of SKR and other species cannot be authorized through the MSHCP or SKR HCP, discuss SCE's plans and timing for completion of USFWS and/or CDFG consultation and Section 7 and/or Section 10 processes along the Valley-Ivyglen 115-kV Transmission Line section between the proposed Alberhill Substation site southeast to 3rd Street (Alberhill System Project 115-kV Segment 2).</p> <p>4. Provide GIS data that identifies the Additional Reserve</p>				

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			<p>Land that would be traversed by components of both the proposed Valley-Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line and Alberhill System Project's reconductoring of the Valley-Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line. See below for reference:</p> <p><i>“Addressing ARL: It’s also important to bring to your attention that the proposed VIG project 115 kV alignment will cross two areas of land that have been acquired as MSHCP Additional Reserve Lands (ARL) and are located within the MSHCP’s Core 1. The two areas of established ARL are both part of one large parcel of established MSHCP Additional Reserve Lands (ARL) owned by Riverside County and located within the City of Lake Elsinore boundaries. <u>The addition of an Alberhill line to the VIG line would also be located within this same ARL.</u> SCE is coordinating with the RCA and the Wildlife Agencies on the appropriate approval process to expand existing facilities on established ARL, including proposing replacement land (in Core 1) equivalent or superior in functions and values as compared to the ARL potentially impacted by the proposed project. As part of the MSHCP Participating Special Entity (PSE) process, the VIG project will provide an equivalency analysis for RCA review and Wildlife Agency concurrence that would also cover Alberhill. The equivalency analysis will compare the potential effects on the ARL to the benefits of the replacement land, including other specific mitigation/compensation for potentially lost conservation functions and values. The analysis considers specific project design features, including consideration of the siting and design guidelines and best management practices, and shall address effects on covered species and habitats, core areas, linkages, constrained linkages, MSHCP Conservation Area configuration and management, and ecotones. The replacement ratio is anticipated to be 2:1 but will ultimately be determined by RCA and the Wildlife Agencies as part of the MSHCP PSE process.</i></p> <p><i>One other area (< 1 acre) of ARL located to the east of Tower R14X (of the 500 kV alignment) may potentially be impacted during construction. This area will be restored to greatest extent possible.</i></p>				

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			<i>Should any permanent impacts to ARL result for the construction of R14X, the Alberhill project will provide an ARL equivalency analysis to be included as part of the MSHCP PSE process. As with the VIG project, RCA and the Wildlife Agencies will make equivalency findings and determine the appropriate replacement ratio as part of the MSHCP PSE process."</i>				
14.12	Project Description	SCE Project Update and Follow-Up Emails (August/Sept. 2012)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss all project modifications anticipated to be proposed by SCE for Valley-Ivyglen Project components that would be shared by components of the proposed Alberhill System Project (e.g., Alberhill System Project 115-kV Segment 2 (see attached map of 115-kV segments), Discuss the timing of submission of requests for Valley-Ivyglen Project modifications including anticipated Petitions for Modification to the CPUC. 2. Discuss SCE's current plans for next steps associated with Valley-Ivyglen Phase I and Phase II and where changes to the approved alignment of the Valley-Ivyglen 115-kV Transmission Line may be required that may also require revision to the proposed Alberhill System Project 115-kV alignments. 3. Discuss SCE's current construction schedule for the Valley-Ivyglen 115-kV Transmission Line. It is the CPUC's understanding that Phase I of the line (roughly east of State Route 74) may be proposed for start of construction by SCE prior to Phase II (roughly west of State Route 74). 	10/05/12			
14.13	Project Description	SCE Project Update (August 2012), SCE Responses 026-01 and 026-02 (08/23/12)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the phrase, "line separation outage." 2. Confirm that no additional temporary or permanent structures (e.g., snub poles) would need to be installed to complete wire snubbing activities within the Core Reserve (e.g., to ensure that the existing 500-kV towers do not topple over) when the line is cut/separated to connect to the proposed 500-kV towers). 3. 3a. Clarify the statement that SCE would be required to construct a road through the Additional Reserve Land if access to the Core Reserve is determined not to be permissible. Hill Top Drive, for example, does not traverse the Additional Reserve Land located immediately south of the Serrano-Valley 500-kV Transmission Line ROW and east of Lake Street. If Hill Top Drive were used, why would additional access to RCA Additional Reserve Land be required? 	10/05/12			8/16/2012 SCE Figure attached

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			<p>3b. Identify on a map the entire extent of the road specified by SCE that would be improved/constructed within Additional Reserve Land if access to the Core Reserve is determined not to be permissible.</p> <p>3c. Identify on a map where the proposed 500-kV towers would be located if the road on Additional Reserve Land were constructed.</p> <p>3d. Discuss the feasibility of constructing the proposed 500-kV towers farther east such that access to the Core Reserve would be avoided or minimized.</p> <p>3e. Discuss the maximum distance that the proposed 500-kV conductor could span with reference to moving the proposed 500-kV towers farther east to avoid access to towers M14-T2 and M14-T1 for construction of the proposed project.</p> <p>4. Data Response SCE-026-02 dated 08/23/2012 does not list existing 500-kV tower M13-T1 with regard to ground clipping and wire snubbing. Describe the work, if any, that would be conducted at existing 500-kV tower M13-T1?</p> <p>5. 5a. Confirm that ground clipping and wire snubbing activities would be the <u>only</u> activities that would occur at any existing 500-kV tower located within the Core Reserve.</p> <p>5b. Explain which activity, specifically, would occur at each tower location. The CPUC assumes, for example, that ground clipping would not be required at more than two 500-kV towers (one on each side of the proposed construction area near tower M13-T4). In addition, it is unclear why wire snubbing would be required at two (or three) towers on each side of the proposed construction area. Explain the rationale for wire snubbing at more than two locations.</p> <p>6. 6a. Describe each type of activity that would occur at the "Proposed Stringing Set-ups" GIS data points provided. Five different colors are used. White boxes, for example, are shown around existing 500-kV towers M14-T2, M14-T1, M13-T3, and M13-T2. No box is shown around M13-T1. Green, pink, aqua, red box colors are also provided.</p>				

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			<p>6b. Define the acronyms PST #1 and PST2 used within the Proposed Stringing Set-ups GIS dataset.</p> <p>6c. Clarify whether existing 500-kV tower M14-T1 would be accessed for ground clipping and wire snubbing activities. The GIS data provided highlights access roads to existing 500-kV towers M14-T2, M13-T3, M13-T2, and M13-T1 but not M14-T1.</p> <p>7. Identify where conductor would be removed between towers M14-T2 and M13-T1. Identify each span where existing conductor would remain in place or be reused and where new conductor would be installed.</p> <p>8. 8a. Provide documentation that confirms the RCHCA will approve access to the towers within the Core Reserve specified for grounding, wire snubbing, and any other activity as specified in the responses to CPUC data requests.</p> <p>8b. Discuss nighttime road access and all other nighttime activities that may occur within the Core Reserve with the RCHCA and provide the results of that discussion. If possible, set up a meeting that includes the RCHCA, CPUC, E & E, and SCE to discuss all nighttime activities that may occur within the Core Reserve.</p> <p>8c. Provide documentation that confirms the BLM will allow SCE to use Hilltop Road and/or other areas within BLM Core Reserve land that would be required to access the proposed work areas.</p> <p>9. 9a. Confirm that the 500-kV tower locations within or near the Core Reserve would only be accessed for wire snubbing activities for a total of two days and provide a range of hours during which the towers would be accessed and roads within the Core Reserve would be used.</p> <p>9b. Provide a range of hours (e.g., 7:00 am to 5:00 pm) during which the towers would be accessed for grounding and wire snubbing activities and roads within the Core Reserve would be used.</p> <p>9c. At what time of year (i.e., range of two or three months) does SCE anticipate that ground clipping and wire snubbing at the 500-kV tower sites located within the</p>				

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 10/05/12

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			<p>Core Reserve would occur?</p> <p>10. Discuss the feasibility of de-energizing the Serrano–Valley 500-kV line for (A) multiple days or (B) multiple weeks to reduce the frequency of roadway use within the Core Reserve to install and remove ground-clipping devices.</p> <p>11. 11a. SCE has indicated that there may be occasions when night work may be required. Under what circumstances would SCE either install or remove grounds, conduct wire snubbing, or conduct other activities at the 500-kV towers within the Core Reserve during non-daylight hours?</p> <p>11b. What additional safety requirements would be required to carry out this work during non-daylight hours?</p> <p>12. 12a. If night work within the Core Reserve, including driving on roads within the Core Reserve, is determined not to be allowable pursuant to Core Reserve SKR HCP requirements, confirm that the proposed grounding, wire snubbing activities, and any other proposed activities (see questions above, e.g., pulling sites) at the 500-kV tower sites or that require use of the roads within the Core Reserve would be feasible.</p> <p>12b. Discuss the feasibility of leaving all equipment required for ground clipping installation and removal at 500-kV towers M14-T2, M14-T1, M13-T3, M13-T2, and M13-T1 and accessing the sites by foot as ground clipping installation or removal is required.</p> <p>12c. Discuss the feasibility of leaving all equipment required for wire snubbing at 500-kV towers M14-T2, M14-T1, M13-T3, M13-T2, and M13-T1 and then leaving and returning to the site by foot.</p> <p>12d. Discuss the feasibility of using helicopters for equipment delivery for wire snubbing and ground clipping activities at the 500-kV tower sites to avoid the use of roads within the Core Reserve.</p>				