

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



October 13, 2020

Alex Gutierrez
Senior Advisor - Infrastructure Licensing
Southern California Edison

Via email to Alex.Gutierrez@sce.com

RE: CPUC Supplemental Data Request 7 for the Southern California Edison Alberhill System Project, A.09-09-022

Dear Mr. Gutierrez,

Upon further review of Southern California Edison's supplemental data response to the additional analyses requested in Decision 18-08-026, the Energy Division requests the information contained in Attachment 1 to this letter. Responses should be submitted to the Energy Division and Ecology and Environment, Inc. in electronic format. We request that SCE respond to this data request by October 23, 2020. Inform us as soon as possible if you cannot provide specific responses by this date. Delays in responding to this data request may cause delays in the supplemental analysis review process.

Direct questions to Joyce Steingass at (415) 703-1810 or by e-mail (address below). Please copy the CPUC's consultant, Amy DiCarlantonio and Grant Young, Ecology & Environment, Inc., on all communications (ADiCarlantonio@ene.com, GYoung@ene.com). Energy Division reserves the right to request additional information at any point during the proceeding and subsequently during project construction and restoration should Application (09-09-022) be approved.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joyce Steingass".

Joyce Steingass, P.E.
CPUC Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298
Joyce.Steingass@cpuc.ca.gov

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



CC: Amy DiCarlantonio, Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.
Grant Young, Deputy Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

Attachment 1: 2020-1013_Data Request No. 07_Table

Attachment 1: 2020-1013_Data Request No. 07_Table

DG #	Resource Areas/ Topic	SCE Data Submittal Item/Page	Data Gap Question	Response
DG-MISC-60	Interim Battery Project	N/A	Why didn't SCE apply the reliability and resiliency values to their 2020 GNA/DDOR filing (Valley/Alberhill need/planned investment) that were used in the cost-effectiveness analysis submitted to the Alberhill proceeding (A.09-09-022), e.g., Flex 1 and Flex 2 values?	
DG-MISC-61	Interim Battery Project	N/A	<p>Why couldn't Flex 1, Flex 2, and/or similar SCE value assumptions be used to separate the scope and costs associated with the respective capacity, reliability, and resiliency needs to define discreet DER operating requirements and LNBAs as required by Reform 12 in the May 11, 2020 DRP Ruling?</p> <p>Reform 12: "The IOUs shall present all grid needs separately for the purpose of identifying planned investment and candidate deferral projects and applying the prioritization metrics to determine which projects to include in the DIDF RFO. For comparative purposes, the IOUs may also present prioritization results from combining grid needs for a deferral opportunity accompanied by an explanation of why the IOU believes the grid needs must be combined into a single deferral opportunity."</p>	