

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



January 20, 2021

Alex Gutierrez
Senior Advisor - Infrastructure Licensing
Southern California Edison

Via email to Alex.Gutierrez@sce.com

RE: CPUC Supplemental Data Request 8 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 February 3, 2021. 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 black ink, 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: 2021-0120_Data Request No. 08_Table

Attachment 1: 2021-0120_Data Request No. 08_Table

DG #	Resource Areas/ Topic	SCE Data Submittal Item/Page	Data Gap Question	Response
DG-MISC-62	Planning Study	Data Request Item C – Planning Study ED-Alberhill-SCE-JWS-4: Item C/pg 46	<p>Please provide a GIS package (geodatabase or shapefiles) of the GIS data shown on Insignia's GIS Map Viewer: "Alberhill System Project Map Viewer Summary."</p> <p>Please provide all files associated with each of the viewer tabs listed below:</p> <p>TAB 1: PROJECT VICINITY Existing Substation Existing Transmission/Subtransmission Line Electric Needs Area</p> <p>TAB 6: SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES (be sure to include all components/metadata/and attribute data associated with each alternative) SDG&E SCE Orange County Menifee Mira Loma Valley South to Valley North Valley South to Valley North to Vista Centralized Bess in Valley South Valley South to Valley North and Distributed Bess in Valley South SDG&E and Centralized Bess in Valley South Mira Loma and Centralized Bess in Valley South Valley South to Valley North and Centralized Bess in Valley South and Valley North Valley South to Valley North to Vista and Centralized Bess in Valley South</p> <p>Additionally, please provide the GIS data for existing substations and existing transmission and subtransmission lines. Please ensure that appropriate metadata and attribute data is included within each feature resulting from this request.</p>	
DG-MISC-63	AMI Data	N/A	Please provide SCE associated customer load and system AMI/meter locational data (all geospatial information and service address ID in .csv/.xlsx file similar to DG-MISC-35) for 10/01/2019-12/31/2020.	
DG-MISC-64	SCADA Data	N/A	Please provide available geographic location of SCADA data for each transformer bank and feeder for 10/01/2019-12/31/2020.	
DG-MISC-65	DER proposed alternative	N/A	Did SCE consider the implications of more load being transferred from the Valley South to the Valley North if more storage was interconnected in the Valley North system? Please explain why or why not.	
DG-MISC-57_FollowUp	CEC Forecast Data	Response to DG-MISC-57	From the response to DG-MISC-57, it sounds like a CEC forecast was not shared with Quanta, only the SCE forecast. Is that correct?	

Attachment 1: 2021-0120_Data Request No. 08_Table

DG #	Resource Areas/ Topic	SCE Data Submittal Item/Page	Data Gap Question	Response
DG-MISC-58_FollowUp		Response to DG-MISC-58	Two clarification questions pertaining to the response to DG-MISC-58: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PSLF determines magnitude of overload. How was the time duration of the overloads determined? 2. Only PSLF models were provided. Are the base cases that were provided to Quanta not available? 	
DG-MISC-61_FollowUp		Response to DG-MISC-61	Please describe why DERs cannot meet the reliability and resiliency needs of the Alberhill System Project independent of the specific capabilities of the proposed tie-lines. Flex 1 and Flex 2 would still appear to have an LNBA value, independent of any deferral component. It appears that SCE is suggesting that deferral value is the only value that should be considered as part of LNBA. Is this the case?	