

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



September 1, 2015

VIA MAIL AND EMAIL

Christine McLeod
Principal Advisor - Regulatory Affairs Dept.
Southern California Edison
8631 Rush Street, General Office 4 - G10Q (Ground Floor)
Rosemead, CA 91770

SUBJECT: Data Request #7 for the Southern California Edison Moorpark-Newbury 66 kV
Subtransmission Line Project

Dear Ms. McLeod:

As the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) proceeds with our environmental review for Southern California Edison (SCE)'s Moorpark-Newbury 66 kV Subtransmission Line Project (Proposed Project), we have identified additional information required in order to adequately conduct the CEQA review. Please provide the information requested below (Data Request #7) by September 8, 2015. Please submit your response in hardcopy and electronic format to me and also directly to our environmental consultant, Environmental Science Associates (ESA), at the physical and e-mail addresses noted below. If you have any questions please direct them to me as soon as possible.

If SCE believes any of the responses constitute Critical Infrastructure Information warranting confidentiality, please indicate clearly in the transmission and within the response.

Sincerely,

Michael Rosauer
CPUC CEQA Project Manager
Energy Division
505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Michael.rosauer@cpuc.ca.gov

ESA
Attn: Matthew Fagundes
1425 North McDowell Blvd.
Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954
mfagundes@esassoc.com

Data Request #7

Moorpark-Newbury 66 kV Subtransmission Line Project

1. In its comments on the Draft EIR dated July 27, 2015, SCE indicates that need for the Proposed Project has been confirmed using its recently approved 10-year planning forecast data for 2015 - 2024. Please provide the associated power flow studies for the existing base case as well as for the N-1 abnormal system condition.
2. Please also provide the 2015 - 2024 power flow studies for the base case as well as for the N-1 abnormal system condition under the following Draft EIR alternative scenarios: Alternative 1, Reconductoring; Alternative 4, Reconnect the Camgen Generator to the Moorpark System; and the combination of Alternatives 1 and 4, Reconductoring plus Camgen Reconnection. For each power flow study, indicate the first year when a voltage violation is projected and first year when a line overload is projected.
3. Confirm whether or not the power flow studies conducted by SCE for the reconductoring alternative as described in SCE responses to CPUC Data Request 4 assume that a portion of the reconductoring would be with 954 SAC conductor. If so, describe why 954 ASCR conductor would not be exclusively used for reconductoring given that it has a higher standard rating than 954 SAC.
4. Provide a detailed accounting of how projected growth in demand was estimated for the 2015 – 2024 forecast and discuss how and why projected growth in demand compares to SCE’s recent previous 10-year forecasts. Identify the projected growth in demand for each year of the 10-year forecast. Describe the process of how new and upcoming local demand side management programs and distributed energy generation projects, as well as recent CPUC decisions (such as approval of Time-of-use rates), are accounted for in the growth factors used in the 2015 – 2024 forecast.
5. Confirm that the 2015 – 2024 forecast data and power flow studies requested above use “Likely Case” forecast data, as opposed to the “High Case” data used in the 2013 – 2022 and earlier forecasts.