

Attachment F
Project Cost Comparison Overhead (OH) vs. Pats Ranch Rd. Underground (UG) Alternative
Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP)

Project Element	Project Cost ⁴				
	SCE Proposed CPCN Project (10 mi. OH)			Pats Ranch Road Alternative (5.5 mi OH, 4.1 mi UG)	
	SCE Estimate	<u>YEAR 2017</u> Real Properties Adjustment ^{2,5}	<u>YEAR 2020</u> Real Properties Adjustment ^{2,5}	SCE Estimate ¹	Adjustments to UG Cost ⁶ and Contingency ⁷
Network Upgrades (NU)					
Licensing	6	6	6	8	8
Substation	16	16	16	16	16
Substation Reactive Compensation	n/a	n/a	n/a	28	28
Transmission (>200 kV) - Overhead (OH)	80	80	80	44	44
Transmission (>200 kV) - Underground (UG)	n/a	n/a	n/a	180	106
Telecom	2	2	2	2	2
Edison Carrier Solutions	1	1	1	1	1
Power System Control	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Real Properties - 5.5 mi Riverside Segment	41	41	41	41	41
Real Properties - 4.1 mi Jurupa Valley Segment	33	224	333	0	0
Environmental	14	14	14	10	10
Direct Expenditures	194	385	494	329	255
Contingency - 15% ³	28	58	74	17	38
Contingency - 35% for Reactive Comp. & UG ³	0	0	0	73	0
Total Direct Expenditures with Contingency	222	442	568	419	294

Note: 15% contingency is 379

Notes:

¹ SCE's Supplemental Response to the CPUC dated 9/18/2015

² No surcharge for SCE administration or overhead costs are included.

³ SCE uses contingency of 15% for all NU except for Reactive Compensation and UG Transmission at 35%.

⁴ Direct Costs in millions of 2015 constant dollars, excludes SCE corporate overhead and cost of financing.

⁵ Valuation Services Relative to Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Land Uses in Jurupa Valley, CA, report by Concord Group, dated 11/18/15

⁶ \$79.4 million per Proctor Engineering Report dated 10/22/15 plus 33% SCE division overhead

⁷ Adjust contingency to 15% overall due to conservative SCE assumptions of UG and reactive compensation scope.

OH = overhead; UG = underground