

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



November 8, 2024

Ms. Lori Charpentier
Licensing/Regulatory Affairs
Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Ave.
Rosemead, CA 91770

Re: Data Request #18 for the SCE Ivanpah-Control (I-C) Project (A.19-07-015)

Dear Ms. Charpentier:

Southern California Edison Company (SCE) submitted its Amended Permit to Construct (PTC) application and Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) on April 13, 2020. The PTC application was deemed complete on May 31, 2023. This data request defines additional information required for completion of the Draft EIR that we are preparing.

18-1: Alternatives Data

We understand that preliminary structure locations and other construction disturbance areas have been defined for the three Segment 1 alternatives. Please provide GIS data for these areas.

18-2: Conductor Type

In SCE's comments on the EIR Project Description (late 2023), SCE removed reference to ACCC conductor and stated that conductor type had not yet been determined. However, the Amended PTC Application (October 31, 2024) states the following (page 8):

- Removing existing conductor and installing new Aluminum Conductor Composite Core ("ACCC") 'Dove' conductor on replacement and existing structures.

Based on discussion in the November 7, 2024 project meeting, we believe it is accurate to state in the EIR that the conductor type will be either ACCC or ACSR for Segments 1 and 2, and that it will be ACCC for Segments 3N and 3S. Please confirm.

18-3: Missing Material Yards

The GIS data provided to us includes 52 material yards, but 54 yards are listed in PEA Table 3.7-1. The two yards missing from the GIS data are 1-11 and 1-19. Please let us know whether those two yards should still be considered in the analysis, and if so, please provide the GIS data.

18-4: Segment 1 Material Yard Locations

PEA Table 3.7-1 (Potential Material Yards) and Figureset 3.7-1 show potential locations for material yards. On Figureset 3.7-1 page 2 of 8 (see last page of this letter), yards defined as 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, and 1-7 are mostly located immediately adjacent to US 395 in the segment where the highway is designated as a Scenic Highway.

- a. Please confirm whether these four yards are still being considered by SCE for potential use during construction.
- b. Please estimate the maximum length of time that the material yards in this area of Segment 1 may be required, considering the construction schedule requiring both construction of the new subtransmission line and the subsequent removal of the existing line.
- c. Given the scenic highway designation, would it be possible to identify yards that are more distant from this highway segment?

Response

Please respond to this request within 2 weeks with a proposed approach and provide a copy to our CEQA consultant (Susan Lee at Slee@aspeneg.com). Additional data requests may be necessary to address other issues as we move forward with EIR preparation. Any questions on this data request should be directed to me at (916) 217-5073 or by email at john.forsythe@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



John E. Forsythe
Project Manager for the I-C Project
Energy Division CEQA Unit

cc: David LeBlond, Southern California Edison (David.leblond@sce.com)
Michelle Wilson, Supervisor CEQA & Energy Permitting Group, CPUC
michelle.wilson@cpuc.ca.gov
Joan Patrovsky, Project Manager, BLM jpatrovs@blm.gov
Regan Watt, NEPA Coordinator, BLM rwatt@blm.gov
Susan Lee, Aspen Environmental Group Slee@aspeneg.com
Susanne Heim, Panorama Environmental susanne.heim@panoramaenv.com

