

Southern California Edison
A.19-07-015 – TLRR IC

DATA REQUEST SET E D - S C E - 0 1 8

To: Energy Division
Prepared by: Scott Lacy
Job Title: Sr. Construction Project Manager
Received Date: 11/8/2024

Response Date: 11/21/2024

Question 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.

Response to Question 18-1:

Please see attachment “ED-SCE-018_Q18-1_IC AltEngineeringData.zip” for the most current version of GIS data containing preliminary structure locations and other construction disturbance areas for the three Segment 1 alternatives.

Southern California Edison
A.19-07-015 – TLRR IC

DATA REQUEST SET E D - S C E - 0 1 8

To: Energy Division
Prepared by: Scott Lacy
Job Title: Sr. Construction Project Manager
Received Date: 11/8/2024

Response Date: 11/21/2024

Question 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.

Response to Question 18-2:

Correct, Segments 1 and 2 would utilize ACCC or ACSR conductor and Segments 3N and 3S would utilize ACCC conductor. Due to the proposed full rebuild of Segments 1 and 2, SCE will further evaluate the optimal conductor for those segments during the final engineering efforts that occur after a PTC is issued. SCE expects to only utilize ACCC conductor for Segments 3N and 3S due to the proposed reconductor scope of work in these segments, which would re-use the existing pole structures.

Southern California Edison
A.19-07-015 – TLRR IC

DATA REQUEST SET E D - S C E - 0 1 8

To: Energy Division
Prepared by: Scott Lacy
Job Title: Sr. Construction Project Manager
Received Date: 11/8/2024

Response Date: 11/21/2024

Question 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.

Response to Question 18-3:

SCE identified 57 material yards listed in PEA Table 3.7-1 (after removing the 16 Segment 4 material yards). SCE has subsequently eliminated the following five yards from the GIS files: 1-3, 1-5, 1-10, 1-18, and 2-7B. As a result, 52 potential materials yards should be included in the GIS files and considered in the analysis.

SCE's records show yards 1-11 and 1-19 in the GIS files. SCE would like these material yards included in the impact analysis, so they are available for use during construction. If desired, SCE will hold a real-time joint GIS working session to confirm these datasets.

Southern California Edison
A.19-07-015 – TLRR IC

DATA REQUEST SET E D - S C E - 0 1 8

To: Energy Division
Prepared by: Scott Lacy
Job Title: Sr. Construction Project Manager
Received Date: 11/8/2024

Response Date: 11/21/2024

Question 18-4:

Segment 1 Materials 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 to Question 18-4:

- a. Material yard 1-5 was removed from consideration and is no longer included in the GIS files. Yards 1-4 and 1-6 could be removed with minimal overall impact to construction. SCE would like to continue to consider Yard 1-7 for potential use during construction.
- b. Based on the current construction schedule, SCE estimates that the material yards in Segment 1 would be in use for approximately 36 months.
- c. Currently, there are no suitable candidate properties for a construction yard that are farther away from this highway segment. As the start of construction activities approaches, SCE or its construction contractor may identify some potential alternative yard locations, which would then need to be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval.