
From: Ryan Stevenson <Ryan.Stevenson@sce.com>
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 2:58 PM
To: billie.blanchard@cpuc.ca.gov; 'fmcmenimen@blm.gov'
Cc: Nicole Di Jerlando; Scott Lacy; KATHY YHIP; Fritts Golden; jkalish@blm.gov; Susan Lee; Hedy Koczwara
Subject: WOD Draft EIR/EIS: SCE Data Requests

Billie/Frank,

Below are a few questions we have regarding information in the Draft EIR/EIS. Your assistance in providing responses to these questions will help us prepare our comments to the Draft EIR/EIS as well with information for the CPUC's Case-in-Chief process.

1. Please provide GIS data for the Tower Relocation Alternative, more specifically the data related to figures AP-5-3 (a-h).
2. For the Phased Build Alternative, pp. Ap.5-47 describes the tower locations and lines for Segment 1 as keeping the existing towers and only reconductoring the circuits nearest the edges of the ROW, while Attachment 1, Figure 1, shows bundled 1033 ACSR on both circuits of the western towers and single 795 on both circuits of the eastern towers in Segment 1. Similarly, the subsequent descriptions of the circuit orientations on pp. Ap.5-47 and Ap.5-48 include the reconfigurations at San Bernardino Junction and Banning Junction, to place the Devers-El Casco-San Bernardino circuits in the northern part of the ROW, but this would conflict with stringing the Segment 1 corridor as described in the text. Please clarify the correct alignment and wire placement in Segment 1 for this alternative?
3. Per the Phased Build Alternative, in Segments 5 & 6 (MP30 – MP45) the existing 220 kV double-circuit structures are located in the far northern portion of the ROW. It's not clear whether these structures would be removed and replaced with new 220 kV double circuit structures to be located in the middle of the southern portion of the ROW or if they would remain in the northern portion of the ROW. If the latter, then SCE assumes that spacing for any future project would be left within the southern portion of the ROW such that the future line(s) would be positioned in-between the existing structures (located in the northern portion of the ROW) and the new double-circuit structures that would be located in the southern portion of the ROW. Please confirm the alignments in this portion of Segment 6 for the Phased Build Alternative.
4. In several sections of the Draft EIR/EIS, it states that the Phased Build Alternative would result in an overall construction duration and/or construction activities that would be shorter than that of the Proposed Project. Please send the Project/Construction schedule and assumptions that were used to conclude that the Phased Build Alternative would require less time to construct and could be in service sooner than the Proposed Project. If available, please also include all the Phased Build Alternative schedule assumptions associated with the additional engineering that would be needed, the number and duration of additional shoo-files and outages, and the procurement duration for the new 795 conductor as compared to the Proposed Project.
5. In Appendix 5, Attachment 2, pp. 6-7, it states that the Phased Build Alternative would reduce the overall cost of the upgrades as compared to the Proposed Project. Please provide the cost estimate for the Phased Build Alternative that supports the conclusion that the Phased Build Alternative would be less expensive than the Proposed Project. If no such cost estimate exists, please provide the assumptions that led to this conclusion. Also, please explain if a cost per MW comparison and/or if the cost of any future phases were assessed in determining that the Phased Build Alternative would be less costly than the Proposed Project.

Thanks,

Ryan Stevenson

Principal Advisor
Regulatory Policy & Affairs
Southern California Edison
8631 Rush Street, General Office 4 - G100 (Ground Floor)
Rosemead, CA 91770
Office (626) 302-3613 (PAX 23613)
Cell (626) 602-5194
Fax (626) 302-4332 (FAX 24332)