

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Set #12

DG#	Resource Area/ Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
Data Request #12							
12.1	Purpose and Need	Chapter 1.0, Table 1.1	For the Valley South 115-kV System, provide the recorded peak demand in megavolt amperes for 2010 and forecasted peak demand for a 1-in-5 year heat storm through 2021.	05/18/11			
12.2	Alternatives	(April 2011 Revision) Chapter 2.0, Section 2.2 and Figure 2.2a: 500 kV Transmission Line Segment Alternatives	<p>1) Revised PEA Section 2.2 states that Segment C4 "crosses land designated as SKR HCP Core Reserve." Please indicate where this would occur or confirm that the segment does not cross it.</p> <p>2) Revised PEA Section 2.2 states that the construction of Segments C2 and C3 would require entry onto Bureau of Land Management land. Explain why the construction of Segments C1, C4, SA, and VA would not require entry onto Bureau of Land Management land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Describe in detail different techniques that would be used and how such techniques would result in different areas of disturbance for 500-kV segments C1, C2, C3, C4, SA, and VA. 	05/18/11			
12.3	Alternatives	(April 2011 Revision) Chapter 2.0, Section 2.2 and Figure 2.2a: 500 kV Transmission Line Segment Alternatives	<p>1) Overlay the Figure "Figure 2.2a: 500 kV Transmission Line Segment Alternatives" with the WRCMSHCP conservation land discussed in Section 2.2 of the PEA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised PEA Section 2.2 states that Segment VA would span ("avoid") conservation land for the WRMSHCP. 	05/18/11			
12.4	Alternatives	(April 2011 Revision) Figure: Proposed 500-kV Project Elements Aerial Overview, March 11, 2011	<p>1) Confirm that the numbering sequence omits Alternative Towers #3, #6, #9, #10, and #16 and that they are not proposed, or indicate on a figure their locations.</p> <p>2) Explain the purpose of Proposed Alternative Towers T1 and T2.</p>	05/18/11			
12.5	Project Description	(April 2011 Revision) Chapter 3.0	<p>1) Indicate on a map where each existing structure on the Serrano-Valley 500-kV Line would be removed or modified for construction of 500-kV segments SA and VA.</p> <p>2) How long would the segment of transmission line be that is</p>	05/18/11			

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Set #12

DG#	Resource Area/ Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			removed from the Serrano–Valley line? The previous proposed project would have removed 1,500 feet of conductor from the Serrano–Valley transmission line to create the loop-in to the proposed Alberhill Substation.				
12.6	Project Description	(April 2011 Revision) Chapter 3.0	<p>1) If a switch would not be installed on a pole as part of the proposed project, explain how the disconnect between the Valley South 115-kV System and the proposed Alberhill 115-kV System.</p> <p>2) Would open spans still be created as part of the proposed project? If so, how many and where?</p>	05/18/11			
12.7	Project Description	(April 2011 Revision) Chapter 3.0 (p. 3-4)	<p>a. Describe the current status of the horse ranch located on the property proposed for the Alberhill Substation.</p> <p>b. Explain why the paragraph about horse ranch demolition was removed from the revised project description.</p> <p>c. Provide SCEs current plans and schedule for horse ranch demolition.</p>	05/18/11			
12.8	Aesthetics	Section 4.1	Provide new visual simulations for proposed 500-kV transmission lines and towers.	05/18/11			
12.9	Air Quality	Section 4.3	Provide revised air quality calculations (Appendix H) consistent with revised PEA.	05/18/11			
12.10	Project Description	Ch. 3	<p>a. To what extent is it accurate to say that telecommunication lines would only be installed underground in existing underground conduit within the perimeter of existing substations?</p> <p>b. If new trenching would be required, indicate which substations would require trenching for telecommunications line installation (e.g., Serrano, Barre, Walnut, Mira Loma, Serrano, Ivyglen, Fogarty, Skylark, Tenaja, Newcomb, Valley).</p>	05/18/11			
12.11	Project Description, Biological Resources, Visual Resources	Ch. 3, Sec. 4.1, Sec. 4.4, Data Gaps 6.1, 6.1.1, 5.17, 7.7.1	<p>a. Provide maps at a scale of 1 inch:400 feet or more detailed that show the locations where poles currently supporting each of the 115-kV line segments would be removed. Indicate (e.g., by using a key) what type of pole currently exists in each location. Number the poles on the map. Engineering maps or AutoCAD files showing street names, pole numbers, pole heights, and types of poles may be adequate.</p> <p>b. Provide a table for the 115-kV lines with rows that show pole/structure number and columns that specify the type of</p>	05/18/11			

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Set #12

DG#	Resource Area/ Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			<p>pole currently in place and the type of pole that the existing pole will be replaced with (e.g., LWS, TPS, H-frame).</p> <p>c. Specify, on the same maps, where staging areas, laydown areas, other work areas around pole removal sites, and pulling/tensioning/splicing sites would be located for the 115-kV lines.</p> <p>d. On the same maps, indicate where guard structures would be used for the 115-kV lines.</p>				
12.12	Project Description, Biological Resources	Ch. 3, Sec 4.4, Date Gap Response 7.9	<p>a. Where new staging areas, guard structure locations, laydown areas, other work areas around pole removal sites, or pulling/tensioning/splicing sites are indicated on the maps provided in response to Data Gap Request 11.4, update PEA Table 3.3 and 3.4 accordingly to indicate the additional acreage of land disturbance for the 115-kV lines.</p> <p>b. Total land disturbance for the project was provided in Data Gap Response 7.9, however, responses to other data gaps have indicated that a number of staging areas, pulling/tensioning/splicing sites, and other work areas, have not been accounted for in the land disturbance estimates provided. Provide total land disturbance for the project including all staging areas, pulling/tensioning/splicing sites, and other work areas.</p>	05/18/11			
12.13	Project Description	Ch. 3	Given that some new access/spur roads may be up to 22 feet wide (including a 2-foot shoulder on each side) the number of acres that would be disturbed is not correctly estimated in Table 3.3 or Table 3.4 of the PEA. If no new estimate is provided, it will be assumed that all access and spur roads will be 22 feet wide and the estimate adjusted accordingly.	05/18/11			
12.14	Project Description	Ch. 3, Data Gap 6.1.1	The revised PEA states that for the preparation of 500-kV tower sites, grading may be required (p. 3-24). It also states that benching may be required. Indicate on maps similar to the ones provided in the Road Story (PEA Appendix D), where grading and benching may be required.	05/18/11			
12.15	Project Description	Ch. 3, Data Gap 6.1.1	The PEA states that crane pads for 500-kV tower construction would be located within the laydown areas used for structure assembly but that separate crane pads may be required, and if so, they would occupy an area of approximately 50 feet by 50 feet (p. 3-24). Indicate on maps similar to the ones provided in the Road Story (PEA Appendix D), where crane pads may be located outside of laydown areas.	05/18/11			
12.16	Biological	Data Gaps	a. Provide maps at a scale of 1 inch:400 feet or more detailed	05/18/11			

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Set #12

DG#	Resource Area/ Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
	Resources	1.13, 7.52, 7.54, 7.55, 7.56, 7.58	<p>that show vegetation types (including oak trees, shrub stands, aquatic resources, etc.) and suitable habitat for sensitive and special status plant and wildlife species along the 500-kV line and 115-kV line routes.</p> <p>b. The responses to Data Gaps 1.13, 7.52, 7.54, 7.55, 7.56, and 7.58 did not include the results of the 2010 Biological Surveys. Provide updated responses to each of the data gap requests based on the 2010 survey results; include 2011 survey data as available. For data that were requested on maps or GIS coordinates in the previous data gap requests, the updated responses may be combined with the maps provided in response to part "a" of this request.</p>				
12.17	Project Description, Biological Resources, Noise	Ch. 3, Sec. 4.11 Sec 4.4, Date Gap Response 1.10, 5.8, 5.17, 6.1, 6.1.1	<p>a. Confirm that, as described in the response to Data Gap 1.10, only one materials staging area in addition to the proposed Alberhill Substation site and existing substations is proposed.</p> <p>b. No pulling/tensioning/splicing sites were provided in response to Data Gaps 5.8, 5.17, 6.1, or 6.1.1. Verify that all pulling, tensioning, and splicing for the 500-kV lines would occur from the proposed Alberhill Substation site. If this is not the case, indicate on maps similar to the ones provided in the Road Story (PEA Appendix D), where pulling, tensioning, and splicing sites would be located.</p>	05/18/11			
12.18	Project Description	Ch. 3	What is the maximum distance that could be spanned by each type of structure proposed for the 115-kV subtransmission lines (e.g., TSPs, LWS Poles, and LWS H-Frames)? If the span distance varies depending on topography or structure type, use a map in your response to correspond span distances you are capable of accomplishing by locations along each 115-kV route.	05/18/11			
12.19	Lake Elsinore Advanced Pump Storage (LEAPS) Project	PEA p. 2-1, 6-1	a. SCE's July 2010 protest letter to Nevada Hydro's TEVS LEAPS Project PEA stated that the PEA did not adequately study potential impacts on SCE, CAISO, and WECC systems posed by the 115-kV and 500-kV project elements. Explain what results may reasonably be anticipated from such study work and provide information about how the lack of adequate studies could impact SCE, CAISO, and WECC facilities. In your reply please address the potential impacts one may reasonably anticipate should Nevada Hydro's 115-kV and 500-kV project elements go forward as proposed.	05/18/11			

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Set #12

DG#	Resource Area/ Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			b. During a conference call between SCE, E & E, and the CPUC on July 14, 2010, reliability issues associated with operating the 115-kV and 500-kV system in parallel via a 500/115-kV transformer located at the proposed Santa Rosa substation were briefly discussed. Explain in greater detail what issues (reliability and other) could reasonably be expected as a result of such interconnection.				