DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
4.18.1	Purpose and Need	Ch. 1.0	 a) After review of the energy data provided in your reply to data requests 4.18 and 4.28, it appears that many of the energy values identified as GWH are in fact MWH. For example, 4.18 indicates that SCE 2009 annual energy sales were 101,843,760 GWH. Please review the example data gap responses that are attached and confirm. b) Provide corrected data gap responses as needed. 	02/25/10		No response	
4.28.1	Purpose and Need	Ch. 1.0	After reviewing the SCE annual sales data contained in data request 4.18 with the forecasted Retail Sales contained in data request 4.28 there appears to be approximately a 18,000 GWH difference in the quantities. For example, the first shows 2009 SCE Energy sales at 101,843 GWH. The second shows SCE "Retail Annual Sales" forecasted to be 83,435 GWH in 2010 and only reaching 98,918 by 2020. Explain this discrepancy.	02/25/10		No response	
5.22	Other CEQA Cumulative	Ch. 6.0	Please provide a map that illustrates the anticipated destinations and routes of all new subtransmission/distribution line projects that SCE plans to construct as a result of the Alberhill System project. For example, please identify the communities where the installation of new 12 kV lines will become possible as a result of the Alberhill project.	01/07/10		No response	
5.24	Purpose and Need	Sec. 1.1	Please indicate which portions of the Alberhill project are being built to satisfy/comply with internal SCE requirements or guidelines. Please cite and all internal SCE guidelines/requirements that SCE relies on to support the purpose and need for the Alberhill project.	01/07/10		No response	
5.24.1	Purpose and Need	Ch. 1.0	 a) Provide a complete copy of SCE's Transmission Planning Criteria and Guidelines. b) Provide other SCE internal transmission planning documentation or manuals applicable to the proposed project as well as the Valley–Ivyglen Subtransmission and Fogarty Substation project. 	02/25/10		No response	
5.25	Purpose and Need	Sec. 1.2.1	The PEA includes five bullet points that disclose demographic\economic conditions in the Riverside County. Please update the data to include: <u>- Population growth for 2009.</u> <u>- Foreclosure rate for 2009.</u> -Total meters installed, removed and net installation for 2009.	01/07/10		No response	E & E obtained population data through 2010.

DG#	Resource Area / Topic		Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
7.7.1	Project Description / Visual Resources	Ch. 3.0 / Sec. 4.1	Specify the number and locations where poles currently supporting 115-kV lines would be removed. For each location, specify the height and type (LWS, TSP, H-frame) of pole to be removed. Specify the number and locations where new poles would be installed to support 115-kV lines. For each location, specify the height and type (LWS, TSP, H-frame) of pole to be installed. Provide this information as GIS shape files.	05/05/10		No response	See also 12.11.
7.12.2	Hydrology and Water Quality / Utilities and Service Systems / Project Description	Data Gap 7.12	 a. Confirm the source of de-ionized water for the Valley Substation. Is water supplied from the local water agency then de-ionized at the Valley Substation or another SCE facility? b. At what frequency would 3,000 gallons of de-ionized water be consumed at the Alberhill Substation for cleaning electrical equipment? 	07/18/11		No response	
7.38.1	Utilities and Service Systems / Project Description / Transportati on and Traffic	Data Gap Request 7.38.1	 a) Addressed on 08/09/11 b) Addressed on 08/09/11 c) Addressed on 08/09/11 d) Withdrawn. e) Would one or more lanes of a public roadway be closed, and if so, for how long? 	07/18/11	08/09/11	Incomplete	Data Requests 7.38 and 7.38.1 refer to relocation of the agricultural water pipeline.
7.73.1	Noise	Data Request 7.73	 a) Withdrawn. b) Identify the closest sensitive receptor to the proposed substation site. Indicate the distance between the closest sensitive receptor and substation perimeter wall as well as the type of receptor. Under the Riverside County General Plan, the following are considered sensitive receptors: residential uses, schools, hospitals, rest homes, long term care facilities, mental care facilities, libraries, passive recreation uses, and places of worship. c) Conduct a noise survey for the proposed substation site containing: 1. A set of daytime and nighttime background ambient noise measurements from the perimeter wall of the substation site and the closest sensitive receptor. 2. Predict substation operating noise contributions to background ambient noise levels at the substation perimeter wall and closest sensitive receptor. Base predicted noise levels on the model of transformers to 	02/25/10		No response	

							,
DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			 be installed and location of the transformers in the substation footprint. Provide predicted noise levels with and without transformer cooling fans running. If the transformer model and proposed layout of the substation have not yet been determined, provide the maximum noise contribution that two transformers with the proposed rating (560 MVA) would produce under the expected operational conditions (transformers operating simultaneously, with and without cooling fans). 				
8.1.2	Alternatives	DG 8.1.1	The response to Data Gap Request 8.1.1 indicates that to make the output from an additional transformer at Valley Substation for the Valley South System useful, an approximately 20-mile 115-kV subtransmission line would need to be constructed from Valley Substation to Pauba Substation. Explain why construction of a 20-mile line to Pauba Substation is relevant to an alternative that would install an additional transformer at Valley Substation to meet demand projected in proximity to the proposed Alberhill Substation site. Provide the assumptions and calculations that lead to the conclusion that a new 115-kV line to Pauba Substation would be required due to construction of the proposed Alberhill System Project or confirm that the need for the new line to Pauba Substation exists regardless of approval to construct the proposed Alberhill System Project.	08/22/11		No response	
8.3.2	Alternatives	Response to DG 8.3.1	 Addressed on 10/20/11. Addressed on 10/20/11. Addressed on 10/20/11. The last statement of the response states that the Sun Valley Project would not meet project objectives for the Alberhill System Project. Please specify which project objectives the Sun Valley Project fails to meet and explain why. Assuming that the Sun Valley Project would meet the basic objectives of the proposed project sufficiently to be considered for analysis as an alternative pursuant to CEQA, discuss the effects of its interconnection with the Valley South 115-kV System in terms of fault conditions (short circuit values), induction motor stalling, and other operational issues. 	09/30/11	10/20/11	Incomplete	
12.1.1	Purpose and Need	Chapter 1.0	 Confirm that the following statements are accurate, and estimate the date when load would be exceeded and a third transformer would be required. The substation would be constructed with enough 	07/18/11		No response	

		-			-		
DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			space for two additional 560 MVA 500/115-kV				
			transformers. When electrical load exceeds 560 MVA,				
			the first two transformers would serve the load and a				
			third transformer would be installed as a spare. Based				
			on the applicant's projections, the load may exceed				
			560 MVA as early as [INSERT DATE]. A fourth				
			transformer would be installed as a spare and the first				
			three transformers would serve the load when				
			electrical load exceeds 1,120 MVA, which is not				
			anticipated to occur before 2018, based on the				
			applicant's projections.				
12.7	Project	(April	a. Describe the current status of the horse ranch located on	05/18/11		No	
	Description	2011	the property proposed for the Alberhill Substation.			response	
		Revision)	b. Withdrawn.				
		Chapter	c. Provide SCE's current plans and schedule for horse ranch				
		3.0 (p. 3-	demolition.				
		4)					
12.7.1	Project	Chapter	a) Provide documentation that indicates it is SCE's standard	07/18/11		No	
	Description	3.0	practice to remove structures from property newly acquired			response	
			by SCE.				
			b)Complete.				
			c) Indicate the dates and times of demolition and each				
			structure that was demolished. Provide a figure of				
			appropriate scale that indicates where structures were				
			demolished and the boundary within which land was				
			disturbed during demolition activities.				
			d) Provide a list of each permit obtained for demolition of the				
			horse ranch.				
			e) List the number of wells and septic tank pits abated and list				
			all associated permits obtained. Confirm that abatement				
			was carried out in accordance with either Section 722.0 of				
			the Uniform Plumbing Code or by methods approved by the				
			County Building Official.				
			f) Indicate how much solid waste was removed during				
			demolition. Indicate how much solid waste was recycled.				
			List the types of materials that were disposed of and the				
			types of waste that were recycled.				
			g) List the amount and types of hazardous wastes that were				
			removed and how it was disposed of.				
			h) Indicate if contaminated soil or groundwater were				
			encountered during demolition and the actions that were taken if encountered.				
			 i) Emissions estimates were revised to include horse ranch demolition in response to Data Gap Requests #1.8 and 				
L			demonition in response to Data Gap Requests #1.8 and				

DG#	Resource	Source /	Data Gap Question	Request	Reply	Status	Notes
	Area / Topic	PEA Page	#9.1. Update these estimates based on the actual work performed.	Date	Date		
12.9. <i>X</i>	Air Quality, Project Description	Data Response 12.9	[Data Request Pending]			Data Request Pending	New project description information was provided in response to Data Request 12.9 (Received 12/8/11). Follow-up request to Data Response 12.9 is pending.
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	 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. b. Provide a table for the 115-kV lines with rows that show pole/structure number and columns that specify the type of pole currently in place and the type of pole that the existing pole with be replaced with (e.g., LWS, TPS, H-frame). 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. d. On the same maps, indicate where guard structures would be used for the 115-kV lines. 	05/18/11		No response	See also 7.7.1.
14.1	Alternatives	Ch. 2	 If a modified system were constructed for an ultimate build out of two transformers and a spare at a site located just north of the proposed 115-kV Segment 8 (see Attachment A), describe the changes, additions, and improvements to existing 115-kV systems that would be required to make the output from these transformers useful in meeting projected demand in a reliable and flexible manner. Assume that site improvements (e.g., grading) and acquisition feasibility would be comparable to the proposed site. Additional assumptions would be similar to those used to respond to Data Gap Request 8.1.1. This system alternative also assumes that a smaller overall project would be constructed and operated to serve a reduced Alberhill 115-kV service area. The reduced Alberhill 115-kV service area may include Scenario A: Ivyglen, Fogarty (proposed), and Elsinore substations; Scenario B: Ivyglen, Fogarty (proposed), Elsinore, and Skylark substations; or 	08/22/11		No response	Attachment A

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
			 <u>Scenario C:</u> another combination of substations that would be sufficient to relieve load from the Valley South 115-kV System through the planning period (through 2020) if a new 500/115-kV substation were constructed for an ultimate build out of only two transformers and one spare. In addition, instead of de-energizing (or keeping energized but not serving load) a long segment of the existing 115-kV Valley–Elsinore–Ivyglen Line as proposed, consider using this existing line along with the pending 115-kV Valley–Ivyglen Line to transmit electricity from a 500/115-kV substation constructed at one of the substation site alternatives shown in Attachment A. If a reduced Alberhill 115-kV system were to be constructed, at what point in time would additional reinforcements be required assuming each of the scenarios described above (Scenarios A, B, and C)? See also outstanding Data Gap Request 12.1.1 regarding when a third transformer is projected to be required at the proposed Alberhill Substation. 				
14.3	Alternatives	Ch. 2	 If the proposed substation (in full) were constructed at a site located just north of the proposed 115-kV Segment 8 (see Attachment A), describe the changes, additions, and improvements to existing 115-kV systems that would be required to make the output from these transformers useful in meeting projected demand in a reliable and flexible manner. Assume that site improvements (e.g., grading) and acquisition feasibility would be comparable to the proposed site. Additional assumptions would be similar to those used to respond to Data Gap Request 8.1.1. In addition, instead of de-energizing (or keeping energized but not serving load) an approximately 10-mile segment of the existing 115-kV Valley–Elsinore–Ivyglen Line as proposed, discuss the feasibility of using this line along with the pending 115-kV Valley–Ivyglen Line to transmit electricity from a the proposed 500/115-kV substation were it constructed at one of the substation site alternatives shown in Attachment A. 	09/02/11		No response	Attachment A