

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Set #9

DG#	Resource Area/ Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
Data Request #9							
9.1	Air Quality	Section 4.3	<p>Section 3.1.1.9 of the PEA describes demolition of the existing horse ranch and relocation of an existing agricultural water line as part of Alberhill Substation site preparation. Further details about ranch demolition activities have been provided in SCE response to Data Gap Question 1.8. However, ranch demolition and removal of the existing water line and trenching/installation of the new water line are not clearly identified in the construction equipment list provided in Appendix F of the PEA or in the air quality construction emission calculations for the substation provided in Appendix H of the PEA. Were equipment and emissions associated with ranch demolition activities and water pipeline relocation activities included with the air quality calculations in Appendices F and H?</p> <p>If yes, indicate where the equipment and related emissions have been included in Appendices F and H.</p> <p>If no, provide a description of equipment for demolition activities and water pipeline relocation (to the same level of detail as for the other substation construction activities included in Appendix F) and provide emission calculations for demolition activities and water pipeline relocation (to the same level of detail as the emission calculations for the other substation construction activities in Appendix H).</p>	05/26/10			
9.2	Air Quality	Section 4.3	<p>Provide a discussion of the potential for asbestos in the existing ranch buildings at the Alberhill Substation site:</p> <p>Are asbestos containing materials (ACMs) present in the ranch buildings? If yes, provide a rough estimate of the volume of buildings to be demolished (in cubic feet) on a daily basis.</p> <p>Has an ACM survey been performed at this facility? If yes, provide a copy of this survey.</p>	05/26/10			

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Set #9

DG#	Resource Area/ Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
9.3	Air Quality	Section 4.3	<p>Section 3.2.1.4 of the PEA indicates that a temporary concrete batch plant would be set up if existing concrete supply facilities are not available. Emission calculations in Appendix H appear to be based on use of existing concrete supply facilities because no concrete batch plant is identified in the construction equipment list provided in Appendix F of the PEA or in the air quality construction emission calculations for the substation provided in Appendix H of the PEA.</p> <p>a. Provide a detailed estimate of the fugitive dust and combustion emissions associated with temporary concrete batch plant operations, including emissions associated with the travel of concrete trucks from the batch plant to construction sites. The estimate should be in the same level of detail as the calculations provided in Appendix H.</p> <p>b. Indicate if the temporary batch plant (if needed) would be located at the Alberhill Substation site (primary staging area) or at the additional staging area proposed to be located at the Valley-Serrano 500-kV transmission line ROW (0.75 miles north of Big Canyon Drive).</p>	05/26/10			

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Set #9

DG#	Resource Area/ Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
9.4	Air Quality	Section 4.3	<p>Section 3.2.3.2 of the PEA indicates that a helicopter may be used if needed in some difficult terrain for the installation of 500-kV structure(s). Appendix H includes emissions for the use of a helicopter for 500-kV wire stringing operations. However, Appendix H does not include helicopter emissions for the installation of 500-kV tower structures.</p> <p>a. Are the current emission estimates in Appendix H based on the assumption that land-based cranes and no helicopters would be used for the installation of all 500-kV tower structures? If no, please explain what assumptions were used for the installation of these structures.</p> <p>b. Provide emission calculations for the potential maximum use of helicopters for the installation of 500-kV tower structures. Emission calculations should have the same level of detail as for other construction activities in Appendix H. In addition, provide a description of helicopter usage to the same level of detail as for the other construction activities in Appendix F. These estimates should include the use of any ground-based equipment to support helicopter use.</p> <p>c. Provide an estimate of the net decrease in emissions from land-based equipment that would be unnecessary if helicopters are used for the installation of 500-kV tower structures (as described under bullet “b” above). Emission calculations should have the same level of detail as in Appendix H. In addition, provide a description of equipment to the same level of detail as in Appendix F.</p>	05/26/10			
9.5	Air Quality	Section 4.3	Provide the approximate date (month and year) for the scheduled start of each of the different sub-phases of construction for each project component (i.e., substation, 500-kV transmission lines, 115-kV subtransmission lines, and telecommunications), as detailed in Appendix H, Table 1.	05/26/10			

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Set #9

DG#	Resource Area/ Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
9.6	Air Quality	Section 4.3	<p>In the localized significance threshold (LST) analysis included in the PEA, the two closest receptors to substation and telecommunication construction are identified as a commercial receptor and residential receptor located 270 meters and 420 meters from the substation site, respectively. However, a review of data and aerial images in the project area indicates that two residential receptors are located nearer to the substation site (20 meters and 70 meters). Explain why these closer receptors were not used in the LST analysis. In addition, provide the address or geographical locations of the receptors used in the LST analysis.</p> <p>Relative to construction for the 500-kV transmission line, the LST analysis identifies the closest receptor at 93 meters. However, a review of data and aerial images in the project area indicate that two residential receptors are located within approximately 50 m of proposed Tower C1-1 and approximately 40 m of proposed Tower C1-2. Explain why these closer receptors were not used in the LST analysis. In addition, provide the address or geographical locations of the receptors used in the LST analysis.</p> <p>Explain why the activity that generates the highest PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} on-site emissions during 115-kV subtransmission line construction (i.e., Roads and Landing Work) was not used in the LST analysis.</p>	05/26/10			
9.7	Air Quality	Section 4.3	<p>The introduction to Appendix H indicates how the annual emissions from leakage of SF₆ storage capacities of the 500-kV switchrack gas insulated switchgear (GIS) were calculated. Table 48 indicates 500-kV and 115-kV equipment have SF₆ storage capacities of 50,000 pounds and 15,000 pounds, respectively. However, Data Gap Response 7.25 lists the SF₆ storage capacities of the 500-kV switchrack from 25,000 to 35,000 pounds and the 115-kV switchrack from 750 to 1,100 pounds.</p> <p>a. Provide an explanation for the differences in these values. b. Do the emission estimates in Table 48 account for SF₆ storage in additional gas-insulated electrical equipment (i.e., capacitors, other equipment) at the Alberhill Substation? c. What is the SF₆ capacity (in pounds) of the additional gas-insulated equipment at the Alberhill Substation?</p>	05/26/10			