

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



September 29, 2023

Tom Diaz
SCE Regulatory Affairs - Infrastructure Licensing
Southern California Edison

Via email to thomas.diaz@sce.com

RE: CPUC Supplemental Data Request 19 for the Southern California Edison Alberhill System Project, A.09-09-022

Dear Mr. Diaz,

Upon further review of Southern California Edison's Third Amended Application and Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA), the Energy Division requests the information contained in Attachment 1 to this letter. Responses should be submitted to the Energy Division and WSP in electronic format. We request that SCE respond to this data request by October 13, 2023. Inform us as soon as possible if you cannot provide specific responses by this date. Delays in responding to this data request may cause delays in the supplemental analysis review process.

Direct questions to Trevor Pratt at (916) 894-5734 or by e-mail (address below). Please copy the CPUC's consultant, Amy DiCarlantonio, WSP, on all communications (amy.dicarlantonio@wsp.com). Energy Division reserves the right to request additional information at any point during the proceeding and subsequently during project construction and restoration should Application (09-09-022) be approved.

Sincerely,

Trevor Pratt
Senior CEQA Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814
Trevor.Pratt@cpuc.ca.gov

CC: Amy DiCarlantonio, Project Manager, WSP

Attachment 1: 2023-0929_Data Request No. 19_Table

Attachment 1: 2023-0929_Data Request No. 19_Table

DG #	Resource Areas/ Topic	SCE Data Submittal Item/Page	Data Gap Question	Response
DG-MISC-91	Air Quality	SCE Third Amended Application and PEA - Revised Environmental Impact Analysis, Section 4.3.5	<p>Unable to confirm emissions shown in Table 4.3-12 to validate reducing 'significant with mitigation' to 'less than significant'. For example, maximum daily onsite controlled emissions for PM10 for 500 kV transmission line construction is shown as 14 lbs/day. This value does not appear in Appendix P so unable to confirm which emissions were summed to arrive at the value shown in the table.</p> <p>Provide the appropriate reference to where the detailed information is in the Third Amended PEA to confirm emissions in Table 4.3-12 or provide the appropriate summary tables based on the information provided in the Third Amended PEA Appendix P: Revised Air Quality and GHG Calculations.</p>	
DG-MISC-92	Air Quality	SCE Third Amended Application and PEA - Revised Environmental Impact Analysis, Section 4.3.5	<p>The text on page O-42 of the ASP third amended PEA for MM AQ-3 indicates that emissions of PM10 and PM2.5 during construction of the 500-kV transmission lines would remain significant after mitigation (see excerpted text below). However, Table 4.3-12 shows controlled emissions do not exceed threshold for PM10 and PM2.5. Explain the discrepancy.</p> <p>MM AQ-3 would reduce some emissions of fugitive PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, but these reductions would not reduce emissions to levels below localized significance thresholds. Emissions of PM_{2.5} from combustion engines during construction of 500-kV transmission lines using the conventional method of construction and emissions of PM₁₀ during construction of 500-kV transmission lines using helicopter construction therefore would remain significant after mitigation.</p>	
DG-MISC-93	Transportation and Traffic	SCE Third Amended Application and PEA - Revised Environmental Impact Analysis, Section 4.15.5	<p>The Third Amended PEA Appendix P: Revised Air Quality and GHG Calculations indicates additional motor vehicle usage. However, Table 4.15-14 does not show any changes to the Construction Trip Generation. Explain the discrepancy and confirm the maximum number of construction workers on a peak day of construction remains 200 workers.</p>	