

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



May 13, 2020

Alex Gutierrez
Senior Advisor - Infrastructure Licensing
Southern California Edison

Via email to Alex.Gutierrez@sce.com

RE: CPUC Supplemental Data Request 4 for the Southern California Edison Alberhill System Project, A.09-09-022

Dear Mr. Gutierrez,

Upon further review of Southern California Edison's supplemental data response to the additional analyses requested in Decision 18-08-026, the Energy Division requests the information contained in Attachment 1 to this letter. Responses should be submitted to the Energy Division and Ecology and Environment, Inc. in electronic format. We request that SCE respond to this data request by May 28, 2020. 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 Joyce Steingass at (415) 703-1810 or by e-mail (address below). Please copy the CPUC's consultant, Amy DiCarlantonio and Grant Young, Ecology & Environment, Inc., on all communications (ADiCarlantonio@ene.com, GYoung@ene.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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joyce Steingass".

Joyce Steingass, P.E.
CPUC Project Manager
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298
Joyce.Steingass@cpuc.ca.gov

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



CC: Amy DiCarlantonio, Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.
Grant Young, Deputy Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

Attachment 1: 2020-0513_Data Request No. 04_Table

Attachment 1: 2020-0513_Data Request No. 04_Table

DG #	Resource Areas/ Topic	SCE Data Submittal Item/Page	Data Gap Question	Response
DG-G-2	Cost Benefit	A.09-09-022 CPUC-JWS-4 Q.01g Attachment 1 of 5_Quanta Technology Cost-Benefit Spreadsheet - Effective PV Forecast	Please explain why SCE used 10% for the weighted cost of capital. Additionally, please describe the weighting methodology. Does the weighted cost of capital include payment of taxes on profits?	
DG-G-3	Cost Benefit	A.09-09-022 CPUC-JWS-4 Q.01g Attachment 1 of 5_Quanta Technology Cost-Benefit Spreadsheet - Effective PV Forecast	Why is the discount rate set at the weighted aggregate cost of capital, rather than return on equity?	
DG-A-2	Load Forecast	Data Request Item A- A.09-09-022 ED-Alberhill-SCE-JWS-4 Item A	In the Load Forecast (Data submission item A) it states, "For the Conventional Forecast, DER, energy efficiency (EE), and demand-side management (DSM) are considered implicitly based on an assumed continuation of their adoption trend reflected in recent historical load data. Importantly, increased rates of PV adoption due to the California Net Zero Energy mandate for new residential homes beginning in 2020, or increased load due to future plug-in electric vehicles (PEV) adoption, are not explicitly captured in this forecast. Like DER, EE, and DSM, the historical trends of PV and PEV adoption are assumed to continue into the future." does this mean that the CEC future DER growth forecasts are not used, just historical trends are carried forward?	
DG-G-4	Load Forecast	A.09-09-022 CPUC-JWS-4 Q.01g Attachment 4 of 5_Appendix A_Quanta Technology_Cost Benefit Analysis of Alternatives.pdf	Please explain why Effective PV, spatial load forecast, and PV Watts lead to such radically different growth projections over 30 years.	
DG-C-18	Cost Benefit	Data Request Item C – Planning Study ED-Alberhill-SCE-JWS-4: Item C/	Why did SCE choose to use a value of service (VOS) metric to represent customer value for the Flex criteria?	