

## Matthew Fagundes

---

**From:** Peterson, Robert <Robert.Peterson@cpuc.ca.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 24, 2019 4:26 PM  
**To:** 'Horne'; Rosalie Barcinas; 'Diana Gallegos'; Michael Bass; Jennifer Shaw; Paul McCabe; Kashif Siddiqi  
**Cc:** Laura Wang (laura@kevalaanalytics.com); Matthew Fagundes; aram@kevalaanalytics.com  
**Subject:** Circle City - Data Request 21

**SCE Team,**

This DR is a follow up to our 6/5 call. Happy to have a call this week or early next week to further clarify the following as needed.

Regards,  
Rob

### **Data Request No. 21: Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson Subtransmission Line Project, A.15-12-007**

#### **1. Contents for an SCE Webinar to ED in July**

On 6/4, SCE explained that they use a third-party provider to disaggregate DER forecasts data from the IEPR to the circuit level. SCE then aggregates the forecast DER data back to the substation level. Please provide more information about the third-party provider, their tools, and the DER adoption propensity model used by SCE to conduct this analysis; how does the model work? Specifically, what are the assumptions to DER adoption, and how are the results communicated to SCE (e.g., by 8760 load or DER savings shape, by average or peak DER by season in MW, impact to coincident circuit peak, etc.)?

For battery storage specifically, what are the adoption assumptions, and are residential and commercial battery storage adoption both modeled? If so, how are the assumptions for battery dispatch/operations modeled and aggregated to the circuit level to estimate net load impact?

During the webinar, please show the third-party tool(s) onscreen with data from SCE's Circle City/MLJ project-area facilities loaded. A live presentation of the tool(s) would be helpful in addition to slides.

#### **2. Data to Update (Due in July, specific day TBD by SCE, please provide the data as available)**

- a. Please provide the updated 2019-2028 load forecast data aggregated to each substation in the ENA, and the updated 2019-2028 load forecast data for the MLJ line. Please include the separate 2019-2028 DER forecast for each DER type forecast. Include predicted peak load under both normal and extreme-heat conditions. Also include the unadjusted peak load for each year in the forecasts and explain any adjustments made to the loads.
- b. Please provide the updated 8760 hourly load profile curve used to model MLJ line for the purpose of evaluating potential battery storage alternatives.
- c. On 6/4, SCE provided an initial timeline for evaluating the MLJ line and the types of analyses expected to occur. Please clarify when the following analyses and inputs are expected to be provided.
  1. MLJ load-growth analysis: load growth forecasts (2019-2028) and current 8760 load shape
  2. Energy storage sizing/modeling: battery storage size, duration, and operation parameters (e.g., operating only to meet the identified need or participation in other services while the storage system is idle or not in use)

3. Circuit analysis: identify likely impacted circuits, circuit-specific load growth forecasts (2019-2028) and current 8760 load shapes
4. Land requirements and environmental analysis
5. Cost and revenue estimates
6. Regulatory filing (due 9/5/19 per Ruling)

-----Original Appointment-----

**From:** Diana Gallegos <diana.s.genasci@sce.com>

**To:** Diana Gallegos; Rosalie Barcinas; Paul Mccabe; Bernice Goldsmith; Michael Bass; Peterson, Robert

**Cc:** Matthew Fagundes; aram@kevalaanalytics.com; laura@kevalaanalytics.com

**Subject:** Confirmed: ED-SCE update on MLJ Line Scope and Schedule

**When:** Tuesday, June 04, 2019 10:00 AM-11:00 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).

Purpose: SCE to provide a status update on scope and schedule for MLJ Line analysis