

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



April 6, 2010

VIA MAIL AND EMAIL

Mr. Ryan Stevenson
Regulatory Policy and Affairs Department
Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, Quad 3D, 388K
Rosemead, CA 91770

Re: Data Request Number 2 for the Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) for a Permit to Construct Electrical Facilities with Voltages between 50 kV and 200 kV: Mascot Substation Project

Dear Mr. Stevenson:

As the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) proceeds with our preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Mascot Substation Project, we have identified additional information required to complete our analysis of the Proposed Project. Please provide the information requested on the pages attached to this letter.

We would appreciate your response to this data request by April 23, 2010 which will help us maintain our schedule for analysis and processing of this application. Please submit your response in hardcopy and electronic format to me and also directly to our environmental consultant, ESA, at the mail and e-mail addresses noted below. If you have any questions please direct them to me as soon as possible at (415) 703-5595.

Sincerely,

Monisha Gangopadhyay
Project Manager for the Mascot Substation Project
Energy Division Transmission Permitting Branch

cc: Ken Lewis, CPUC
Jason Reiger, CPUC Legal Division
Maryam Ebke, CPUC ALJ
Michael Manka, ESA

Data Request #2

Project Description

Substation

1. Circuit Breakers – Provide information on whether or not circuit breakers to be installed at the proposed substation would use SF₆.
2. Provide any available information regarding the potential historical significance of the Goshen and Hanford Substations.
 - Have the two substations been recorded on Department of Recreation (DPR) forms or by other means?
 - Have the substations been evaluated for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources, or any local registers?
 - Can SCE provide more information regarding the history of the substations or details on their construction?
3. Water Supply – Because no municipal water supply is available at the site, would all water be supplied using water trucks? Can we assume that there would be no landscaping installed in the reasonably foreseeable future? Would SCE drill any wells on the site?
4. Transportation and Traffic – Would the substation be set back enough from Grangeville Boulevard to allow for future widening of Grangeville Blvd. Although a widening project is not in planning stages, both the County and City expressed interest in this potential project. If this request results in any design or project footprint changes, provide an updated drawing.

Subtransmission Line

5. Hazards – The preliminary environmental site assessment focused on the proposed substation site and did not include an assessment of the proposed subtransmission line alignment. Provide a records search for the proposed subtransmission line alignment.
6. Access Roads/work areas – Describe the location of the proposed new access road and work areas in relation to encroachment or crossing of Settlers and Lakeside Ditches. Would SCE be avoiding encroachment on these structures during construction?