PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

February 24, 2015 VIA MAIL AND EMAIL

Christine McLeod
Principal Advisor - Regulatory Affairs Dept.
Southern California Edison
8631 Rush Street, General Office 4 - G10Q (Ground Floor)
Rosemead, CA 91770

SUBJECT: Data Request #4 for the Southern California Edison Moorpark-Newbury 66 kV Subtransmission Line Project

Dear Ms. McLeod:

As the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) proceeds with our environmental review for Southern California Edison (SCE)'s Moorpark-Newbury 66 kV Subtransmission Line Project (Proposed Project), we have identified additional information required in order to adequately conduct the CEQA review. Please provide the information requested below (Data Request #4) by March 10, 2015. Please submit your response in hardcopy and electronic format to me and also directly to our environmental consultant, Environmental Science Associates (ESA), at the physical and e-mail addresses noted below. If you have any questions please direct them to me as soon as possible.

If SCE believes any of the responses constitute Critical Infrastructure Information warranting confidentiality, please indicate clearly in the transmission and within the response.

Sincerely,

Michael Rosauer
CPUC CEQA Project Manager
Energy Division
505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Michael.rosauer@cpuc.ca.gov

ESA
Attn: Matthew Fagundes
1425 North McDowell Blvd.
Suite 200
Petaluma, CA 94954
mfagundes@esassoc.com

Data Request #4
Moorpark-Newbury 66 kV Subtransmission Line Project

Alternatives

The purpose of the following questions is to provide additional information to assist in the development of alternatives for consideration in the Environmental Impact Report.

1. Provide details regarding System Alternative 2 (the reconductoring alternative) identified in the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA), including the specific line segments that would be reconductored, distances of the replaced segments, the need to replace existing poles, the size and ampacity (normal and emergency) of the new conductor, as well as the ampacity information for the existing conductors (for purposes of this discussion, conductors refer to the lines connecting Moorpark and Thousand Oaks substations to Newbury Substation).

2. Conduct power flow studies (and provide results in the form of power flow plots) assuming implementation of System Alternative 2 (for both the Moorpark-Newbury-Pharmacy line and the Thousand Oaks-Newbury line).

3. Conduct analysis and provide results to show the load level and years at which SCE would expect voltage or line loading violations under normal and emergency conditions under System Alternative 2.

4. Provide power flow studies assuming implementation of System Alternative 2 to illustrate the impact of connecting Camgen during any violations identified as a result of item 3, above (i.e., to what extent would the Camgen generator assist in mitigating voltage or line overloads?).