

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



May 5, 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 #6 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 #6) by May 19, 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 #6

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. SCE's response to CPUC Data Request 4, Question 2, indicates that under PEA System Alternative 2 for the N-1 Case with the Pharmacy Substation reconnected, there would be a voltage drop at Newbury Substation in 2026 that would be approximately 12.8 percent. Given the 12.8 percent voltage reduction noted in the 2026 model for this alternative, please provide an estimate for the earliest year that a voltage violation (i.e., 5 percent or more) would occur at Newbury Substation during the N-1 conditions with the Pharmacy Substation load reconnected. Please also provide the associated power flow studies.
2. Assuming connection of the CamGen generator to the Moorpark System, provide an estimate for the earliest year that a voltage violation (i.e., 5 percent or more) would occur at Newbury Substation during the N-1 conditions with the Pharmacy Substation load reconnected. Please also provide the associated power flow studies.
3. SCE's response to CPUC Data Request 4, Question 4, indicates that under PEA System Alternative 2 and the connection of the CamGen generator for the N-1 Case with the Pharmacy Substation reconnected, there would be a voltage drop at Newbury Substation in 2026 that would be approximately 6.3 percent. Given the 6.3 percent voltage reduction noted in the 2026 model, please provide an estimate for the earliest year that a voltage violation (i.e., 5 percent or more) under System Alternative 2 and the connection of the CamGen generator would occur at Newbury Substation during N-1 conditions with the Pharmacy Substation load reconnected. Please also provide the associated power flow studies.