STATE OF CALIFORNIA ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *Governor*

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

May 19, 2009 VIA MAIL AND EMAIL

Christine McLeod
Project Manager - Regulatory Affairs
Regulatory Policy & Affairs Dept.
Southern California Edison
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, Quad 3D, 388L
Rosemead, CA 91770

SUBJECT: Data Request #3 for Presidential Substation Project

Dear Ms. McLeod:

As the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) proceeds with our environmental review for Southern California Edison (SCE)'s Presidential Substation Project, we have identified additional information required for our analysis of the Proposed Project and alternatives. Please provide the information requested on the pages attached to this letter by June 2, 2009. 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.

Sincerely,

Juralynne Mosley
CPUC CEQA Project Manager
Energy Division

Phone: (415) 703-2210
JBM@cpuc.ca.gov

ESA
Attn: Michael Manka
1425 North McDowell Blvd.
Suite 105
Petaluma, CA 94954
mmanka@esassoc.com

Data Request #3
Presidential Substation Project

Project Description

1. Provide GIS (or equivalent) data layers for the Proposed Project preliminary engineering depicting the existing pole locations and estimated locations of new poles. Distinguish between types of existing poles (i.e., wood, TSP) and new poles (LWS, TSP, dead-end. and riser).
2. Provide GIS (or equivalent) data layers for the Proposed Project preliminary engineering depicting anticipated locations of work areas, pull and tension sites, vault location, vent pipe(s) alignment, underground duct bank alignments and underground conduits/distribution getaways alignments (i.e., to the vault and from the vault to the TSP-Riser and 8700 feet west on Olsen Road to Erbes Road as well as towards the City of Thousand Oaks, and the other towards the City of Simi Valley from the south of the substation site). Also depict the location of the unpaved dirt road which is anticipated to provide access to the distribution circuit between State Highway 23 and the Presidential Substation site (described on page 3-16 of PEA).
3. Provide a written description of construction activities associated with underground duct bank, conduit and getaway installation (trenching). Make sure to include information on depth, length and width of trench ,anticipated cubic yardage of material that would be removed and amount that may require disposal, and amount of any imported backfill. Would conduit always be installed within a duct bank? What is the installation process for installing, conduit or cable (i.e. is conductor pulled through conduit after installation or installed at the same time) from the switchrack to the vault and beyond where required? Update construction equipment table/personnel/emissions and required staff as necessary.
4. Provide typical duct bank block diagram. Include information about conduits and getaways. Describe the termination of the two getaways described as being routed 125 feet south of the substation. Would they connect with existing distribution lines, would a second vault be required? How does the conduit exit the trench? Also, the PEA states that routes have not been determined at this time; however if new distribution routes would be required preliminary routes must be provided for CEQA analysis.
5. The PEA describes constructing one vacant position on the 66 kV switchrack for future use and 15 empty (of the 22 total) positions on the 16 kV switchrack, for ultimate build out. When would ultimate build out be expected and what is involved? Would future use include another 66 kV source line?
6. Provide a profile drawing of the Presidential Substation showing the height above grade for all proposed structures.
7. Has the substation site configuration been changed to address biological habitat impacts, based on recent surveys? If yes provide revised site configuration. Also provide detailed vegetation map in GIS based on recent surveys, if different from PEA data provided previously.
8. SCE previously provided a conceptual grading plan in response to a pre-filing data request. Please provide native files (e.g., CAD or GIS) of the conceptual substation plan drawing so ESA can create a suitable figure for CEQA analysis.
9. Provide EDR reports for Proposed Substation Site and subtransmission routes for hazardous materials analysis.
10. Would any other fences be constructed at the substation besides the chain link fence associated with the construction? If so, provide a description of where it would be installed, what it would it look like, the finished height and the material that it would be made of.
11. Provide a description of what the perimeter wall is anticipated to look like, what type of materials (cinder blocks, concrete, etc.) would be used to construct the wall, what color would the wall be.

12. Provide a preliminary landscaping plan that would be "designed to filter views for the surrounding community and other potential sensitive receptors". Provide details as to anticipated time required for plants to grow to mature heights/widths if mature plants are not proposed in the plan.
13. Regarding irrigation, describe where the water would come from? How would the irrigation system be connected to a water supply, where, what construction would be required for installation? Update construction equipment table/personnel/emissions and required staff as necessary.
14. For the acceleration and deceleration lanes on Olsen Road. How wide would the lane be? Would Olsen Road need to be widened? Describe any construction activities that would need to occur to install/make the acceleration and deceleration lanes on Olsen Road. Any permits required for this component of the Proposed Project? Update construction equipment table/personnel/emissions and required staff as necessary.
15. Provide an updated graphic of the proposed drainage plan. Provide a description of how the plan would be constructed (i.e., installation of culvert to connect to existing storm drain, use of pre-cast or pour in place concrete swales). Explain if and how surrounding hillside run off would be routed differently than substation stormwater run off. Confirm that all drainage (substation site and surrounding hillside) would be routed through the existing 36 inch CSP Culvert under Olsen Road (PEA lists two options). Would the entrances to the drain and culvert be screened? Update construction equipment table/personnel and required staff as necessary. When in the sequencing of work would the drainage plan be implemented?
16. In regard to vault installation, the PEA states, assuming excavated soil is uncontaminated, approximately 80 tons of soil would be extracted. Eighty tons of soil is approximately eight loads with 10-ton dump truck. What would occur if the soil was contaminated? Whether or not the soil is contaminated or uncontaminated, would it be hauled off-site?
17. The PEA states that the vent pipe conduits would be encased. What would it be encased with?
18. The PEA states that transformers would be delivered by heavy-transport vehicles and off-loaded on site by large cranes with support trucks. What about all the other substation facilities (i.e., MEER, lighting, switchracks, etc.)?
19. Describe the activities associated with the relay work at Royal, Thousand Oaks and Moorpark Substation.
20. Pole data in the PEA is inconsistent with pole data provided by SCE. For instance, the pole table shows the removal of removal of 80 wood poles and two TSPs and installation of 45 LWS and 37 TSPs; however the PEA states there would be the removal of 82 wood poles and two TSPs and installation of 44 LWS and 39 TSPs. Please update the pole table and provide written text clarifying this information. Also, when updating the pole table, distinguish between regular TSPs, TSP-Risers and dead-end TSPs. Also update pole table with anticipated maximum height above ground and embedment depth for poles that would be installed for the crossing of Highway 23.
21. For the LWS and TSPs, what type of finish would they have? Dulled, self-weathering (i.e., turns brown over time)?
22. For TSPs, provide the diameter that the poles would generally taper to at the top. Would this be different for dead end or riser poles? If so, provide diameter information.
23. Include a written description of the anticipated radius within which a new pole would be installed relative to the existing poles. Describe the types, approximate number, and size (diameter at breast height [DBH]) of trees that may need to be removed. For removal of trees, distinguish between tree trimming as required under GO-95D and tree removal. Also provide minimum distance of LWS and TSP foundations from the existing road (in other words, how far from the side of the road would the above ground foundations for TSPs or LWS be?).

24. Would pull and tensioning sites be required for this project? If so, provide the area required (X feet by X feet) and a description of the site preparation activities that would occur. Provide information on how far apart they would likely be (e.g., pull and tension sites would be spaced approximately every xx feet).
25. What would the lowest sag elevation be for the conductor? Provide information for both the single-circuit and double-circuit portion of the project.
26. In addition to the subtransmission lines, how many distribution lines and telecommunication lines are expected to be located on the poles?
27. The PEA states that either Moorpark Substation or Pardee Substation would be used as a marshalling yard if feasible. If not feasible SCE, would lease an existing commercial facility approximately 3 acres in size. Provide an approximate location and distance from construction activities of existing commercial facilities that may be used as a marshalling yard.
28. Where would the assembly of the poles take place? If it were to take place within the roadways, what is the area anticipated to be required, what type of traffic controls would be required, etc? If it were to occur off site, how would the poles be transported to the installation site?
29. The PEA states that survey crews would survey the limits of grading for structure excavations. Provide information as to what the approximate limits of grading for structure excavation would be for pole installation. There is discussion of situations where excavation may be required for pole removal; include approximate limits of grading for pole removal as well.
30. The PEA states that excavated material from installation of LWS and TSPs would be distributed at each pole site; does this mean that it could be spread on site? Please clarify.
31. The PEA states that delivery activities requiring major street use would be scheduled to occur during off-peak traffic hours to the extent feasible in accordance with applicable local ordinances. What are the anticipated off peak traffic hours?
32. Provide an approximate location or distance from the Proposed Substation for the source of the fill soil (40,000 cubic yards). Also, what type of testing would be conducted to guarantee the source soil would be uncontaminated?
33. The PEA states that existing paved public roads and unpaved access roads would be used to provide necessary construction access. Are the unpaved access roads public or private?
34. Regarding the unpaved dirt road anticipated to provide access to the distribution circuit between State Highway 23 and the Presidential Substation site, the PEA states the access road would be blade-graded to remove potholes, ruts, and other surface irregularities, sloped to minimize soil erosion, and re-compacted to provide a smooth and dense riding surface capable of supporting heavy construction equipment. Would any soil need to be removed from or added to the site? If so, how much?
35. The PEA states that there is a low spot along the unpaved dirt road (described on page 3-16) that directs storm water from an area north of Olsen Road to the Tierra Rejada Valley and that a wet crossing would be installed in the dirt access road within this low spot to minimize impacts to water quality. Please define wet crossing (i.e., culvert?) and how the wet crossing would be constructed. What BMPs would be implemented during construction, and would there be a timing restriction? Would any permits be required for this component of the Proposed Project? Update construction equipment table/personnel and required staff as necessary.
36. For the Proposed Project, where would the construction workers park their personal cars for the subtransmission line work and for substation work?

37. For construction activities that include excavation, would dewatering be required? If so, describe dewatering activities. Would a gas or electric sump pump be used, a baker tank, where would collected water be discharged, how, etc.?

38. Please clarify the Proposed Construction Timetable provided below. What activities are anticipated to take place in August 2010? Also, update anticipated schedule for clean-up and restoration. Is this anticipated to take place as construction is occurring?

TABLE
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION TIMETABLE

Proposed Project Component	Duration (months)	Estimated Schedule
Construction Begins		August 2010
Subtransmission Construction	9	September 2010-May 2011
Substation Construction	9	September 2010-May 2011
Project Operational		June 1, 2011
Clean Up and Restoration		June 1, 2011

System Configuration

39. SCE previously provided a schematic drawing of the Moorpark system with and without the Presidential Substation Project. Provide additional system information including geographic underlay and system voltages for lines presented. If there are additional lines not represented on the previous schematic please provide.

Operation and Maintenance

40. Describe the minimum vegetation clearing requirements around poles and under the lines.

Alternatives

41. Substation Target Area – As requested via email from Lynne Mosley to SCE on May 8, 2009, provide further clarification on how the Substation Target Area was defined. In particular, can SCE provide technical justification for the geographic extent of the Substation Target Area?

42. Alternative Work Areas – Provided details regarding work areas anticipated for construction of alternative subtransmission routes or the alternative substation site. Would the marshalling yard be the same? Would additional staging areas be required, if yes where?

43. Alternative Substation Site B – Initial site visit discussions described the need to reconfigure the substation design to accommodate the existing topography and layout of Alternative Substation Site B. Please describe any differences in substation component layout and profile that would be required to construct on the Alternative Substation B site. In addition, if any landscape plantings for screening, or perimeter wall construction for the substation would be different than for the Proposed Substation Site, please describe.

44. Alternative Substation Site B – Describe any major grading, filling, or drainage activities required for construction on the Alternative Substation B site. Additionally, it is assumed that all existing buildings would be demolished. Please describe if any existing structures would remain.

45. Alternative Substation Site B – Initial site visit discussions described the site as previously containing underground storage tanks. Provide any available details regarding these tanks (i.e., EDR reports, what did they contain, are they leaking, were any removed, location, etc.)
46. Alternative Subtransmission Routes – Provide estimated locations, distances and widths for new access road requirements. Describe whether newly constructed access roads would be permanent or temporary, and type of construction activities necessary.
47. Alternative Subtransmission Routes – Provide information regarding the locations and size of any anticipated pull and tension sites.
48. Alternative Subtransmission Routes – Confirm that all of the alternative route segments would be composed of single circuit lines (Route Alternatives 1 and 2).
49. Alternative Subtransmission Routes – Provide data in GIS layers for existing and proposed poles including locations, height, and type (LWS, TSP, TSP riser, or TSP dead-end) for each of the alternative routes. Provide estimated span distance requirements. Describe any changes to construction schedule or workforce levels that may be required for each of the alternative routes.
50. Alternative Subtransmission Route 2 (parallel to Olsen and Madera Roads) – Provide GIS data showing approximate locations where additional support mechanisms such as anchors and guy wires would be required.

EMF

51. In the Application, Appendix F, Figures 3 and 7 show calculated magnetic field levels along Read Road. These figures do not appear to take into account the sloped topography. Provide revised figures showing the calculated magnetic field levels, with the sloped topography on the south side of Read Road.