

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



March 15, 2012

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 #8 for the Southern California Edison 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 (Proposed Project), we have identified additional information required in order to complete the Final EIR for the Proposed Project. Please provide the information requested below (Data Request #8) by April 2, 2012. Please submit your response in hardcopy and electronic format to me and also directly to our environmental consultant, ESA, at the physical 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 200
Petaluma, CA 94954
mmanka@esassoc.com

Data Request #8 Presidential Substation Project

1. Provide substation single line drawings and substation layout diagrams for the following substations:
 - Royal
 - Potrero
 - Thousand Oaks
 - Presidential
2. Provide subtransmission and distribution conductor rating data associated with each of the above noted substations in Item 1.
3. Please confirm (or correct) the following transformer ratings parameters as they apply to the current SCE standard 66/16 kV transformer.
 - Base rating, 55 degree C rise, 15 MVA.
 - Top nameplate rating, 65 degree C rise with one stage of fans, 28 MVA.
 - PLL rating, 65 degree C rise with four stages of fans and low 5% impedance, 36.4 MVA (130% of Top nameplate rating).
 - Emergency rating, 145% of Top nameplate rating, 40.6 MVA.
4. Describe the criteria used to determine which substations were included in the ENA versus which substations providing load (as described in the revised load forecast) into the proposed Presidential Substation Project were not included in the ENA (Santa Susana, Newbury, Oak Park).
5. If an alternative was developed to address only the forecast load growth generated from within the ENA, describe the load impacts on those substations outside the ENA (Santa Susana, Newbury, Oak Park), which have been identified under the revised load forecast as rolling significant load into the Proposed Presidential Substation. This alternative would assume that there would not be capacity within the ENA substations to accommodate load rolling from outside the ENA.