

Southern California Edison
A.21-08-009 – TLRR CSP PTC

DATA REQUEST SET C P U C - S C E - C S P P - 0 0 1

To: CPUC
Prepared by: David Balandran
Job Title: Sr Advisor
Received Date: 1/25/2024

Response Date: 2/8/2024

Question 003:

Please provide answers to the following questions:

- A. On page 4 of SCE’s response, it states: “BLM’s Hwy 6 Alternative, when more accurately described, requires the construction of approximately 97 miles of double-circuit 55 kV lines, which is 64 miles longer than the approximately 33 miles of line construction identified in the Proposed Project.” This seems to be based on the lengths of Segment 4 (16 miles), Segment 6 (21 miles), and Segment 7 (60 miles), which add up to 97 miles. However, wouldn’t there also be double-circuit line construction for the portions of Segment 3 that would still be constructed (i.e., from the terminus of Segment 2 to the White Mountain Substation, and from the Deep Springs Tap to Fish Lake Valley Metering Station) under the BLM Highway 6 Alternative?
- B. If the answer to the question above is yes, and the BLM-modified Highway 6 Alternative would involve more than 64 additional miles of double-circuit construction, relative to the Proposed Project, would this affect the cost estimates provided on pages 5 to 6 in the response document? In other words, would the cost estimates need to be adjusted upwards?
- C. For the BLM-modified version of the Highway 6 Alternative, please describe the scope of work at the White Mountain and Deep Springs substations. Would the work at these substations be the same as the Proposed Project, or would anything be different?

Response to Question 003:

All alternatives that require re-routing of the lines via CA Highway 6 and/or Nevada Highway 264 more than double the linear circuit mileage of the Project. SCE’s analysis concluded that it would be infeasible to electrically operate 55 kV circuitry effectively over that distance without causing severe voltage and power quality issues. Therefore, SCE has concluded that due to the additional length of the Highway 6 alternatives (PEA and BLM), these alternatives are infeasible.

A. Under the BLM’s-modified Highway 6 Route Alternative, part of Segment 3 (from Terminus of Segment 2 to the Zack Tap) would be rebuilt as a double-circuit line. The remaining portions of Segment 3 (from Zack tap to White Mountain Substation and Deep Springs Tap to Fish Lake Valley Metering Station) would be rebuilt as a single-circuit 55kV pole line. Therefore the single circuit 55kV pole lines were not included as part of the 97 miles of double circuit construction.

B. There would not be more than 64 miles of double circuit construction since these portions would be rebuilt as a single circuit, as described in part A above. Therefore, the cost estimate does not need to be adjusted.

C. The scope of work for White Mountain and Deep Springs substations under the BLM-modified Highway 6 Route alternative provided in response to the BLM request would not be exactly the same, but is expected to be similar to the Proposed Project. Detailed engineering would have to be completed to identify the similarities and differences between the BLM and PEA alternatives.