

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

**DATA REQUEST SET CPUC - SCE - CSPP - 001**

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

**Response Date: 2/8/2024**

---

**Question 004:**

Regarding the Rebuild Existing Single-Circuit Pole Lines Alternative, described in the PEA, please provide the following:

- Please provide the height range, pole type, and material for the single-circuit subtransmission structures along Segment 3 under this alternative. The PEA indicates that the existing poles within this segment range from 24 to 63 tall, but what would be the height range of the new poles, since the single-circuit lines would still need to be rebuilt to address the G.O. 95 discrepancies?
- Additionally, please estimate the number of new poles/structures that would be required for Segment 3 under this alternative. Would the new poles be spaced further apart than the existing poles, or would the poles/structures be replaced on essentially a one-to-one basis?
- Would the single-circuit poles proposed for Segment 3 be the same as those for Segments 4 and 5 under the Proposed Project? If not, please provide the pole diameter, foundation depth, and foundation diameter.
- Please provide a rough cost comparison between this alternative and the Proposed Project. Since more poles would need to be installed under the alternative (i.e., two single-circuit pole lines), it seems that it could be more expensive; however, please confirm.
- Additionally, indicate/confirm whether this alternative would involve a greater overall amount of construction activity relative to the Proposed Project, due to the need to install more new poles.

**Response to Question 004:**

Rebuilding the existing single-circuit pole lines would be more environmentally impactful than the Proposed Project. The Rebuild Existing Single-Circuit Pole Lines Alternative would rebuild two separate pole lines – with one circuit on each pole line. This would require twice the amount of poles as the single pole line included in the Proposed Project. The Rebuild Existing Single-Circuit Pole Lines Alternative would require roughly double the amount of construction activity due to the additional number of poles, work locations to install those additional poles and additional work activity and lands disturbance associated with the additional poles.

A. The Rebuild Existing Single-Circuit Pole Lines Alternative would utilize similar pole types and heights as those proposed to be used in Segment 3 of the Proposed Project.

B. The number of new poles/structures needed for the Rebuild Existing Single-Circuit Pole Lines Alternative would be approximately equal to the number of poles that currently exist. SCE anticipates that spacing would be generally similar due to varying terrain (both vertically and horizontally) through the canyons, but would not know for certain until final engineering is completed.

C. The single-circuit poles that would be used for Segments 4 & 5 would be the same as those used in Segment 3 of the Proposed Project.

D. Further cost analysis would be necessary to provide an accurate cost estimate; however SCE believes that this alternative would be more expensive than the Proposed Project due to the cost of the additional infrastructure (twice the number of poles) and the additional labor required to build a separate pole line.

E. The Rebuild Existing Single-Circuit Pole Lines Alternative would likely require a greater overall amount of construction activity relative to the Proposed Project. Detailed engineering would be required to obtain the pole counts for both the Proposed Project as well as the Rebuild Existing Single Circuit Pole Lines Alternative. However, SCE expects that the same number of poles would need to be replaced; which is twice the number of poles needed to construct to the Proposed Project. In addition to pole replacements, this alternative would require installation of new conductor and associated infrastructure. These activities would result in greater overall construction activity as compared to the Proposed Project.