

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



February 28, 2025

Mr. David Balandran
Regulatory Affairs – Infrastructure Programs & Projects
Southern California Edison
8631 Rush St.
Rosemead, CA 91770

Subject: Southern California Edison’s Control-Silver Peak Project (A.21-08-009) – Data Request and Proponent’s Environmental Assessment Follow-up

Dear Mr. Balandran:

As indicated in a separate letter, dated February 21, 2025, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has rescinded the outstanding items under Data Request No. 2 related to engineering designs and survey information for the Highway 6 Alternative. While Southern California Edison (SCE) does not need to produce the originally requested outstanding (rescinded) items – the CPUC has several clarifying or follow-up questions regarding the Data Request No. 2 items that were responded to in early January 2025. Additionally, the CPUC has questions regarding information in the Proponent’s Environmental Assessment (PEA), which is relevant to the analyses currently being conducted for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Please see the questions below.

1. Would the work at the Fish Lake Valley Metering Station under the Highway 6 Alternative (as described in response to DR #2, question 01, page 4) change for the PEA version, where Segment 3 would be removed?
2. SCE previously estimated the power need for the customer load served out of Deep Springs Substation at 0.2 MVA (compared to 0.1 MVA for the White Mountain Substation). In the latest response, however (response to DR #2, question 01), SCE states that the load out of Deep Springs Substation is ten times greater than that out of White Mountain Substation. Can you explain this discrepancy and what is the current load forecast for the two substations?
3. Is wind generation a potentially viable option at the White Mountain Substation and/or Deep Springs Substation? (see response to DR #2, question 01, page 3). If so, how big or how many turbines would be needed? What would the footprint of the turbine towers be approximately?

4. In the revised version of Table 3.5-5 provided in response to DR #2, question 13, it seems that new total number of pull boxes outside substations should be 11 (instead of 5). Please confirm.
5. Based on the response to DR #2 (question 01), it seems the preferred approach is to supply the communication facilities currently served by White Mountain Substation with a 12 kV distribution line installed through Silver Canyon – is that correct? Would new poles be installed along Silver Canyon or could the existing 55 kV poles be utilized?
6. In the response to DR #2, question 1, g., no changes were listed for Deep Springs Substation. Does this indicate that the modifications to Deep Springs Substation would be the same as the Proposed Project, or would equipment need to be updated to 115 kV?
7. Clarify the cost estimate provided in response to DR #2, question 02. The numbers don't add up to the \$690M total – rather, I calculated \$674 assuming the substation construction costs are additional.
8. In the response to DR #2, question 12, with respect to Undergrounding Alternative, it is stated that the number of pulling structures would increase due to increased number of vertical and horizontal bends required to follow the terrain. Are these the same as splicing vaults?
9. The PEA states in Sections 5.10 and 5.19 that approximately 1,200 acre-feet of water would be required during the construction period. This seems like a lot and could equate to a large number of truck trips assuming water would be trucked to the site along much of the alignment. Could you confirm this amount (what uses specifically during construction) and describe how water would be obtained and transported to the site?
10. Could you confirm the amount/weight of soil that could be removed and potentially disposed of due to pole installation? Assuming holes are dug to the maximum depth and radius for poles, as indicated in PEA Table 3.3-2, and that soil has a weight of 81 pounds per cubic foot, Montrose calculated that 8.5 tons of earth could be removed during the installation process. Please confirm whether these are reasonable assumptions or provide an alternative estimate.

The CPUC requests that a response to this data request be provided within a few weeks.

If there are any questions regarding the contents of this letter, please don't hesitate to reach out to me.

Regards,



Eric Chiang
California Public Utilities Commission