

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



January 25, 2024

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 No. 1**

Dear Mr. Balandran:

Please find attached Data Request No. 1 for the Control-Silver Peak Project. Full responses are requested within two weeks (**due Thursday, February 8<sup>th</sup>, 2024**). However, if any of the responses will take more time, please let us know. We are also available to meet to discuss the request items, if desired.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Eric Chiang".

Eric Chiang  
California Public Utilities Commission

**Data Request No. 1 (January 25, 2024) for SCE's Control Silver Peak Project (A.21-08-009)**

#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page #	Data Request Item	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Follow-Up Request
1	Alternatives – Decommission and Remove 'A' or 'C' Circuit While Making Other Upgrades Alternatives	PEA Sections 4.1.3.3.1 and 4.1.3.3.2, pp. 4-1 to 4-3	<p>For the alternatives involving decommissioning and removing either the 'A' or 'C' circuit and making other upgrades, please confirm/provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For the remaining line to be rebuilt, would all existing poles need to be removed and replaced or could any existing poles remain (while correcting the G.O. 95 clearance discrepancies)?</li> <li>▪ Would the new poles be installed generally proximate to the existing poles in the same alignment (similar to the Proposed Project approach)? Confirm the approximate distance the new poles would be installed from the existing poles?</li> <li>▪ Since the remaining line under these alternatives would stay as a single-circuit, we assume that the new poles for the rebuilt line would be shorter than those proposed for Segment 3 in the Proposed Project. Please confirm that this assumption is correct and provide the height range for the new single-circuit poles. Please also confirm what types of structures these would be and the material (e.g., wood pole-equivalents made of ductile iron, etc.) and diameter. Additionally, provide the pole foundation depth and diameter for the single-circuit pole installation.</li> <li>▪ Under both of these alternatives (i.e., decommission/removal of 'A' or 'C'), the tap-connections to Zack and Deep Springs substations would still need to be remediated, correct? If so, would the scope be the same for Segments 4 and 5 as under the Proposed Project, with the exception of the remote disconnect switches that would need to be installed on each side of the tap connection points, as indicated in the PEA?</li> </ul>	1/25/2024			
2	Alternatives – SCE Version of Hwy 6 Alternative	PEA Section 4.1.9.1, pp. 4-7 to 4-8; and SCE's Response to BLM's Data Request Re: the Hwy 6 Alternative	<p>For the Highway 6 Route Alternative, as described in the PEA and subsequently modified, provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For Segments 6 and 7, which will need to be double-circuit pole lines based on SCE's response to BLM's data request regarding a Highway 6 alternative, will these lines utilize the same types of structures and components as the double-circuit pole lines proposed for Segment 3 in the Proposed Project? If not, please indicate the differences and/or provide the structure information as provided in Table 3.3-2 for these segments, including the estimated number of poles/structures required for the segments.</li> <li>▪ For Segment 4, which will need to be rebuilt into a double-circuit pole line under a Highway 6 Route Alternative per SCE's response to BLM, indicate the types of poles and height range of the existing structures along this segment. Table 3.3-1 in the PEA indicates the existing poles are wood poles ranging from 35 to 47 feet tall, but this is only pertaining to the two poles proposed for removal or modification as part of the Proposed Project. Are the other existing poles within Segment 4 similar?</li> <li>▪ The PEA indicates that the Highway 6 Route Alternative would require installation of a new metering station at either the California/Nevada border, the Zack Substation, or near the Fish Lake Valley North Substation. Please indicate the types of facilities that would comprise the metering station, and provide an estimate of the station footprint (acres).</li> <li>▪ Could you provide the same economic cost estimates for the SCE version of the Highway 6 Alternative as are provided for the BLM-modified version in SCE's response to the BLM data request? The SCE version of the alternative (as described in the PEA) would require less new double-circuit line construction than the BLM-</li> </ul>	1/25/2024			

**Data Request No. 1 (January 25, 2024) for SCE's Control Silver Peak Project (A.21-08-009)**

#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page #	Data Request Item	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Follow-Up Request
			modified version (e.g., nearly all of Segment 3 would be removed and not rebuilt); however, it would require the DER systems at White Mountain and Deep Springs substations, which SCE estimates will cost \$10M and \$12M, respectively. We're wondering how the alternative compares overall in terms of cost.				
3	Alternatives – BLM Modified Hwy 6 Alternative	SCE's Response to BLM's Data Request Re: the Hwy 6 Alternative	<p>Please provide answers to the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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?</li> <li>▪ 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?</li> <li>▪ 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?</li> </ul>	1/25/2024			
4	Alternatives – Rebuild Existing Single-Circuit Pole Lines Alternative	PEA Section 4.1.10.1, pp. 4-8 to 4-9	<p>Regarding the Rebuild Existing Single-Circuit Pole Lines Alternative, described in the PEA, please provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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?</li> <li>▪ 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?</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>	1/25/2024			

**Data Request No. 1 (January 25, 2024) for SCE's Control Silver Peak Project (A.21-08-009)**

#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page #	Data Request Item	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Follow-Up Request
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>				
5	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	PEA Section 3.5.5.1.3, p. 3-35	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Confirm that there is no removal of gas insulated switches containing SF6. If there is removal, we need to know for existing setting the amount of SF6 in these and plan for recovery/disposal of these. It was only stated that there will be no new switches.</li> <li>2. For the concrete batch plant, what is the volume of material that will be processed so that emissions can be estimated. Will the concrete batch plant include any PM controls such as filters or baghouses?</li> <li>3. Will there be any generators used, if so size and hours of use?</li> </ol>	1/25/2024			
6	Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Emission	PEA Appendix B and L	<p>There were several discrepancies between the equipment parameters in Appendix B (Emissions Calculations) and Appendix L (Vehicle Miles Traveled Calculations) in the PEA, as follows. Please clarify which are correct. For Off-Road Equipment – all number of hours, horsepower, and load factors were consistent except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guard Structure Install/Removal Phase:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Backhoe/Front Loader listed 350 HP in Appendix L and 125 HP in Appendix B</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Fish Lake Civil 21a Phase               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cranes listed 250 HP in Appendix L and 300 HP in Appendix B</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	1/25/2024			