## Southern California Edison

## A.23-04-009 - TLRR EPL

# DATA REQUEST SET ED-S CE-E PL-0 03 

To: Energy Division<br>Prepared by: Danielle Ferralez<br>Job Title: Environmental Project Manager<br>Received Date: 12/12/2023

Response Date: 12/27/2023

## Question DR3-2:

Issue: Within the revised Health Risk Assessment memo, Tables 1 and 2 and supporting text changes have been updated correctly. However, the updates to Table 3 (values associated with Lugo 1) seem to be incorrect. The provided AERSCREEN files for Lugo 1 (entitled ED-SCE-EPL-002-HRA-Lugo 1 AERSCREEN Results v2.xls) reported a maximum modeled 1-hour concentration at 120 meters of $1,950 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ (which equates to a maximum modeled annual concentration of 195 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ and an annual DPM concentration at the maximally exposed individual receptor of 0.00480 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ instead of $0.00523 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ ). Therefore, the values in Table 3 for Lugo 1 would be 1.67 and 0.0297 for MICR for sensitive and worker receptors, respectively, and 0.000959 for chronic impacts.

How to Address: Provide update to Table 3 results for Lugo 1 or an explanation why a different value from the AERSCREEN files for Lugo 1 was used.

## Response to Question DR3-2:

AERSCREEN models the maximum 1-hour concentration at various receptor distances, with the first distance listed in the output file being the closest receptor. AERSCREEN allows the user to select the closest receptor distance and then automatically calculates the 1 -hour concentration at 25meter intervals, up to a specified maximum distance. Note that the closest receptor is not necessarily the maximally exposed individual receptor. The maximally exposed individual receptor for the Lugo 1 staging yard as provided in the ED-SCE-EPL-002-HRA-Lugo 1 AERSCREEN Results v2.xls is located at 205 meters and has a maximum 1-hour concentration of $2,131.2 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$, which is the concentration used to calculate the MICR of 1.83 and 0.03 in a million for sensitive and worker receptors, respectively, and 0.001 for chronic impacts. Using the 1 -hour concentration at 205 meters is appropriate, as there are receptors located at that distance from the Lugo 1 staging yard.

While checking the AERSCREEN results in the "ED-SCE-EPL-002-HRA-Lugo 1 AERSCREEN Results v2.xls" file, we noticed that Excel appears to have rounded some of the results, resulting in a slight discrepancy in the 1 -hour concentrations used in the Lugo 1 calculations. We have attached an updated version of the "ED-SCE-EPL-002-HRA-Lugo 1 AERSCREEN Results v2.xls" file that displays the unrounded values.
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## Question DR3-3:

Issue: The information provided in Appendix B of the revised Health Risk Assessment memo does not correspond to the values in Table 3. Table 3 is correct (except as noted previously for Lugo 1) and the information within Appendix B needs to be properly updated and correspond to Table 3. For example, Table 3 reports a MICR for sensitive and worker receptors of 1.29 and 0.023 , respectively, and 0.000724 for chronic impacts for Bear Valley. However, Appendix B displays a MICR for sensitive and worker receptors of 0.660 and 0.00918 , respectively, and 0.000724 for chronic impacts for Bear Valley.

Attached are verification calculations for comparison. An older version of Appendix B may have been included within the revised Health Risk Assessment memo.

How to Address: Provide update to Appendix B with calculated values which correspond to Table 3.


Lugo 1 Staging Area


| Project: | SCE Eldorado-Pisgah-Lugo 220-kV TLRR Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | December 4, 2023 |
| Staging Area: | Lugo 1 |
| Receptor | Residence |


|  | Daily inhalation | Annual DPM | Exposure | Daily Breathing Rates | Exposure | fraction of time |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age Range | Dose | Concentration (ug/m3) | Duration | (L/kg-day) | Factor | at home | Cancer Risk | 9.59E-04 Chronic Hazard Impact |
| Third Trimester | $1.66 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00480 | 0.25 | 361 | 10.0 | 1.00 | 0.07 | 1 Significance Threshold |
| 0 to <2 yrs | 5.01E+06 | 0.00480 | 1 | 1,090 | 10.0 | 1.00 | 0.79 | No Significant? |
| 0 to <2 yrs | $5.01 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00480 | 1 | 1,090 | 10.00 | 1.00 | 0.79 |  |
| 2 to<16 yrs | $2.63 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0.00480 | 0.25 | 572 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 0.03 | 1.67 Cancer Risk <br> 10 Significance Threshold <br> No Significant? |


| 5 Chronic Reference Exposure Level ( $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{m} 3$ ) for DPM <br> 1.1 Cancer Potency Slope Factor (cancer risk per $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$-day) for DPM <br> 250 days per year <br> 25,550 days per lifetime | Project: <br> Date: <br> Staging Area: <br> Receptor | SCE Eldorado-Pisgah-Lugo 220-kV TLRR Project <br> December 4, 2023 <br> Lugo 1 <br> Worker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  Daily inhalation Annual DPM Exposure Daily Breathing Rates  <br> Age Range Dose Concentration (ug/m3) Duration (L/kg-day)  <br> 16 to $<70$ yrs $7.56 \mathrm{E}+05$ 0.00480 2.5  230 | Exposure fraction of time <br> Factor at home <br> 1.0 1.00 | Cancer Risk 9.59E-04 Chronic Hazard Impact <br> 1 Significance Threshold  <br> No Significant?  <br>   <br>  2.97E-02 Cancer Risk <br> 10 Significance Threshold  <br>  No Significant? |


| th Risk Assessment Assumptions |  |  |  |  | go 2 Staging Area |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 Chronic Reference Exposure Level ( $\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{m3}$ ) for DPM <br> 1.1 Cancer Potency Slope Factor (cancer risk per $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$-day) for DPM <br> 350 days per year <br> 25,550 days per lifetime |  |  |  |  | Project: SCE Eldorado-Pisgah-Lugo 220-kV TLRR Project <br> Date: December 4, 2023 <br> Staging Area: Lugo 2 <br> Receptor Residence |  |  |  |
| Age Range <br> Third Trimester <br> 0 to $<2$ yrs <br> 0 to $<2$ yrs <br> 2 to $<16$ yrs | inhalation <br> Dose <br> 4. $29 \mathrm{E}+05$ <br> 1.30E+06 <br> 1.30E+06 <br> $6.80 \mathrm{E}+05$ | Annual DPM Concentration (ug/m3) 0.00124 0.00124 0.00124 0.00124 | Exposure Duration $\begin{array}{r} 0.25 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0.25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Daily Breathing Rates } \\ \text { (L/kg-day) } \\ \\ \\ \\ 1,090 \\ 1,090 \\ \\ 572 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Exposure Factor 10.0 10.0 10.00 3.00 | fraction of time at home $\begin{aligned} & 1.00 \\ & 1.00 \\ & 1.00 \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | Cancer Risk 0.02 0.20 0.20 0.01 | 2.48E-04 Chronic Hazard Impact <br> 1 Significance Threshold No Significant? <br> 0.43 Cancer Risk 10 Significance Threshold No Significant? |
| $\begin{array}{r} 1.1 \\ 250 \\ 25,550 \end{array}$ | th Risk Asse <br> nic Referen er Potency per year per lifetime | sment Assumptions <br> Exposure Level (ug/m3) <br> ope Factor (cancer risk pe | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{or} \mathrm{DPM} \\ & \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} \text {-day) } \end{aligned}$ | r DPM |  | Project: <br> Date: <br> Staging Area: <br> Receptor | SCE Eldorado-Pis <br> December 4, 202 <br> Lugo 2 <br> Worker | ugo 220-kV TLRR Project |
| Age Range 16 to $<70$ yrs | inhalation Dose $1.95 \mathrm{E}+05$ | Annual DPM Concentration (ug/m3) 0.00124 | Exposure <br> Duration $2.5$ | Daily Breathing Rates (L/kg-day) | Exposure Factor 1.0 | fraction of time at home 1.00 | Cancer Risk 0.0077 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.48E-04 Chronic Hazard Impact } \\ & \text { 1 Significance Threshold } \\ & \text { No Significant? } \\ & \text { 7.67E-03 Cancer Risk } \\ & 10 \text { Significance Threshold } \\ & \text { No Significant? } \end{aligned}$ |

## Response to Question DR3-3:

A previous version of Appendix B was inadvertently attached to the revised Health Risk Assessment memo. The correct revised version of Appendix B is attached.

