Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 01/29/13

DG#	Resource Area / Topic	Source / PEA Page	Data Gap Question	Request Date	Reply Date	Status	Notes
1.16.2.1	Biological Resources, Project Description	Response 1.16.2	1. The final SKR take agreement (Exhibit B) provided appears to include substantially larger disturbance areas for the proposed Alberhill System Project than accounted for in the data provided by SCE for the CEQA EIR. Refer to the Exhibit B pages demarked and attached as examples (Exhibit B pages 1 to 5 and 12). Explain the discrepancies. 2. Define the term *NAP* used in the legend of Exhibit B. 3. Explain why page 8 of 12 is included with Exhibit B. There are no project components identified in the EIR in this area. 4. Confirm that the disturbance area along the proposed 500-kV ROWs would be no more than 300-feet wide. The CPUC assumed a 300-foot disturbance width along the proposed 500-kV ROWs during construction to ensure space required for crane pads, as needed. 5. Confirm that the disturbance area along each of the 115-kV routes would be no more than 100-feet wide. In Exhibit B areas where the disturbance exceeds 100 feet along the 115-kV routes, confirm whether the disturbance would be outside the existing ROW for the proposed 115-kV subtransmission line routes. It is the CPUC's understanding that land would not be disturbed outside existing 115-kV ROWs. Impact analyses for the EIR were written with the assumption, for example, that pull sites could occur anywhere within the existing 115-kV ROWs. No assumptions were made that would allow for pull sites or other types of work sites to be set up outside of existing 115-kV ROWs except at the staging areas identified by SCE and evaluated in the Traffic Impact Analysis. 6. Where the disturbance areas delineated in Exhibit B of the final take agreement include pull sites or other types of work areas, identify these locations as such for analysis in the EIR and provide GIS data with corresponding, labeled data attributes. 7. Note that the CPUC may request that SCE update the disturbance area data provided in the PEA and updated by subsequent SCE data submittals for the CEQA EIR to match the disturbance areas delineated in Exhibit B of the final take agreement or per SCE's response to this data request (1.16.2.1). The CPUC may also request that SCE provide GIS data for all of the disturbance areas identified in Exhibit B of the final take agreement..	01/29/13		New	Attachment: Exhibit B mark up (Alberhill only)
1.16.2.2	Biological Resources, Project Description	Response 1.16.2	Confirm (and provide documentation) that the USFWS and CDFW (formerly CDFG) have both signed off on the final SKR take agreement (signed by the RCHCA in October 2012). The USFWS and CDFW letters provided are dated in May and June 2012, prior to the date that the final SKR take agreement was completed and submitted to the RCHCA.	01/29/13		New	

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 01/29/13

12.1.3	Purpose and Need, Valley South Demand	Data Response 12.1.2	For the Valley South 115-kV System, provide the recorded peak demand in megavolt amperes for 2012 and update the attached table through 2022.	01/29/13		New	Attachment: SCE Load Data 2012-2021
12.1.4	Purpose and Need, Valley South Demand	Data Response 12.1.2	Confirm that the need date estimated for an operational Alberhill System Project is now June 2016.	01/29/13		New	
~~14.12.1~~	~~Project Description~~	~~Response to Data Request 14.12~~	~~The CPUC expects a complete response to the following data requests within 10 business days (by 12/5/12) and, depending on the contents of the response, may request a follow-up call with SCE.~~ ~~1a. Explain to what extent the proposed Alberhill Substation would be useful without completion of the Valley–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line. It is not clear to the CPUC if or how operation of Alberhill Substation would be limited if the proposed substation is completed prior to construction of the double-circuit and single-circuit sections of the Valley–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line that would connect to Alberhill Substation (i.e., three of the five 115-kV lines initially proposed to exit the substation).~~ ~~1b. It is the CPUC's understanding that to create and separate the proposed Alberhill 115-kV System from the Valley South 115-kV System, an operational Valley–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line is required. Discuss this assumption, and provide a system diagram similar to the attached for the scenario under which the proposed Alberhill Substation is operational, and Valley–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line has not been completed.~~ ~~1c. Without an operational Valley–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line, which substations, if any, could be transferred to the proposed Alberhill Substation, and which substations would remain connected to Valley Substation?~~ ~~2a. Define and clearly explain the current operating status of Fogarty Substation. It is the CPUC's understanding that Fogarty Substation is operational but either not fully energized or not currently capable of serving all of the loads for which it was designed.~~ ~~2b. Discuss the effect on Fogarty Substation's operational status resulting from the lack of an operational Valley–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line.~~ ~~3. Confirm that modifications to the Fogarty–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line are expected to be proposed in 2013. It is the CPUC's understanding that construction work on this segment of the Valley–Elsinore–Fogarty–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line is not part of the Valley–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line Project.~~	~~11/28/12~~	~~None~~	Withdrawn	Data request withdrawn by the CPUC.
14.12.2	Project Description	Response to Data Request 14.12	4a. System diagrams submitted by SCE for the Alberhill System Project confirm that five 115-kV lines would exit the proposed Alberhill Substation. Two would go to Ivyglen Substation, two would go south toward Elsinore Substation and Skylark Substation, and one would head	11/28/12 and 01/29/13		Outstanding	Two attached figures

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 01/29/13

			in the direction of Valley Substation. Refer to the attached figure (labeled 2-7a), which was created based on GIS data provided by SCE. Confirm that the existing (green) single-circuit 115-kV Valley–Elsinore–Ivyglen line is shown on the wrong side of the road immediately south of the proposed Alberhill Substation site. 4b. In addition to the two poles proposed on each side of the I-15 crossing located immediately southwest of the proposed Alberhill Substation site, describe reconductoring (if any) that would occur across I-15 at this location. Would a double-circuit 115-kV line be installed (i.e., reconductoring) across I-15 at this location as part of the Alberhill System Project that would replace a segment of the single-circuit 115-kV line? It is the CPUC's understanding that the two poles would be installed as part of the Alberhill System Project and not as part of Valley–Ivyglen line construction. If not, please explain. See also Alberhill PEA p. 3-11, which states that the modification of existing 115-kV facilities would include replacing two existing poles with new poles at an existing I-15 freeway crossing. 4c. Depending on the response to Data Request 4b, it may be necessary update the visual simulation provided by SCE (see attached) 4d. Confirm whether the black-and-white dashed line adjacent to the proposed Alberhill Substation's southern boundary should be listed as a double-circuit 115-kV line or whether a segment of the existing (green) single-circuit 115-kV Valley–Elsinore–Ivyglen line would be reconductored to have two circuits from Alberhill Substation southwest and across I-15.				
14.12.3	Project Description	Response to Data Request 14.12, 12/21/12 Meeting at CPUC	Discuss SCE's current plans and timing for next steps associated with construction of the Valley–Ivyglen 115-kV Subtransmission Line and Fogarty Substation Project.	01/29/13		New	
14.12.4	Project Description, Biological Resources	12/21/12 Meeting at CPUC	1. It was unclear after the CPUC's 12/21/12 meeting with SCE how Castle & Cooke permitting relates to SCE permitting. Discuss the relationship of Castle & Cooke permitting to SCE permitting for work on Castle & Cooke land for Alberhill System Project 115-kV Segment 2 (along Lake Street; see attached figure). 2. Clarify how Castle & Cooke permitting for SKR take would or could apply to SCE SKR take permitting. 3. Provide further timing details about Castle & Cooke's permitting schedule for areas along Alberhill System Project 115-kV Segment 2.	01/29/13		New	Attachment: "14.12.4 115-kV Segments_Draft.jpg"

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 01/29/13

14.13.1	Project Description	Response to Data Request 14.13, 12/21/12 Meeting at CPUC	1. Please review the initial draft project description EIR sections (attached) that describe work that would be conducted within and near the Lake Mathews/Estelle Mountain Reserve Core Reserve. For context, additional draft text was also provided. Please review this text and provide revisions as necessary. Relevant initial draft project description figures were also provided for review. Note that areas highlighted in green in the attached initial draft project description document indicate that the text was flagged specifically for SCE review. All revisions to the attached initial draft project description are requested in track changes. 2. Ensure that the following data, among others identified by SCE, are provided or confirmed by SCE's review of the attached documents: 2a. Lengths of the two proposed transmission lines are 1.6 miles and 1.7 miles. 2b. No additional towers are now planned "space reserved" for additional towers near the Alberhill Substation. The current design is for two double-circuit towers at 500-kV tower sites VA1 and SA1 (Figure 2-5, attached). 2c. The full extents of all areas where Core Reserve and BLM land access may be require have been specified (i.e., areas near the proposed sites for 500-kV towers SA6 and VA6 and existing 500-kV tower sites M13-T4, M13-T3, and M13-T2). 2d. Two or more Core Reserve access days would be required for grounding (and removing grounds) in addition to the two Core Reserve access days required for snubbing (one to install and one to remove snubs) depending on when the proposed 500-kV tower foundations would be constructed. 2e. Between one and two conductor phases (bundles with two conductors per bundle) would be installed to towers M14-T2, M14-T1, M13-T3, and M13-T2 and the proposed 500-kV towers VA6 and SA6. Multiple towers would be used for snubbing to ensure that the weight of the conductors does not damage any of the towers along the 500-kV transmission line. Conductor would also be snubbed as needed to the other proposed 500-kV towers (SA1 to SA5 and VA1 to VA5) as needed during	01/29/13		New	Attachments: initial draft project description sections: 2.2.2, 2.3.5, and 2.3.6; initial draft figures 2-5, 2-6, and 2-8

Alberhill System Project Data Gap Requests 01/29/13

			conductor and overhead ground wire installation from the proposed substation, upslope, to the Serrano–Valley 500-kV Transmission Line. 2f. Access to the Core Reserve for snubbing would be required twice: first to snub the conductors and overhead ground wire and then to remove the snubs. Snubbing would take approximately one workday. Snub removal would also take approximately one workday. The 500-kV transmission line would be grounded for the duration of the snubbing period. Once snubbed, the conductor and overhead ground wire snubs would not be removed until conductor and overhead ground wire installation for proposed 500-kV Line SA and 500-kV Line VA is completed. 2g. The applicant estimates that the Serrano–Valley 500-kV Transmission would be de-energized for a minimum of 14 days to install the proposed 500-kV conductor and overhead ground wires. The maximum length of the electrical outage would be determined by the California Independent System Operator. 3. Describe *slack spanning* and how the technique would apply to wire stringing for the proposed 500-kV transmission line alignments. It is the CPUC's understanding that to avoid or minimize locating equipment within the Lake Mathews/Estelle Mountain Core Reserve or on land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, *slack spanning* would be required.				
14.13.2	Project Description	Response to Data Request 14.13, 12/21/12 Meeting at CPUC	Confirm that work within the Core Reserve would only occur during daylight hours and that no work would occur within 30 minutes of sunset or 30 minutes of sunrise within the Core Reserve including work that requires the use of vehicles or equipment that may be partially located within the Core Reserve except during emergency conditions.	01/29/13		New	
14.13.3	Project Description	Response to Data Request 14.13, 12/21/12 Meeting at CPUC	Provide documentation that confirms the RCHCA will approve access to towers within the Core Reserve for grounding and wire snubbing.	01/29/13		New	