

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

Edmund G. Brown Jr., *Governor*



July 22, 2015

Susan Nelson, Project Manager  
Regulatory Affairs Department  
Southern California Edison  
8631 Rush Street, General Office 4 – G10Q (Ground Floor)  
Rosemead, CA 91770

**Re: Data Request No. 2 for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project (CPUC Proceeding A. 15-03-003)**

Ms. Nelson:

Upon further review of Southern California Edison's Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project, the Energy Division requests the information contained in Attachment 1 to this letter. In an effort to expedite scheduling per SCE's request, we request that the responses to this item be provided to us within 14 days.

The Energy Division reserves the right to request additional information at any point in the process. Questions relating to the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project should be directed to me at (415) 703-1966 or [lisa.orsaba@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:lisa.orsaba@cpuc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

*MJ Orsaba*

Lisa Orsaba,  
California Public Utilities Commission  
Energy Division

CC: Nicolas Sher, CPUC Legal Division  
Shanna Foley, CPUC Legal Division  
Claire Hodgkins, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

Attachment 1: Data Request #2

Item #	Reference/ Page #	Title	Request
DR#2 Q.01	PEA, 4.4 Biology	<b>Section 408 consultation</b>	<p>The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has informed the CPUC that SCE will need permission under Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 408, "Section 408") for work conducted in the Whittier Narrows Recreation Area. Please provide the following information regarding Section 408 consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Status of Section 408 consultation with the USACE</li> <li>B. Anticipated timeline to obtain permission under Section 408</li> <li>C. Potential impacts to SCE's proposed construction schedule, including the construction start date</li> </ul>
DR#02 Q.02	PEA page 4.4-60, footnote 16	<b>Acreage Calculations— California Coastal Gnatcatcher Habitat</b>	The Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) states that the Monterey Park Market Place EIR found that there would be permanent impacts to gnatcatcher habitat, but review of the Monterey Park Market Place EIR does not support this assertion. Confirm that acreage calculations for areas of impact to gnatcatcher habitat (designated critical habitat and non-designated habitat) assume current baseline conditions.
DR#02 Q.03	PEA, 5.0 Alternatives	<b>Connection of Additional 220-kV</b>	Describe the function served by connecting the Goodrich–Laguna Bell and Laguna Bell–Rio Hondo 220-kV transmission lines to the Mesa Substation.
DR#02 Q.04	PEA, 5.0 Alternatives	<b>Remedial Actions to Address N-1-1 Scenario</b>	The NERC reliability standards call for a study of a second outage after a major outage (N-1-1). Remedial actions are permitted for the second contingency, up to and including load dropping. What remedial actions—including load dropping—would SCE implement to address the second outages described in the PEA and subsequent studies?
DR#02 Q.05	PEA, 5.0 Alternatives	<b>No Project Alternative— Energy Import</b>	If the project were not implemented, describe whether or not SCE would be able to import additional energy to its service area from the Tehachapi Wind Resource area, PG&E service area, and Pacific Northwest through the 500-kV bulk system.
DR#02 Q.06	PEA, 5.0 Alternatives	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<p>Please describe what actions SCE would take should the proposed project not be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Would SCE implement system-level actions and/or other modifications at the Mesa Substation?</li> <li>B. If SCE could not pursue other actions to address voltage performance, describe the outcome in terms of reliability.</li> </ul>

DR#02 Q.07	PEA, 5.0 Alternatives	<b>Reduced Project Alternative</b>	<p>The CPUC is requesting data related to a potential alternative that would involve implementation of a reduced project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Has SCE considered, as an alternative to the proposed project, upgrading the existing 220-kV substation to 500 kV through implementing all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installing one set of 500-kV transformer banks initially</li> <li>• Planning several locations for more transformer banks</li> <li>• Retaining the existing 220-kV substation facility</li> <li>• Adding, if necessary, a fault reduction scheme</li> </ul> </li> <li>B. If this set of actions has been considered and rejected, please provide the rationale for eliminating this alternative.</li> <li>C. Describe the remaining operational life of the current Mesa Substation.</li> <li>D. If the current substation was left operating, what actions, if any, would SCE take to extend its operational life?</li> <li>E. Describe how long one transformer bank would meet reliability needs under the relevant reliability standards.</li> </ul>
DR#02 Q.08	PEA, 5.0 Alternatives	<b>Additional Reactive Support Alternative</b>	<p>The CPUC is requesting data related to a potential alternative that would involve installing additional reactive support at other SCE substations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Has SCE considered installing additional capacitors or a static var compensator at the Barre Substation?</li> <li>B. If this alternative has been considered, please provide the rationale as to why this alternative was rejected.</li> <li>C. Please describe if it is technically feasible to install additional capacitors or a static var compensator at the Barre Substation and what work would be involved to install such equipment at the Barre Substation.</li> <li>D. If enough voltage support could not be feasibly installed at Barre Substation to meet reliability standards, describe whether voltage equipment could be installed at another substation or a combination of other substations in SCE's service area to meet the relevant reliability standards.</li> </ul>