

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor



August 6, 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 Follow Up for the Mesa 500-kV Substation Project (CPUC Proceeding A. 15-03-003)**

Ms. Nelson:

Upon review of Southern California Edison's partial responses to Data Request #2 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: Shanna Foley, CPUC Legal Division  
Claire Hodgkins, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

Attachment 1: Data Request #2 Follow Up

Item #	Reference/ Page #	Title	Request
DR#02 Q.04-01	PEA, 5.0 Alternatives	<b>Remedial Actions to Address N-1-1 Scenario</b>	<p>Please provide the following information regarding remedial actions taken for the second outage in the N-1-1 contingency studied for the Mesa Substation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Describe the outcome of SCE’s examination of each of these remedial actions to address voltage issues arising in an N-1-1 contingency:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Redispatch of generation</li> <li>b. Implementation of fast acting demand response</li> <li>c. Dispatch of available preferred resources and energy storage.</li> </ul> </li> <li>B. SCE stated that load dropping is prohibited in High Density Areas such as Los Angeles and San Diego Counties in lieu of expanding transmission or local resource capability. State whether load dropping would be feasible in areas not classified as a High Density Urban Area, such as Orange County.</li> <li>C. State where voltage issues arise in SCE’s system in the N-1-1 contingency that SCE states necessitates the proposed project.</li> <li>D. State the level of the voltage in the locations identified in (C) during an N-1-1 contingency.</li> </ul>
DR#02 Q.05-01	PEA, 5.0 Alternatives	<b>No Project Alternative— Energy Import</b>	<p>In its response to Data Request #2, SCE stated it could not import additional energy into the Western Los Angeles Basin without the Mesa Project.</p> <p>It is understood that Lugo Substation provides the main connection between the Western Los Angeles Basin and the PG&amp;E service territory and the Pacific Northwest via the 500-kV bulk transmission system. The Lugo Substation is connected to the Mesa Substation with 220-kV connections.</p> <p>CPUC’s examination of power flow data found that the 220-kV connections between Lugo Substation and Mesa Substation would not experience overloads and therefore would be capable of delivering enough energy to meet load in the Western Los Angeles Basin at SCE’s projected need date for the proposed project.</p>

			<p>Please provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. State when (i.e., what year or what range of years) SCE anticipates that the existing 220-kV connections between Lugo Substation and Mesa Substation will become overloaded and be unable to provide enough energy to serve load in the Western Los Angeles Basin.</li> <li>B. State the additional level of forecasted megawatts that would be imported via the proposed Mesa Substation Project.</li> <li>C. State how much load (in MW) critical lines would carry without implementation of the proposed project.</li> </ul> <p>SCE's PEA stated that an objective of the proposed project is to provide "greater flexibility in the siting of future generation projects to meet local reliability needs in the Western Los Angeles Basin while reducing the total amount of new generation required by providing additional transmission import capacity." The PEA referenced importing energy from the Tehachapi wind resource area.</p> <p>Please provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>D. Given that energy demand can be met through the 220-kV connections between Lugo Substation and Mesa Substation with energy from the PG&amp;E service territory and Pacific Northwest (as described in A), state what policy or planning goal is driving the need for energy import from the Tehachapi wind resource area.</li> </ul>
DR#02 Q.06-01	PEA, 5.0 Alternatives	<b>No Project Alternative</b>	<p>Please describe the actions SCE would take if the proposed project were not implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. What would SCE do in the short-term if the project is not approved? As part of the no project alternative, potential mitigation could include but may not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Load shedding</li> <li>b. Installation of reactive support equipment</li> <li>c. Redispatch of generation</li> <li>d. Dispatch of available preferred resources</li> <li>e. Fast demand response</li> </ul> </li> <li>B. With short-term solutions implemented, at what time would SCE anticipate a violation of reliability standards?</li> </ul>