

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

Edmund G. Brown Jr., *Governor*



August 14, 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. 1 Follow Up 02 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) and response to Data Request #1 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  
Claire Hodgkins, Ecology and Environment, Inc.

Attachment 1: Data Request #1 Follow Up 02

Item #	Reference/ Page #	Title	Request
DR#01 Q.26-01	Traffic Study	<b>Impacts to SR 60</b>	In a comment submitted during the scoping period, Caltrans requested that the traffic study assess construction/traffic impacts on State Route (SR) 60. The current study assesses SR 60 on ramps, but does not include information on how truck traffic may affect eastbound and westbound traffic flow on SR 60. Include information in the report that assesses this.
DR#01 Q.26-02	Traffic Study (Page 3)	<b>Forecast year assumptions</b>	<p>The following phases were analyzed in the analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Phase 1: 2016-2018- Forecast Year 2016 With-Project Phase 1 Construction Traffic</li> <li>b. Phase 2: 2018-2019 - Forecast Year 2018 With-Project Phase 2 Construction Traffic</li> <li>c. Phases 3: 2019-2020 – Forecast Year 2019 With-Project Phase 3 Construction Traffic</li> </ul> <p>Please describe why the starting year of each phase was used in the analysis instead of the end year.</p>
DR#01 Q.26-03	Traffic Study (Page 7, ¶12)	<b>Stop controlled intersections</b>	The study indicates that HCM was used for stop controlled intersections; however, all study intersections appear to be signalized. Please clarify for which intersections the HCM was used. Confirm if this was intended to address unsignalized access driveways.
DR#01 Q.26-04	Traffic Study— (Page 8, ¶1; Figure 10; and Page 57)	<b>Trip distribution</b>	In the section titled “Impacts at Non-Substation Construction Areas,” on Page 57 the discussion indicates that all seven staging areas were accounted for in the trip generation and distribution analyses. However, for all off-site worker trips only two potential staging areas were assumed in the distribution analysis (as discussed on Page 8 and shown in Figure 10). For consistency, describe the assumptions for off-site worker trip distribution from these two staging areas in the section entitled “Impacts at Non-Substation Construction Areas.” Explain the reasoning behind this assumption.
DR#01 Q.26-05	Traffic Study (Page 8, ¶1)	<b>Phase II worker trip distribution</b>	Clarify whether worker trip distribution would be different for Phase II with the addition of the secondary driveway on Markland.

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Reference/ Page #</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Request</b>
DR#01 Q.26-06	Traffic Study (Page 13, ¶4)	<b>Source for Annual growth rate</b>	Growth rates are not identified in the Montebello Specific Plan, but appear to be included in the Montebello Specific Plan EIR. Please clarify the source of the annual growth rates.
DR#01 Q.26-07	Traffic Study (Page 13, ¶13)	<b>Traffic Counts</b>	The Traffic Study identifies multiple previous studies which were used to identify traffic counts for study intersection in this analysis. For all traffic counts, identify the source of the count.
DR#01 Q.26-08	Traffic Study (Page 14, Table 5)	<b>Cumulative projects</b>	Describe how trips from cumulative projects were applied to study intersections (i.e., how many of these trips were assumed to impact each of these intersections)?
DR#01 Q.26-09	Traffic Study (Tables 20, 21, and 22)	<b>ICU and HCM</b>	Tables 20 and 21 identify LOS and Delay for ICU. LOS and Delay for HCM is also identified, but only for some intersections. In Table 22 it appears that significance was determined based only on ICU methodology. Clarify why LOS and Delay for HCM was identified for specific intersections.
DR#01 Q.26-10	Traffic Study (Page 22, ¶12; Page 24, ¶12)	<b>Intersection of Garfield Ave/Via Campo</b>	The Traffic Study indicates that the intersection of Garfield Ave/Via Campo would degrade to LOS F under future conditions; however, the existing LOS at this intersection is LOS F. Modify the text in the Traffic Study to reflect this.
DR#01 Q.26-11	Traffic Study (Page 27, ¶12 and Tables 13, 14, and 15)	<b>AM and PM peak hour assumptions</b>	Page 27 of the Traffic Study indicates that approximately 10% of daily construction vehicles would occur during AM and PM hours. This is consistent with Table 13 and Table 15. However, Table 14 (Phase 2) assumes that fewer than 10% of daily construction vehicles would occur during AM and PM peak hours. Describe how the percentage was determined for each component/phase.
DR#01 Q.26-12	Traffic Study (Page 42, Table 20 and Page 44, Table 22)	<b>2016 without project</b>	The LOS for AM “2016 without project” in Table 22 does not match LOS for AM “2016 without project” in Table 20. It appears that PM values from Table 21 were used in Table 22, instead of AM values from Table 20. This could affect the number of intersections that exceed standards. Please confirm the values and revise as necessary.
DR#01 Q.26-13	Traffic Study (Table 33)	<b>Access driveways</b>	In Table 33 were unsignalized access driveways assumed?