

Southern California Edison
2012 LTPP R.12-03-014

DATA REQUEST SET R.12-03-014 CEJA-SCE-002

To: CEJA
Prepared by: Phillip Leung
Title: Power System Planner
Dated: 07/23/2012

Question 08:

On page 19 of its reply testimony, SCE discussed the 600 MW load transfer that CAISO has found as a reasonable assumption for the 2010 planning. SCE states it that this load transfer has not been "fully developed" and states that it would not address the Western LA worst double contingency. *See* SCE Reply Test. at p. 19.

- a. What analysis has SCE performed, if any, regarding the 600 MW load transfer? Please provide the results of any studies or analysis performed by SCE or any data relied on by SCE in making the above statement.
- b. Does SCE agree that the 600 MW load transfer would reduce LA Basin LCR needs?
- c. If CAISO believes the 600 MW load transfer is reasonable, will SCE defer to CAISO's position?

Response to Question 08:

- a. What analysis has SCE performed, if any, regarding the 600 MW load transfer? Please provide the results of any studies or analysis performed by SCE or any data relied on by SCE in making the above statement.

Response: SCE has not performed any technical analysis on the 600 MW load transfer. No data is available at this time.

- b. Does SCE agree that the 600 MW load transfer would reduce LA Basin LCR needs?

Response: Based on CAISO's Testimony on page 9 - table 5, it appears to be valid that LA Basin LCR needs would go down.

- c. If CAISO believes the 600 MW load transfer is reasonable, will SCE defer to CAISO's position?

Response: There is no project scope at this time. SCE will work with the CAISO to explore the load transfer option and compare with the other option of load curtailment.

Southern California Edison
2012 LTPP R.12-03-014

DATA REQUEST SET R.12-03-014 CEJA-SCE-002

To: CEJA
Prepared by: Phillip Leung
Title: Power System Planner
Dated: 07/23/2012

Question 09.a.vii-viii:

(A) SCE stated that CAISO's assumptions are generally reasonable. Does SCE understand CAISO's assumptions for the Western LA Basin to include the following:

- vii. No unapproved transmission projects will be developed within the Western LA basin by 2021, and
- viii. The worst in 10 year peak demand will occur at the same time as a double contingency N-1-1 outage at Serrano-Lewis #1 and Serrano-Villa Pk #2

Response to Question 09.a.vii-viii:

vii. No unapproved transmission projects will be developed within the Western LA basin by 2021, and

Response: Yes.

viii. The worst in 10 year peak demand will occur at the same time as a double contingency N-1-1 outage at Serrano-Lewis #1 and Serrano-Villa Pk #2

Response: Yes. By worst in 10 year peak demand it is assumed to be the 1 in 10 year heat wave in the CAISO Unified Planning Assumptions.

Southern California Edison
2012 LTPP R.12-03-014

DATA REQUEST SET R.12-03-014 CEJA-SCE-002

To: CEJA
Prepared by: Phillip Leung
Title: Power System Planner
Dated: 07/23/2012

Question 10.a.vii-viii:

(A) SCE stated that CAISO's assumptions are generally reasonable. Does SCE understand CAISO's assumptions for the LA Basin to include the following:

- vii. No unapproved transmission projects will be developed within the LA Basin by 2021, and
- viii. The worst in 10 year peak demand will occur at the same time as a double contingency N-1-1 outage at Chino-Mira Loma East #3 230 kV line + Mira Loma West 500/230kV Bank #2

Response to Question 10.a.vii-viii:

vii. No unapproved transmission projects will be developed within the LA Basin by 2021, and
Response: Yes.

viii. The worst in 10 year peak demand will occur at the same time as a double contingency N-1-1 outage at Chino-Mira Loma East #3 230 kV line + Mira Loma West 500/230kV Bank #2
Response: Yes. By worst in 10 year peak demand it is assumed to be the 1 in 10 year heat wave in the CAISO Unified Planning Assumptions.

Southern California Edison
2012 LTPP R.12-03-014

DATA REQUEST SET R.12-03-014 CEJA-SCE-002

To: CEJA
Prepared by: Lujana Medina
Title: Project Manager
Dated: 07/23/2012

Question 13:

Please identify the number direct access and CCA customers in the Western LA Basin LCR area and the percentage of total customers in the Western LA Basin that are DA or CCA customers. Please provide all documentation that supports these values.

Response to Question 13:

The number of direct access and CCA customers in the Western LA Basin LCR area, as defined by the CAISO 2011/2012 Transmission Plan, is 9,103 DA customers and 0 CCA customers. The percentage of total customers in the Western LA Basin LCR area, as defined by the CAISO 2011/2012 Transmission Plan, that are DA is less than 1% and 0% for CCA. The attached excel formula provides the supporting documentation for these values.

Southern California Edison
2012 LTPP R.12-03-014

DATA REQUEST SET R.12-03-014 CEJA-SCE-002

To: CEJA
Prepared by: Phillip Leung
Title: Power System Planner
Dated: 07/23/2012

Question 14:

On page 18 of SCE's Supplemental Testimony, SCE states: "A change to the configuration of SCE's transmission system will have a direct effect on how SCE's transmission performs under system contingencies. For example, addressing an LCR need for one area with a transmission fix will affect the flow of power through SCE's transmission system. Changing the way power flows through SCE's transmission system may affect, and potentially cause, other contingencies in the system. This in turn may affect the LCR need in other areas. Therefore, in order to determine how a transmission fix for one local area affects the LCR need in the rest of the system, CAISO would have to rerun its analysis to determine how any transmission fix affects the LCR need. "

A. Are the contingencies that CAISO identified in its LCR OTC study, the worst contingencies?
B. Does SCE agree that if the worst contingency were removed, the LCR need would go down?

Response to Question 14:

A. Are the contingencies that CAISO identified in its LCR OTC study, the worst contingencies?
Response: Based on the CAISO Unified Planning Assumptions, the LCR need may be defined by an N-1, N-2, or even up to N-3 as the worst contingency. LCR needs are based on most critical contingencies which may not be the worst contingencies.

B. Does SCE agree that if the worst contingency were removed, the LCR need would go down?

Response: Based on response to A., the worst contingency may not be the most critical contingency that has the highest LCR need, and so removing the worst contingency would not make the LCR need go down. If transmission upgrade is put in to mitigate the most critical contingency, a new LCR study is needed to evaluate the new LCR need to verify if it goes down.

Southern California Edison
2012 LTPP R.12-03-014

DATA REQUEST SET R.12-03-014 CEJA-SCE-002

To: CEJA

Prepared by: Carol Schmid-Frazeo

Title: Senior Attorney

Dated: 07/23/2012

Question 15:

Please produce all data requests that SCE has received and SCE's response to those data requests. This is a continuing request

Response to Question 15:

SCE objects to the continuing nature of this data request as unduly burdensome. Attached are copies of all data requests received by SCE from other parties and responses to data requests provided to other parties to date. If Sierra Club requires future data requests and data request responses, SCE recommends that Sierra Club send an additional data request in the future for such materials.