Rulemaking:	12-03-014
Exhibit No.:	SC-X-SDG&E-
Commissioner:	Michel Florio
ALJ:	David Gamson

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Integrate and Refine Procurement Policies and Consider Long-Term Procurement Plans.	Rulemaking 12-03-014 (DMG) (Filed March 22, 2012)

DRA DATA REQUEST
DRA-SDG&E-DR-03
SDG&E TRACK 4 – LTPP – R.12-03-014
SDG&E RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: SEPTEMBER 18, 2013
DATE RESPONDED: SEPTEMBER 24, 2013

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DRA DATA REQUEST
DRA-SDG&E-DR-03
SDG&E TRACK 4 – LTPP – R.12-03-014
SDG&E RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: SEPTEMBER 18, 2013
DATE RESPONDED: SEPTEMBER 24, 2013

1. Page 11 of John Jontry's testimony in Table 2 presents results of SDG&E's power flow analysis using the N-1-1 reliability criteria with no allowable load shedding.

    a. For scenarios 5 and 6, assuming no reduction in new generation requirement for the Western LA Basin, what is the maximum reduction in new generation requirement for San Diego (SD)? In other words, is it possible to get higher than 850 MW for scenario 5 and 650 MW for scenario 6, or the entire reduction of 1,401 MW for scenario 5 and 1,050 MW for scenario 6 in new generation requirement, in SDG&E's service area only?
    b. For scenarios 5 and 6, does the new generation requirement in Western LA Basin assume SCE's Mesa Loop-in, preferred resources scenario, and/or Track 1 authorization of up to 1,800 MW of new generation resources?

SDG&E Response 01:

a. Yes, it is possible to get a reduction in generation greater than 850 MW for scenario 5 and 650 MW for scenario 6 if the reduction is limited to reduction in generation in the San Diego LCR sub-area, if the generation reduction in the Los Angeles LCR area is reduced or eliminated. SDG&E has not determined the maximum reduction under these conditions. Preliminary indications are that it may be possible to apply the total reduction of 1,401 MW for scenario 5 and 1,050 MW for scenario 6 in new generation requirement solely to the San Diego LCR sub-area, but SDG&E has not confirmed this with the appropriate load-flow study work.
b. For Scenarios 5 and 6, the new generation requirement includes the 1,800 MW of resources authorized in Track 1, but does not include SCE's 500 kV Mesa Loop-In proposal or Preferred Resources Scenario.

DRA DATA REQUEST
DRA-SDG&E-DR-03
SDG&E TRACK 4 – LTPP – R.12-03-014
SDG&E RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: SEPTEMBER 18, 2013
DATE RESPONDED: SEPTEMBER 24, 2013

2. Page 12 of John Jontry's testimony in Table 3 presents results of power flow analysis using the N-1-1 reliability criteria with no allowable load shedding. CAISO's scenarios study a 80/20 LA/SD split and a 67/33 LA/SD split.

    a. For column SDG&E, what is the LA/SD generation split assumption studied? Please describe how SDG&E calculated the LA/SD split.
    b. Has SDG&E calculated what the optimal LA/SD split is for minimizing entire SONGS area (LA + SD) LCR need, ratepayer costs, and GHG emissions?

SDG&E Response 02:

a. For the row labeled "SDG&E", the Los Angeles/San Diego split is 66/34 for the N-1-1 limiting contingency, 68/32 for the G-1/N-1 limiting contingency. However, it is more appropriate to compare the row labeled "SDG&E (including current need authorization)" to the CAISO's results, as this includes the 300 MW of generation at Pio Pico in the calculated need. For the row labeled "SDG&E (including current need authorization)", the Los Angeles/San Diego split is 61/39 for the N-1-1 limiting contingency, 63/37 for the G-1/N-1 limiting contingency. The split was calculated by dividing the SDG&E generation requirement by the total generation requirement for Southern California. The split was not determined ahead of time and then the load-flow cases set up to match the desired split; the generation need was determined through the power flow study work and then the actual split calculated.
b. No