

Southern California Edison
2025-WMPs – 2025-WMPs

DATA REQUEST SET T U R N - S C E - 1

To: TURN
Prepared by: John Rankin
Job Title: Senior Manager
Received Date: 4/17/2024

Response Date: 4/22/2024

Question 01:

With respect to Table 2-11 on page 26 of SCE's 2025 WMP Update:

- a. For the "Undergrounding Overhead Conductor" activity, what is the 2025 "strive" target value and has it changed from SCE's 2023-2025 WMP for 2025? If not, explain why not given SCE's explanation of the reason for the change in the "compliance" target value on page 27.
- b. For the "Undergrounding Overhead Conductor" activity, please explain why "N/A" appears in the "% Risk Impact: Original" and "% Risk Impact: Updated" columns. Please provide the original and updated % risk impact values.
- c. For the "REFCL – GFN" activity, please explain why, given the reduction in the "compliance" target from 4 to 2 substations, the % Risk Impact: Updated value of 1.8% is unchanged from the original value. Please reconcile footnotes 9 and 10, i.e., explain why the updated risk value for REFCL is based on the "strive" target, when footnote 9 states that the risk reduction is based on the compliance target.

Response to Question 01:

Please note that SCE's presentation of 2025 target changes in its 2025 WMP Update is based on the WMP target tables that OEIS defined and required in the 2023-2025 WMP, and is best understood when taken in that context.

a. For the "Undergrounding Overhead Conductor" activity, what is the 2025 "strive" target value and has it changed from SCE's 2023-2025 WMP for 2025? If not, explain why not given SCE's explanation of the reason for the change in the "compliance" target value on page 27.

The 2025 strive target for SH-2, Undergrounding Overhead Conductor, is 60 miles. SCE has not proposed changing this value in its 2025 WMP Update, because it believes it is still a valid strive target. The strive target represents a level of achievement that is possible and that SCE continues to work towards, while being less certain relative to the compliance goal.

b. For the "Undergrounding Overhead Conductor" activity, please explain why "N/A" appears in the "% Risk Impact: Original" and "% Risk Impact: Updated" columns. Please provide the original and updated % risk impact values.

For WMP initiatives that have both a compliance target and a strive target, the risk reduction is based on the strive target. For WMP initiatives that only have a single target, the risk reduction is

based on that single value (which effectively serves as the compliance target even if it is not explicitly labeled as such).

In the case of SH-2, SCE has proposed a change to the compliance target, hence the calculated risk reduction will not change because it is based on the strive target of 60 miles. In Table 8-3 of SCE's 2023-2025 WMP, on page 238, SCE stated a risk reduction of 0.9% for SH-2 for 2025 based on measuring risk reduction at the HFRA level (i.e. how much does the program reduce risk across all SCE HFRA, as opposed to how much does it reduce risk specifically at locations where it is deployed).

c. For the "REFCL – GFN" activity, please explain why, given the reduction in the "compliance" target from 4 to 2 substations, the % Risk Impact: Updated value of 1.8% is unchanged from the original value. Please reconcile footnotes 9 and 10, i.e., explain why the updated risk value for REFCL is based on the "strive" target, when footnote 9 states that the risk reduction is based on the compliance target.

Footnote 9 has an error, and should read as follows:

"In cases in which a program has a strive target and a compliance target, the risk reduction is based on the ~~compliance~~ strive target."

SCE acknowledges this mistake and will correct it in its next opportunity for WMP errata, due to OEIS on May 14, 2024.

Regarding REFCL GFN, the 2025 goal as originally stated in the 2023-2025 WMP (see page 241) was "SCE will complete construction of GFN at four substations." Because there was no distinction between a compliance goal or a strive goal, the risk reduction of 1.8% at the HFRA level was calculated based on completing construction at four substations.

SCE's proposed modification to the SH-17 REFCL goal is to define the strive target as four substations, and the compliance target as two substations. As stated above, since risk reduction is based on the strive target, it remains at 1.8%, which is based on four substations.