

Southern California Edison
2025-WMPs – 2025-WMPs

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

To: TURN
Prepared by: Tram Camba
Job Title: Senior Advisor
Received Date: 4/17/2024

Response Date: 4/22/2024

Question 02:

With respect to the location-specific analysis of system hardening alternatives (in response to ACI 23-09), the results of which are summarized at the top of page 64:

a. Please explain how the methodology (including but not limited to assumptions) for calculating the MARS-based risk reduction values differs from the methodology (including but not limited to assumptions) for calculating the MARS-based risk reduction values shown in the Confidential Appendix B_Benefit Cost Ratio Analysis Excel Workpaper (e.g., Tabs “Benefits TUG” and “Benefits_CC_REFCL++”) in support of SCE’s rebuttal testimony in its 2025 GRC, A.23-05-010.

Response to Question 02:

The scope list (i.e., list of circuit segments) for 2025-2028 that was used in the analysis in response to ACI SCE-23-09 and the Confidential Appendix B_Benefit Cost Ratio Analysis Excel Workpaper is the same. While the two analyses have some key differences, both support SCE’s determination that targeted undergrounding (TUG) is an appropriate mitigation for areas facing extremely high levels of wildfire risk.

In the ACI analysis, SCE compared the amount of risk (both wildfire and PSPS risks) reduced at each circuit under two different mitigation portfolios: a) covered conductor, REFCL, asset inspections and remediation, and vegetation management (“CC/REFCL++”); and b) TUG, over a period of 45 years. This analysis took into account the time value of risk, assuming that covered conductor can be deployed two years earlier than REFCL or TUG. The results show that for all Severe Risk Area (SRA) sites combined, TUG has a higher risk reduction than CC/REFCL++ even though TUG’s 45 years of useful life is not fully realized.

In the GRC Rebuttal analysis, SCE only considered the wildfire risk reduction and assumed CC/REFCL can be deployed at the same time as TUG. SCE monetized the wildfire risk reductions (i.e., benefits) and calculated the lifetime costs of those two mitigations and determined whether the benefits exceed the costs by way of a BCR. The results show that TUG has a BCR > 1 for 447 miles out of the proposed 580 overhead miles, with the benefits exceeding the costs for the majority of the proposed TUG segments.