Southern California Edison
2023-UPS – 2023-UPS

DATA REQUEST SET E S - D R - E U P - 2 4 - 0 4

To: Energy Safety
Prepared by: Kyle Ferree
Job Title: Senior Advisor
Received Date: 7/5/2024

Response Date: 7/15/2024

Question 02. a-i:
Please provide information requested as applicable as it pertains to hybrid projects.

a. In PG&E's May 29th, 2024 comments on draft guidelines, PG&E described a "hybrid" approach or "hybrid distribution hardening" as "a circuit segment that is hardened using a combination of covered conductor, undergrounding, and/or line removal with remote grid" Please confirm whether or not SCE has similar recommended definitions or provide a corresponding SCE-specific definition with any changes.

b. Does SCE have a similar approach where a circuit segment is hardened using a combination of covered conductor, undergrounding, and/or line removal with remote grid?

c. In SCE's aggregation of potential hybrid distribution hardening, is there a definitive list of alternative mitigations that could potentially be included in a designated percentage of non-undergrounding work?

d. Can SCE elaborate on how and why a circuit segment would become a hybrid distribution hardening project? Please explain the process of scoping a such a project and provide an example that illustrates how and why other mitigations were chosen over undergrounding.

d1 Is the reason for using an alternative mitigation always due to a better cost/risk performance, a physical limitation (such as a river crossing or granite), a combination of both, or some other factor? Please explain.

d2 Is there a distinction between how an alternative mitigation will be reported on the EUP if the alternative mitigation is included because of cost/risk performance versus a physical limitation?

e. Provide a .xlsx document that details undergrounding and "hybrid" projects from a recent workplan(s) covering at least 3 years of planned work. Provide the name of the planning document(s) and the years it covers. For each isolatable circuit segment included in the workplan(s) report information in the table below.

f. Provide a general cost comparison, per mile replaced, of each individual mitigation option (e.g. underground, covered conductor, other).

g. For the anticipated projects, how many isolatable circuit segments are typical on a given circuit?

h. Are there instances of planned projects in which only a portion of the circuit segment is undergrounded without required overhead hardening work or wildfire mitigation improvements on the remainder of the overhead section(s) of the circuit segment?

i. Provide specific details and examples on how seeking rate recovery through an alternate regulatory process, such as the GRC, for non-undergrounded portions would affect an undergrounding project. Is there a potential for construction delays, and if so, how long would these delays last? Are there scenarios where SCE would have to return to a circuit segment to construct overhead hardening portions separately?

Field Name	Description	Unit/Datatype
Total Circuit Segment Miles	Length of isolatable circuit segment before mitigation	Miles
Total Constructed Miles	Number of miles of new infrastructure to be energized	Miles
Total Miles Undergrounded	Number of miles of underground infrastructure to be energized	Miles
Overhead Removed	Number of miles of overhead line deenergized upon completion	Miles
Covered Conductor Installed	Number of miles of covered conductor to be installed	Miles
Other Mitigations	Provide brief description of other mitigation efforts or devices installed that are associated with this project	Text
Justification for Alternative Mitigation	Provide brief description for each hybrid project including the reason undergrounding is not used on entire circuit segment and alternative mitigations are chosen (e.g. better cost/risk performance, physical limitations, or any other reasons).	Text
Other Mitigations Miles	Add a field for each alternative mitigation to be used and indicate the number of miles of overhead line it will be applied to or replace	Miles
Total Un-Mitigated Circuit-Miles on Circuit Segment	Number of miles of original, un-mitigated, circuit segment line after completion of project	Miles
Subprojects	Number of total subprojects created within this Project.	Integer
Underground Subprojects	Number of undergrounding subprojects	Integer
Covered Conductor Subprojects	Number of covered conductor subprojects	Integer

Other Mitigation Subprojects	Add a field for each alternative mitigation to be used and indicate the number of subprojects associated with it	Integer
Secondary Lines	Will secondary distribution lines be undergrounded as part of this project?	Boolean
Service Lines	Will service lines be undergrounded as part of this project?	Boolean
Fast Trip Settings	Will Fast Trip settings be added to this circuit segment?	Boolean

Response to Question 02. a-i:

a. Because SCE is not planning to participate in the EUP process, we do not have a recommendation for the definition of hybrid projects.
b. Notwithstanding SCE's plans to not participate in this process, SCE's hardening strategy treats a single circuit segment (poles) with targeted undergrounding (TUG) or covered conductor (WCCP), not both. If TUG and WCCP projects are in close proximity or even on the same overall circuit, they would be scoped, designed and constructed as separate projects.
c. See answer to Q02.b. SCE does not have "hybrid" projects as described in question 2a.
d. See answer to Q02.b. SCE does not have "hybrid" projects as described in question 2a.
e. See answer to Q02.b. SCE does not have "hybrid" projects as described in question 2a.
f. See answer to Q02.b. SCE does not have "hybrid" projects as described in question 2a.
g. See answer to Q02.b. SCE does not have "hybrid" projects as described in question 2a.
h. See answer to Q02.b. SCE does not have "hybrid" projects as described in question 2a.
i. See answer to Q02.b. SCE does not have "hybrid" projects as described in question 2a.