



**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

02-09-12  
04:59 PM

In the Matter of the Application of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Concerning the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (Segments 4 through 11) )  
Application 07-06-031 )  
(Filed June 29, 2007) )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S (U 338-E)**  
**NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION**

BETH GAYLORD  
ANGELA WHATLEY

LAURA A. GODFREY  
BUCK B. ENDEMANN

Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
COMPANY

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, CA 91770  
Telephone: (626) 302-3618  
Facsimile: (626) 302-1926  
E-mail: angela.whatley@sce.com

600 W. Broadway, Suite 1800  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 236-1234  
Facsimile: (619) 696-7419  
E-mail: buck.endemann@lw.com

Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

Dated: February 9, 2012

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of SOUTHERN )	
CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) )	Application 07-06-031
for a Certificate of Public Convenience and )	(Filed June 29, 2007)
Necessity Concerning the Tehachapi Renewable )	
Transmission Project (Segments 4 through 11) )	
_____ )	

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S (U 338-E)  
NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION**

Pursuant to Rules 8.3 and 8.4 of the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) hereby gives notice of the *ex parte* communication described below.

On Thursday, February 9, 2012, at approximately 3:00 p.m., Thomas Burhenn, Director of Regulatory Affairs for SCE, sent an email message to Colette Kersten, Commissioner Catherine Sandoval's advisor, in response to a question asked by Ms. Kersten during an equal time meeting on January 23, 2012. Mr. Burhenn's email discussed the feasibility of utilizing 220 kV transmission lines in Chino Hills State Park. The communication was written. A true and correct copy of the written *ex parte* communication is provided as Attachment A.

Dated: February 9, 2012

Respectfully submitted,  
BUCK B. ENDEMANN

/s/ Buck B. Endemann  
By: Buck B. Endemann

Attorney for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

Latham & Watkins LLP  
600 W. Broadway, Suite 1800  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 236-1234  
Facsimile: (619) 696-7419  
E-mail: buck.endemann@lw.com

**ATTACHMENT A**

From: Thomas Burhenn/SCE/EIX  
To: cek@cpuc.ca.gov  
Date: 02/09/2012 03:01 PM  
Subject: 220 kV Chino Hills Alternative

---

Ms. Kersten:

At our meeting on January 23rd, you asked about the feasibility of utilizing 220 kV transmission lines in Chino Hills State Park as an alternative to the proposed project. We received a data request from Energy Division in early 2008 on this precise topic and I have attached our response.

In summary, this alternative is not viable because it does not meet the project objectives, as explained in further detail in our response. Further, this alternative would cross land owned by the City of Industry which is being studied as a location to build a 250,000 acre-feet reservoir, and which would require relocation or removal of the lines at a future date.

Please call or email me if you have any further questions,

Tom

Thomas A. Burhenn  
Director, Regulatory Affairs  
Southern California Edison  
General Office, Room 388q  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, CA 91770  
Office 626.302.9652  
Mobile 626.688.9478  
Fax 626.302.4332  
Thomas.Burhenn@SCE.com

Southern California Edison  
TRTP A.07-06-031

DATA REQUEST SET TRTP CPUC-ED-05

To: ENERGY DIVISION  
Prepared by: Jorge Chacon  
Title: Manager Project/Product 2  
Dated: 02/26/2008

Received Date: 02/27/2008

Question 5-09:

Alternatives

In a comment letter received from the Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP on behalf of Hills for Everyone, a new alternative has been proposed. The new alternative would involve a new substation at the point that the existing Serrano-Mira Loma [sic] [should be Mira Loma-Olinda/Walnut 220kV] –corridor branches off from the proposed Project route (approximately S8A MP 19.2), in or near the Firestone Boy Scout Reservation. At this substation, the T/L would be stepped down into two 220-kV T/Ls. One could follow the existing corridor through the Chino Hills State Park, using the existing towers. The other 220-kV T/L would follow the proposed Project route to Chino Substation and onward. No information was provided with respect to re-conductoring of the existing 220-kV T/Ls. Based on this suggested alternative, please provide written input on whether or not the alternative would be feasible, would meet the project objectives, and would result in any reliability issues, etc. assuming (1) use of existing towers and conductor on the 220-kV T/Ls east of the new substation, and (2) use of new 220-kV towers and conductor east of the new substation.

Response to Question 5-09:

The alternative proposed by Hills for Everyone does not provide enough detail to allow for a complete technical analysis. However, based on the limited description provided, the alternative appears unacceptable for several reasons, including,

1. The maximum combined power flow capacity of the two lines proposed by Hills for Everyone would be limited to about 2500 MVA, which is significantly less than the 500 kV capability of one circuit.
2. The alternative does not appear to satisfy SCE's project objective for addressing South of Lugo transmission constraints.
3. Future system flexibility would disappear with adoption of this alternative, unless provision is made for construction of numerous additional 230 kV lines in the new substation that Hills for Everyone proposes to be constructed in or near the Firestone Boy Scout Reservation.
4. Outage conditions of one of these 230 kV lines will likely overload the remaining 230 kV line, leading to the need for construction of additional 230 kV lines.
5. Without the additional 230 kV lines, the project objectives of integrating 4500 MW will not be met.