

**AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO
OHIO POWER SITING BOARD STAFF'S
DISCOVERY REQUEST
OPSB CASE 23-0576-EL-BNR
STAFF FIRST SET**

INTERROGATORY

DR-01-001 Page 2 of the Application states that, “.. .. in order to cut into the new Cottrell North and South 138-kV Transmission Line Extension ..”. For clarification, is the cut-in being made into the existing South Point-Portsmouth 138-kV transmission line?

RESPONSE

Correct, the cut-in is being made into the existing double-circuit South Point-Portsmouth 138 kV Transmission Line.

**AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO
OHIO POWER SITING BOARD STAFF'S
DISCOVERY REQUEST
OPSB CASE 23-0576-EL-BNR
STAFF FIRST SET**

INTERROGATORY

DR-01-002	Is the existing South Point-Portsmouth 138-kV transmission line a double circuit line at this location?
-----------	---

RESPONSE

Yes, the existing South Point-Portsmouth 138 kV Transmission Line is a double circuit line.

**AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY’S RESPONSE TO
OHIO POWER SITING BOARD STAFF’S
DISCOVERY REQUEST
OPSB CASE 23-0576-EL-BNR
STAFF FIRST SET**

INTERROGATORY

DR-01-003 Please elaborate on the use or importance of the third pole, “ to prevent conductor blowout between the transmission circuits of the South Point-Portsmouth 138-kV Transmission Line.”

RESPONSE

The third structure is being proposed to prevent the two circuits from physically contacting each other after the “tap” structures (the other two structures) are installed. The two tap structures being installed will not allow the wire of the East Wheelersburg – Millbrook Park 138 kV circuit (western circuit) to swing or blowout in high wind conditions. If the Millbrook Park – South Point 138 kV circuit (eastern circuit) was left as is, the wires of that circuit would still be allowed to swing or blowout far enough to contact the Wheelersburg – Millbrook Park 138 kV circuit (western circuit) being tapped and/or the two new tap structures being installed.

**AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO
OHIO POWER SITING BOARD STAFF'S
DISCOVERY REQUEST
OPSB CASE 23-0576-EL-BNR
STAFF FIRST SET**

INTERROGATORY

DR-01-004

Page 3 of the Application states that, "The Project was presented at the PJM SRRTEP on January 7, 2015 and January 28, 2021 meetings".
Would these be for the Need and Solution respectively?

RESPONSE

This is a baseline project so it would not follow the M3 process. The January 2015 meeting was when the original baseline solution for b2604 was presented to stakeholders. The modified scope that included the Cottrell 138 kV scope of work was presented to stakeholders in 2021.

**AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO
OHIO POWER SITING BOARD STAFF'S
DISCOVERY REQUEST
OPSB CASE 23-0576-EL-BNR
STAFF FIRST SET**

INTERROGATORY

DR-01-005

Page 95/291 of Attachment A, Cost Responsibility Assignment Summary Sheets for b2604.4 shows SE of 359 ~~MVA, but~~ MVA, but the conductor proposed, 795 kcmil ACSR 26/7 has an ampacity of 907 amps, resulting in a capacity of 217 MVA. Would this present a problem of potential overload?

RESPONSE

The Company's rating methodology allows a 795 ACSR 26/7 overhead conductor to be rated to a summer emergency rating of approximately 1500 Amps, which is ~359/360 MVA at 138 kV.

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

8/3/2023 12:03:58 PM

in

Case No(s). 23-0576-EL-BNR

Summary: Response To Staff's 1st Set, South Point-Portsmouth Project.
electronically filed by Hector Garcia-Santana on behalf of AEP Ohio Transmission
Company, Inc..