

MP1/acr 11/10/2011



FILED

11-10-11
03:50 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) 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)

ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S RULING DIRECTING SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY TO PREPARE ALTERNATIVES FOR ROUTING THE PORTION OF SEGMENT 8 THAT TRAVERSES CHINO HILLS

The Commission issued Decision (D.) 09-12-044 on December 24, 2009, granting Southern California Edison Company (SCE) a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) to proceed with the construction of the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (TRTP), Segments 4 through 11. Segment 8 traverses a portion of the City of Chino Hills (City). SCE proposed using an existing right-of-way (ROW), that already had transmission towers but un-energized wires, and that ran through a residential section of the City. This was labeled Alternative 2. During the pendency of the proceeding (Application 07-06-031), the City pursued alternative routes for Segment 8, so that the new transmission line would not be built in the existing ROW. After evaluating numerous alternatives, the City's preferred route was Alternate 4CM, a route that diverted Segment 8 away from the residential neighborhood and through a state park. In addition, Alternative 5, undergrounding a portion of Segment 8, was considered.

The December 2009 Decision, D.09-12-044, adopted SCE's proposed route, Alternate 2, in lieu of the City's preferred 4CM or the undergrounding option. The City filed a timely Application for Rehearing of the Decision and the Commission has not yet acted on that request.

SCE proceeded to construct the TRTP, including Segment 8. Once the new transmission towers were placed in Chino Hills, The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) made recommendations to SCE that SCE modify portions of Segment 8, by installing marker balls on certain transmission line spans, installing lighting on certain transmission structures and making certain engineering refinements for Segment 8. In light of these FAA recommendations, on October 17, 2011, SCE filed a Petition for Modification (PFM) of the TRTP decision, D.09-12-044, seeking modification of the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and ordering paragraphs to account for the proposed FAA recommended changes.

Once the new transmission structures were put in place through the residential neighborhood in Chino Hills, the City found them to have a "visual, economic and societal impact . . . far more significant than what the City or the Commission envisioned at the time the CPCN was issued."¹ On October 28, 2011, the City filed a PFM to reopen the record with regard to Segment 8 of the TRTP.

In light of the recent events and filings that affect Segment 8 of the TRTP, I direct SCE to prepare testimony on alternatives or solutions to the current

¹ City's PFM, October 28, 2011 at 4.

approved route for the transmission line. SCE's testimony should include the feasibility, cost, and timing for each alternative.

Alternatives:

1. Alternative 4CM [City's preferred route through the state park]
2. Alternate 5 [Partial undergrounding]
3. Other alternate routes through the City and/or State Park
4. Utilizing the existing right-of-way with shorter/more frequent towers
5. Mitigation for impact of TRTP line

Many of these alternatives were researched and developed as part of the initial application proceeding. Any alternative reviewed then, that could be considered a viable alternative today, should be presented with refreshed data. In addition, since parties have not yet responded to the recently filed PFMs, my directives here today are not intended to prejudge the PFMs, to be exhaustive, or to foreclose alternatives not yet considered. If parties suggest additional alternate routes or solutions, those may also be considered by the Commission. However, the information and data already gathered was quite extensive, so reviewing known alternatives with up-dated cost, viability, and timing data should prove sufficient.

SCE is to serve testimony, with supporting data, on the alternatives by January 10, 2012. Once the Commission reviews the responses to the PFMs and

the served information, the assigned Administrative Law Judge and I will determine the next procedural steps and schedule and inform the parties.

IT IS SO RULED.

Dated November 10, 2011, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MICHAEL R. PEEVEY

Michael R. Peevey
Assigned Commissioner