



FILED

07-02-12
03:41 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)

SCOPING MEMO AND RULING OF ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER

1. Summary

Pursuant to Rule 7.3(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, this ruling follows upon three prehearing conferences that were held in connection with prepared testimony developed by the Southern California Edison Company (SCE) at my direction. This ruling does the following:

- 1) Requires SCE to develop, by February 28, 2013, prepared testimony based on preliminary engineering studies of two undergrounding options;
- 2) Sets dates for prepared testimony by the City of Chino Hills and other interested parties; and
- 3) Schedules limited evidentiary hearings, briefing and the filing of a proposed decision.

2. Background and Related Procedural History

By Decision (D.) 09-12-044, issued on December 24, 2009, the Commission granted Southern California Edison Company (SCE) a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct Segments 4 through 11 of the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (TRTP), using the Environmentally Superior

Alternative, and subject to the mitigation measures and other conditions described in that decision. Several applications for rehearing of D.09-12-044 are pending, as are three petitions for modification (one filed by SCE and two, by Chino Hills). At present, construction of much of Segment 8A, the portion of Segment 8 that passes through Chino Hills, is stayed.

SCE's petition for modification seeks design changes in several segments of the TRTP, including Segment 8A, so that SCE can comply with mitigations required by the Federal Aviation Authority. The mitigations include the installation of marker balls on certain transmission spans (including Segment 8A), the installation of lighting on certain transmission structures (including Segment 8A), and several engineering refinements along Segment 8 between the Chino and Mira Loma substations.¹ Chino Hills' concerns focus on Segment 8A, which passes through a 150 foot right-of-way (ROW) within the City and in particular, on the height (200 feet) of the tubular steel poles needed to support the 500 kilovolt transmission line in that ROW.

The Commission stayed construction of Segment 8A by D.11-11-020, as subsequently modified by D.12-03-050, to narrow the stay to apply only to "those portions of Segment 8A that lie within the City of Chino Hills or that would become unnecessary or obsolete if the Commission were to select one of the

¹ SCE's petition for modification is unopposed and review under the California Environmental Quality Act is proceeding. However, Commission resolution of the petition will be subject to the construction stay along Segment 8A, until the Commission lifts the stay.

21 identified Alternatives to those portions of Segment 8A.”² The “Alternatives” referenced in D.12-03-050 are the conceptual options SCE developed in supplemental prepared testimony distributed on January 10 and February 1, 2012. (The former in response to my November 10, 2011 Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling and the latter in response to direction at the January 18, 2012 prehearing conference.)

The Commission has held three heavily attended prehearing conferences (on December 5, 2011, January 18, 2012, and March 19, 2012) since the petitions for modification were filed.

3. Discussion

My objective is to ensure that the Commission has adequately explored the multiple issues that concern Segment 8A in Chino Hills so that it may reach a timely and lawful resolution that affirms a viable route for the project within that segment, releases the construction stay, and enables the delivery of electric generation over the TRTP on the schedule currently anticipated. With respect to the latter, the Commission will continue to monitor the development and contractual status of renewable generation projects that expect to interconnect with the TRTP. I expect the construction stay along Segment 8A to remain in effect until the Commission considers the undergrounding options and makes a final determination.

SCE’s supplemental prepared testimony has aided conceptual exploration of routing options within Segment 8A, but more detailed information is needed.

² See D.12-03-050, Ordering Paragraph 2 at 6 (March 23, 2012), modifying the prior stay order, D.11-11-020, Ordering Paragraph at 2 (November 10, 2011). D.11-11-026, issued November 23, 2011, corrected two clerical errors in D.11-11-020.

Two of the three single-circuit underground options outlined in a general way in SCE's February 1, 2012 prepared testimony should be developed more fully based on preliminary engineering.

Parties may develop and serve prepared testimony limited to the issues set forth below. Prepared testimony should be limited to the party's factual contentions; prepared testimony that does not comply, may be stricken. Legal and policy contentions should be raised in briefs. The Commission will undertake any and all appropriate review required by the California Environmental Quality Act before issuing a final decision.

3.1. Scope

3.1.1. SCE

I direct SCE to develop prepared testimony that relies on preliminary engineering to more fully describe and estimate the costs and construction timeline for the following single-circuit underground options. The resulting prepared testimony will be the subject of hearings, as necessary.

- Underground single-circuit XLPE with three cables per phase in conduit in existing Chino Hills ROW (Option 10).
- Underground single-circuit XLPE with two cables per phase in conduit in existing Chino Hills ROW (Option 11).

I have excluded the third option, referred to as "Underground single-circuit XLPE with one cable per phase in conduit in existing Chino Hills ROW (Option 12)," because that option would not supply enough margin under normal and emergency conditions.

I believe this additional effort very likely can be undertaken without affecting the 2015 on-line date currently projected for the TRTP. I note that SCE's conceptual estimates for the three underground options fall either within 2015 or shortly thereafter (December 2015 for Option 12, March 2016 for Option 11 and

May 2016 for Option 10). The conceptual timelines for construction of Options 10 and 11 need to be examined more closely and recalibrated as necessary based on preliminary engineering. Among other things, SCE needs to explain why placing each additional cable would require another two or three months of time.

I also have excluded all options through the Chino Hills State Park since construction in the park continues to be infeasible, for reasons discussed in D.09-12-044. Further, discussion at the prehearing conferences has confirmed no party actively supports such development. Not only does the California Department of Parks and Recreation's opposition continue (together with a number of other parties), but Chino Hills, which formerly was a primary proponent, no longer is advancing that result.

3.1.2. Chino Hills

Chino Hills should develop prepared testimony responsive to SCE's prepared testimony on the three cables per phase (Option 10) and two cables per phase (Option 11) for an undergrounded, single-circuit XLPE in conduit in the existing Chino Hills ROW. In particular, Chino Hills should identify and clearly quantify any financial commitment it is prepared to make to minimize the total additional cost of an underground option as compared to the project initially approved for Segment 8A.

3.1.3. Other Interested Parties

Other interested parties may develop prepared testimony on any of the factual issues that SCE and Chino Hills are directed to address.

3.2. Schedule

The schedule below will govern this proceeding unless revised by a subsequent assigned Commissioner’s ruling or ruling of the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ).

Date	Event
February 28, 2013	SCE revised, supplemental prepared testimony served
March 25, 2013	Chino Hills prepared testimony served
April 15, 2013	Other interested parties prepared testimony served
April 30, 2013	SCE rebuttal prepared testimony served
May 20, 2013, 9:00 am – 3:30 pm, continuing day to day as necessary through May 23, 2013	Evidentiary hearing, Commission Court Room, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
June 14, 2013	Concurrent opening briefs filed
June 28, 2013	Concurrent reply briefs filed
Date to be determined	Submission
Date to be determined	Proposed decision filed
Date to be determined	Comments on proposed decision
Date to be determined	Reply comments on proposed decision
1 st Commission meeting 30 days after proposed decision filed	Commission may act at this meeting or may hold matter to a subsequent meeting.

4. Assignment of Presiding Officer

ALJ Jean Vieth will be the Presiding Officer.

5. Categorization

This proceeding was previously categorized as ratesetting and that categorization will continue. It appears that hearings will be necessary.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The scope of the proceeding is as set forth herein.
2. The schedule for this proceeding is set forth herein.
3. The Presiding Officer is Administrative Law Judge Jean Vieth.
4. The prior categorization of this proceeding as ratesetting will continue.

Dated July 2, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MICHAEL R. PEEVEY

Michael R. Peevey
Assigned Commissioner