BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for a Permit to Construct Electrical Facilities: Red Bluff Substation Project.	Application 10-11-012 (Filed November 17, 2010)

DECISION GRANTING SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY A PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE RED BLUFF SUBSTATION PROJECT

1. Summary

This decision grants Southern California Edison Company a permit to construct the Red Bluff Substation project with mitigation identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan included as Appendix L to the final Environmental Impact Statement and attached to this order. As the lead agency for environmental review of the project, we find that the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for this project meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, and that there are overriding considerations that merit construction of the project notwithstanding its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. This proceeding is closed.

2. Proposed Project

By this application, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) seeks authority to build the Red Bluff Substation project, which includes, among other components, a proposed new 500/220 kilovolt (kV) substation, two new parallel 500 kV transmission lines of about 2500 to 3500 feet each to loop the existing ~~DPV~~Devers - Palo Verde 500 kV transmission line (DPV1) into the new

substation, and two parallel 500 kV transmission lines of about 2500 to 3500 feet each to loop the proposed Devers-Colorado River 500 kV transmission line (DPV2) into the new substation. The project will enable the proposed Desert Sunlight Solar Farm, a 550 megawatt (MW) solar photovoltaic energy-generating project, to interconnect to the California Independent System Operator (CAISO)-controlled transmission grid.

3. Procedural Background

SCE filed this application for a permit to construct the Red Bluff substation project on November 17, 2010.

The Division of Ratepayer Advocates protested the application, asserting that, pursuant to General Order (GO) 131-D, the requisite authority is a certificate of public convenience and necessary, which would require the Commission to find that the project serves a present or future convenience or ~~necessary~~necessity pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1001 and to establish a cost cap for the project pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1005.5.

After the conduct of a prehearing conference on February 10, 2011, the assigned Commissioner issued a scoping memo and ruling on February 25, 2011, determining that the requisite authority to construct the Red Bluff substation project is a permit to construct, identifying the issues to be determined by the Commission in resolving the proceeding, and setting a schedule for addressing those issues.

In accordance with the scoping memo and ruling, SCE served prepared direct testimony on March 14, 2011. No party submitted any prepared rebuttal testimony or requested to cross-examine any of SCE's witnesses. Accordingly, the evidentiary hearing was removed from calendar, and SCE filed a motion to admit its prepared testimony pursuant to Rule 13.8. No party opposed the

motion. The prepared testimony is hereby admitted into the evidentiary record as Exhibit 2.

4. Environmental Review

Pursuant to GO 131-D, in order to issue a permit to construct, the Commission must find that the project complies with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).[1] CEQA requires the lead agency (the Commission in this case) to conduct a review to identify environmental impacts of the project, and ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage, for consideration in the determination of whether to approve the project or a project alternative. CEQA precludes the lead agency from approving a proposed project or a project alternative unless it requires the project proponent to eliminate or substantially lessen all significant effects on the environment where feasible, and determines that any unavoidable remaining significant effects are acceptable due to overriding considerations. (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15090, 15091, 15093, 15126.2, 15126.4, and 15126.6.)

Because it would be located primarily on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Desert Sunlight Solar Farm project requires the BLM's authorization of a right of way and approval of a resource management land use plan amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan. The BLM's decision to grant the right of way and amend the California Desert Conservation Area Plan will be based in part on the BLM's evaluation of the project's environmental effects pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

---

[1] Public Resources Code Section 21000, *et seq.*

Where, as here, the project requires compliance with both CEQA and NEPA, CEQA encourages the state agency to use the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) if that document is prepared before the state agency would otherwise prepare its own environmental impact report (EIR) so long as the EIS complies with the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines and is supplemented to include certain CEQA requirements that are not required pursuant to NEPA. (CEQA Guidelines § 15221; Pub. Resources Code § 21083.7.)

The BLM published a notice of intent to prepare an EIS on January 13, 2010, while SCE did not file this application until November 17, 2010, at which time the Commission would otherwise have initiated its environmental review.

The BLM noticed and conducted a public scoping meeting that was held on January 28, 2010, in Palm Desert, California. The proponent of the Desert Sunlight Solar Farm project engaged in additional public outreach including meetings held with individuals and groups that commented on the scope of the project, additional workshops held in the local community, and discussions with local, state and federal government officials. The BLM produced a scoping report in February 2010 which identified the issues and concerns received during the scoping period.

The BLM issued the draft EIS for public review and comment on August 27, 2010.[2] During the comment period, the BLM conducted three public meetings on October 20, 2010, in Palm Desert; on October 21, 2010, in Desert Center; and on November 4, 2010, in Joshua Tree. The BLM received 147 comment letters

[2] The scoping memo and ruling received the draft EIS into the evidentiary record as Exhibit 1.

during the 90-day comment period ending November 26, 2010, and responded to them in the final EIS which it issued on April 15, 2011.

Pursuant to the BLM's planning regulations at 43 Code of Federal Regulations 1610.5-2, participants in the BLM's planning process for the California Desert Conservation Area Plan amendment who have an interest that is or may be adversely affected by that planning decision may protest approval of that planning decision within 30 days after issuance of the EIS. The BLM received seven protests during this period.

On June 1, 2011, the Commission's Energy Division gave notice, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15225(a), that the Commission will use the final EIS in the place of an EIR. By memo to the Administrative Law Judge and served on the official service list in this proceeding on June 7, 2011, the Energy Division informed the Administrative Law Judge that, after reviewing the protests submitted to the BLM, it continues to believe that the final EIS meets the requirements of CEQA. Accordingly, the June 7, 2011, memo is hereby identified as Exhibit 3 and the final EIS is hereby identified as Exhibit 4, and both are received into the evidentiary record.

5. Scope of Issues

Pursuant to GO 131-D, in order to issue a permit to construct, the Commission must comply with the requirements of CEQA. In addition, pursuant to GO 131-D and Decision (D.) 06-01-042, the Commission will not certify a project unless its design is in compliance with the Commission's policies governing the mitigation of electromagnetic field (EMF) effects using low-cost and no-cost measures.

Accordingly, the assigned Commissioner's February 25, 2011, scoping memo and ruling determined the following issues to be within the scope of the proceeding:

1. What are the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project?
2. Are there potentially feasible mitigation measures that will eliminate or lessen the significant environmental impacts?
3. As between the proposed project and the project alternatives, which is environmentally superior?
4. Was the EIR (or EIS) completed in compliance with CEQA, did the Commission review and consider the EIR (or EIS) prior to approving the project or a project alternative, and does the EIR (or EIS) reflect the Commission's independent judgment?
5. Are the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible?[3]
6. To the extent that the proposed project and/or project alternatives result in significant and unavoidable impacts, are there overriding considerations that nevertheless merit Commission approval of the proposed project or project alternative?
7. Is the proposed project and/or project alternative designed in compliance with the Commission's policies governing the mitigation of EMF effects using low-cost and no-cost measures?

6. Description of Project Alternatives

The EIS evaluated six project alternatives:

- Alternative 1, which is the Desert Sunlight Solar Farm project as proposed by the project proponent, and includes components designated as Solar Farm Layout B, Gen-Tie Line GT-A-1, Red Bluff Substation A and Access Road 2;

[3] The scoping memo and ruling erroneously references Pub. Util. Code § 1002(a)(1) with respect to the considerations within the scope of this issue.

- Alternative 2, which is an alternative project configuration that would include Solar Farm Layout B, Gen-Tie Line ~~BT~~GT-B-2, and Red Bluff Substation B;
- Alternative 3, which is an alternative configuration that would include Solar Farm Layout C, Gen-Tie Line GT-A-2, Red Bluff Substation A and Access Road 1;
- Alternative 4, which is a no-action alternative under which the project would not be approved;
- Alternative 5, which is a no-project alternative under which the project would not be approved and future large-scale solar energy development would not be allowed; and
- Alternative 6, which is a no-project alternative under which the project would not be approved and future large-scale solar energy development *would* be allowed.

Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 represent only three of the seven possible combinations of the project components (i.e., Solar Farm Layout, Gen-Tie Line, Red Bluff Substation and Access Road). The Commission's Energy Division therefore also considered the remaining four combinations, by analyzing and comparing the following component alternatives; this analysis is contained in Appendix C to the EIS:

- Red Bluff Substation:
  - Substation A (eastern) and Access Road 1,
  - Substation A (eastern) and Access Road 2, and
  - Substation B (western).
- Gen-Tie Line:
  - GT-A-1 (Kaiser Road to Desert Center, then east -- 12.2 miles),
  - GT-A-2 (SCE right of way to Substation A -- 9.5 miles), and
  - GT-B-2 (Kaiser Road to Desert Center, then west – 10 miles).
- Solar Farm Layout:
  - Layout B (3912 acres)

- Layout C (3045 acres)

7. Significant Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

We examine, first, the project action alternatives identified in the EIS and, second, the alternative components additionally analyzed by the Commission's Energy Division.

7.1. Impacts by Project Action Alternative

All of the project action alternatives analyzed in the EIS (Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 6) would have significant and unavoidable adverse impacts on air resources, cultural resources and visual resources. The significant environmental effects on other resources can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

7.1.1. Air Resources

All of the project action alternatives would have similar significant and unavoidable impacts on air resources.

Construction activities and associated vehicle traffic would generate emissions of criteria pollutants and hazardous air pollutants. Daily construction-related emissions for all of the action Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District regional emissions significance thresholds for reactive organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, Particulate Matter (PM) 10 and PM 2.5. Alternative six would have similar impacts on air emissions as the action alternatives.

Operational emissions would involve vehicle travel by Solar Farm employees or other employees conducting periodic inspections or maintenance activity along the Gen-Tie Line or at the Red Bluff Substation.

Decommissioning emissions would be comparable in type and magnitude, but likely lower than, the construction emissions.

7.1.2. Cultural Resources

All of the project action alternatives would have similar significant and unavoidable impacts on cultural resources.

Construction of Alternative 1 would directly impact at least 57 sites within the footprint of the project components. Twenty of the sites are potentially eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). In addition, construction would directly impact the potential Desert Training Center/ California-Arizona Maneuver Area Historic District and the North Chuckwalla Petroglyph District. Construction would indirectly impact the historic landscapes of the Colorado River Aqueduct, the North Chuckwalla Mountains Quarry District, and a prehistoric site by constructing modern elements that would disturb the historic setting of these resources.

Construction of Alternative 2 would directly impact 42 sites within the footprint of the project components. Twenty-one of the sites are potentially eligible for the CRHR and assumed to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and thirteen are believed to be associated with the potential Desert Training Center/California-Arizona Maneuver Area Historic District. All project components would have direct audible and visual impacts on the historic landscapes of the Colorado River Aqueduct, the North Chuckwalla Mountains Quarry District, and a prehistoric site by constructing modern elements that would disturb the historic setting of these resources.

Construction of Alternative 3 would directly impact 41 sites within the footprint of the project components, as well as the potential Desert Training Center/California-Arizona Maneuver Area Historic District and the North Chuckwalla Petroglyph District. Fourteen of the sites are potentially eligible for the CRHR, nine of these are believed to be associated with the Desert Training

Center, and one is a contributing, National Register of Historic Places-listed site in the North Chuckwalla Petroglyph District. All project components would indirectly impact the historic landscapes of the Colorado River Aqueduct, the North Chuckwalla Mountains Quarry District, and a prehistoric site by constructing modern elements that would disturb the historic setting of these resources.

Construction of Alternative 6 would have similar impacts to cultural resources as construction of Alternative 1.

Native American consultation is on-going at this time and may find that sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, or traditional use areas are present within or near the construction area of all of the action alternatives, which may directly disturb Native American resources, impede access to these areas, or otherwise disrupt traditional practices.

Operation of all of the project action alternatives would have similar impacts. Operations would primarily have indirect impacts on the historic landscapes of five resources and possibly an unknown number of Native American resources, stemming from new construction within these landscapes that would not be in keeping with the historic nature and setting of the resources. The presence of project components may exclude Native American access to resources of traditional significance or detract from the viewshed of a sacred site, traditional use area, or ~~TCP~~traditional cultural property.

Decommissioning of all of the action alternatives would have similar impacts. Decommissioning would restore historic landscapes and viewsheds of, and access to, some, but not all, impacted cultural resources.

7.1.3. Visual Resources

All of the project action alternatives would have similar significant and unavoidable impacts on visual resources.

Construction would result in the permanent disturbance of approximately 3000 to 4000 acres. Construction and operations would be visible and changes to the characteristic landscape would alter visual resources. For three of the most critical viewpoints (or key observation points), the strong degree of contrast would not comply with interim visual resource management Class II and III objectives.

Decommissioning (which would not occur until the end of the project lifespan, which could be greater than 50 years) would restore the natural visual resources, but would likely take decades after decommissioning for the landscape to resemble the existing conditions.

7.2. Impacts by Component Alternatives

7.2.1. Red Bluff Substation Alternatives

All of the Red Bluff Substation alternatives would have significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources, with Substation A and Access Road 1 causing the most impacts, and Substation B causing the fewest impacts.

All of the Red Bluff Substation alternatives would have comparable significant and unavoidable impacts to air resources and visual resources.

7.2.2. Gen-Tie Line Alternatives

All of the Gen-Tie alternatives would have significant and unavoidable impacts to cultural resources. Based on the surveys conducted, GT-A-2 appears to have substantially fewer impacts (two potentially eligible CRHR sites and impacts to two additional archeological resources) than either GT-A-1 (six potentially eligible CRHR sites and impacts to 13 additional archeological

resources) or GT-B-2 (six potentially eligible CRHR sites and impacts to 17 additional archeological resources). However, full-coverage surveys for the GT-A-2 corridor were not available, and additional resources likely exist which could be affected by construction of GT-A-2.

All of the Gen-Tie Line alternatives would have significant and unavoidable impacts to visual resources. However, GT-A-2 would have the least impact because it would be collocated with an existing transmission line for the majority of its length, while GT-A-1 and GT-B-2 would both require new transmission corridors with similar impacts.

7.2.3. Solar Farm Layout Alternatives

Both Solar Farm layouts would have significant and unavoidable impacts on air resources, cultural resources, and visual resources. Solar Farm Layout B would have 550 MW of power output and would permanently disturb 3912 acres of ground, as compared to Solar Farm Layout C which would have 314 MW of power output and would permanently disturb 3045 acres of ground. Solar Farm Layout C would have the fewest short-term impacts to environmental resources overall. However, by more greatly contributing to California's Renewable Portfolio Standard goals, Solar Farm Layout B would have fewer long-term indirect environmental impacts to special status plants and wildlife. Solar Farm Layout B and Solar Farm Layout C are therefore considered to be environmentally equal.

8. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Red Bluff Substation A with Access Road 2, in combination with Gen-Tie GT-A-2 and either Solar Farm Layout B or Solar Farm Layout C, would have the fewest adverse impacts on environmental resources and is therefore the environmentally superior alternative.

9. Certification of EIS

As stated previously, where, as here, the project requires compliance with both CEQA and NEPA, CEQA encourages the state agency to use the EIS if that document is prepared before the state agency would otherwise prepare its own EIR so long as the EIS complies with the provisions of the CEQA Guidelines and is supplemented to include certain CEQA requirements that are not required pursuant to NEPA. (CEQA Guidelines § 15221; Pub. Resources Code § 21083.7.)

The EIS was completed after notice and opportunity for public comment on the scope of the environmental review and the draft EIS, as required by CEQA. The final EIS documents all written and oral comments made on the draft EIS, and responds to them, as required by CEQA. The EIS identifies the proposed project's significant and unavoidable environmental impacts and mitigation measures that will avoid or substantially lessen them. As required by CEQA (but not NEPA), Section 2.2.6 of the EIS identifies a combination of Gen-Tie GT-A-2, Red Bluff Substation A and Access Road 2, and either Solar Farm Layout C or Solar Farm Layout B as the environmentally superior alternative pursuant to CEQA, and Appendix C documents the details of the Energy Division's consideration and comparison of the three combinations of alternatives considered in full detail in the body of the EIS, as well as four additional technically feasible combinations of project components. Additionally, as required by CEQA (but not NEPA), the final EIS discusses growth-inducing effects in Section 4.18.4.

We have reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIS and believe it meets the requirements of CEQA. We certify that the EIS has been completed in compliance with CEQA that the final EIS was presented to us and

we have reviewed and considered the information contained in it, and that the final EIS reflects our independent judgment and analysis.

10. Infeasibility of Environmentally Superior Alternative

The environmentally superior alternative is a combination of Red Bluff Substation A and Access Road 2, Gen-Tie Line GT-A-2 and either Solar Farm Layout C or Solar Farm Layout B. The feasibility of the environmentally superior alternative depends upon the BLM's grant of a right of way for constructing and operating the facilities on public lands. In the final EIS, the BLM identified Alternative 1 as the Agency Preferred Alternative, which includes Gen-Tie Line GT-A-1 rather than Gen-Tie Line GT-A-2, as its preferred alternative pursuant to NEPA; in the event that the BLM grants a right of way for Gen-Tie Line GT-A-1 rather than Gen-Tie Line GT-A-2, this component of the environmentally superior alternative will be legally infeasible since only BLM has the authority to select an alternative on BLM-administered public lands.

11. Overriding Considerations

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15093, the Commission may only approve a project that results in significant and unavoidable impacts upon a finding that there are overriding considerations. The Red Bluff Substation project will enable the Desert Sunlight Solar Farm to interconnect to the CAISO-controlled transmission grid, aiding in progress towards federal and state greenhouse gas reduction and renewable electricity goals, including the requirements set forth in the California Renewable Portfolio Standard Program,[4] Assembly Bill (AB) 32

---

[4] The California Renewable Portfolio Standards Program was established by Senate Bill (SB) 1078 (Stats. 2002, ch. 516, Sec. 3, codified as Pub. Util. Code §§ 399.11 *et seq.*, effective January 1, 2003). The Renewable Portfolio Standards Program or related

Footnote continued on next page

(California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006), the Governor's Executive Order S-14-08 to increase the state's Renewable Energy Standard to 33% renewable energy by 2020, and Title XVII, Section 1705, of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (authorizing a new program for rapid deployment of, among other things, renewable energy projects). For these reasons, we find that there are overriding considerations that support our approval of the Red Bluff Substation project, whether configured as Alternative 1 (Red Bluff Substation A and Access Road 2, Gen-Tie Line GT-A-1 and Solar Farm Layout B) or by utilizing Gen-Tie Line GT-A-2, despite its significant and unavoidable impacts on air resources, cultural resources and visual resources under either configuration.

SCE's witness Jorge Chacon also asserts that the project will provide additional benefits of (1) maximizing the use of the existing transmission system in the Desert Center area by establishing an interconnection to it; (2) improving the reliability of the transmission grid following interconnection of new generation resources in compliance with reliability criteria requirement by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, CAISO, and SCE's planning design guidelines an criteria; (3) allowing SCE to construct facilities in a manner that will minimize service interruptions and environmental impacts; and (4) create construction jobs. With respect to item (1), it is not apparent that establishing an interconnection to the existing transmission system is a benefit of the project so much as a description of it. With respect to items (2) and (3), it is not apparent that compliance with

---

elements have been amended several times, including by SB 107 (Stats. 2006, ch. 464), AB 1969 (Stats. 2006, ch. 731), SB 1036 (Stats. 2007, ch. 685), SB 380 (Stats. 2008, ch. 544), SB 32 (Stats. 2009, ch. 328), SB 695 (Stats. 2009, ch. 337), and SB 2 (2011-12 First Extraordinary Session, Stats. 2011, ch 1).

required reliability criteria and minimizing service interruptions and environmental impacts are benefits of the project so much as best business and legal requirements for its construction. With respect to item (4), while the creation of construction jobs is a societal and economic benefit, SCE does not offer evidence to gauge whether the construction jobs that will be created by this project are a sufficient benefit to override the significant and unavoidable impacts on air resources, cultural resources and visual resources.

12. EMF

The Commission has examined EMF impacts in several previous proceedings.[5] We found the scientific evidence presented in those proceedings was uncertain as to the possible health effects of EMFs and we did not find it appropriate to adopt any related numerical standards. Because there is no agreement among scientists that exposure to EMF creates any potential health risk, and because CEQA does not define or adopt any standards to address the potential health risk impacts of possible exposure to EMFs, the Commission does not consider magnetic fields in the context of CEQA and determination of environmental impacts.

However, recognizing that public concern remains, we do require, pursuant to GO 131-D, Section X.A, that all requests for a permit to construct include a description of the measures taken or proposed by the utility to reduce the potential for exposure to EMFs generated by the proposed project. We developed an interim policy that requires utilities, among other things, to identify the no-cost measures undertaken, and the low-cost measures

[5] *See* D.06-01-042 and D.93-11-013.

implemented, to reduce the potential EMF impacts. The benchmark established for low-cost measures is four percent of the total budgeted project cost that results in an EMF reduction of at least 15 percent (as measured at the edge of the utility right-of-way).

The proposed project is designed to place its major substation electrical equipment (such as transformers, switchracks, buses and underground duct banks) away from the substation property lines, and to arrange the conductors of the proposed transmission line segments for magnetic field reduction along adjacent transmission corridors. This design is consistent with the Commission's EMF policy for implementing no-cost and low-cost measures to reduce potential EMF impacts.

13. Waiver of Comment Period

At a status conference conducted on May 25, 2011, the parties stipulated to the waiver of comments on the proposed decision. Accordingly, pursuant to Section 311(g)(2) of the Public Utilities Code and Rule 14.6(b) and (c)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the otherwise applicable 30-day period for public review and comment is waived.

14. Assignment of Proceeding

Catherine J. K. Sandoval is the assigned Commissioner and Hallie Yacknin is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. The proposed Red Bluff Substation project and all seven of the possible alternative combinations of the project components would have significant and unavoidable adverse impacts on air resources, cultural resources and visual resources.

2. Red Bluff Substation A with Access Road 2, in combination with Gen-Tie GT-A-2 and either Solar Farm Layout C or Solar Farm Layout B is the environmentally superior alternative.

3. The Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIS.

4. The EIS reflects the Commission's independent judgment and analysis.

5. The environmentally superior alternative will be infeasible if the BLM approves its preferred alternative combination, which utilizes Gen-Tie GT-A-1 instead of the environmentally superior Gen-Tie GT-A-2.

6. The Red Bluff Substation project will enable the Desert Solar Sunlight Farm to interconnect to the CAISO-controlled transmission grid, aiding in progress towards federal and state greenhouse gas reduction and renewable electricity goals, including the requirements set forth in AB 1078 (California Renewable Portfolio Standard Program), AB 32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006), the Governor's Executive Order S-14-08 to increase the state's Renewable Energy Standard to 33% renewable energy by 2020, and Title XVII, Section 1705, of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (authorizing a new program for rapid deployment of, among other things, renewable energy projects).

7. The proposed project incorporates no-cost and low-cost measures to reduce potential EMF impacts by placing its major substation electrical equipment (such as transformers, switchracks, buses and underground duct banks) away from the substation property lines, and arranging the conductors of the proposed transmission line segments for magnetic field reduction along adjacent transmission corridors.

Conclusions of Law

1. The EIS was completed in compliance with CEQA.

2. In the event that the BLM grants a right of way for Gen-Tie Line GT-A-1 rather than Gen-Tie Line GT-A-2, this component of the environmentally superior alternative will be legally infeasible.

3. The contribution of the Red Bluff Substation project (Red Bluff Substation A with Access Road 2, in combination with either Solar Farm Layout C or Solar Farm Layout B and either Gen-tie GT-A-1 or Gen-Tie GT-A-2) to California's progress towards federal and state greenhouse gas reduction and renewable electricity goals is an overriding consideration that supports our approval of it, despite its significant unavoidable impacts on air resources, cultural resources and visual resources under the respective configurations.

4. The proposed project design is consistent with the Commission's EMF policy for implementing no-cost and low-cost measures to reduce potential EMF impacts.

5. SCE should be granted a permit to construct the Red Bluff Substation project, configured as Red Bluff Substation A and Access Road 2, in combination with either Solar Farm Layout C or Solar Farm Layout B, and with either Gen-tie GT-A-2 or Gen-Tie GT-A-2, in compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan included as Appendix L of the final EIS and attached to this order.

6. This proceeding should be closed.

7. This order should be effective immediately.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Southern California Edison Company is granted a Permit to Construct the Red Bluff Substation project, configured as Red Bluff Substation A and Access Road 2, in combination with either Solar Farm Layout C or Solar Farm Layout B, and with either Gen-tie GT-A-1 or Gen-Tie GT-A-2, in compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan included as part of the final Environmental Impact Statement and attached to this order.
2. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, included as Appendix L of the final Environmental Impact Statement and attached to this order, is adopted.
3. Southern California Edison Company's prepared testimony is admitted into the evidentiary record as Exhibit 2, Energy Division's June 7, 2011, memo to the Administrative Law Judge and attached response to protests is admitted into the evidentiary record as Exhibit 3, and the final Environmental Impact Statement for the Desert Sunlight Solar Farm project is admitted into the evidentiary record as Exhibit 4.
4. No evidentiary hearings are necessary.
5. Application 10-11-012 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

Document comparison by Workshare Professional on Thursday, July 07, 2011 2:26:02 PM

Input:	
Document 1 ID	file://d:/lil/Desktop/CPUC01-#453877-v1-A1011012_Yacknin_Agenda_Dec_.DOC
Description	CPUC01-#453877-v1-A1011012_Yacknin_Agenda_Dec_
Document 2 ID	PowerDocs://CPUC01/455711/1
Description	CPUC01-#455711-v1-A1011012_Yacknin_Agenda_Dec._Rev._1
Rendering set	standard

Legend:	
Insertion	
~~Deletion~~	
~~Moved from~~	
Moved to	
Style change	
Format change	
~~Moved deletion~~	
Inserted cell	
Deleted cell	
Moved cell	
Split/Merged cell	
Padding cell	

Statistics:	
	Count
Insertions	8
Deletions	5
Moved from	0
Moved to	0
Style change	0
Format changed	0
Total changes	13