



MGA/mph 6/13/2018

FILED
06/13/18
09:16 AM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Liberty Utilities
(CalPeco Electric) LLC (U 933 E) for
Approval to Construct a Battery
Energy Storage System in
Alpine County, California.

Application 17-11-014

ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S SCOPING MEMO AND RULING

This scoping memo and ruling sets forth the category, issues to be addressed, and schedule of the proceeding pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1 and Article 7 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Procedural Background

Liberty CalPeco requests Commission approval to construct a battery energy storage system ("BESS") in Alpine County, California. Liberty CalPeco asserts that a BESS will improve the quality of electric service for its customers in Alpine County, improve system reliability for the affected service area to the level enjoyed by customers in the rest of Liberty CalPeco's service areas, and improve safety.

A prehearing conference was held on April 4, 2018 to discuss the issues of law and fact and determine the need for hearing and schedule for resolving the matter. After considering the protest and discussion at the prehearing conference, I have determined the issues and schedule of the proceeding to be as set forth in this scoping memo.

Issues

The issues to be determined are:

1. Is the proposed procurement of Liberty's CalPeco BESS reasonable?
 - a. Is the technology appropriate?
 - b. Is there need for the resource?
 - c. Are the price, terms, and conditions of the contract and project reasonable?
 - d. Does the project provide the best value to ratepayers?
 - i. Is it cost-effective?
 - ii. Does it provide environmental, public health, and/or safety benefits?
 - e. To what extent will the system assist reliability and provide back-up power for customers?
 - f. Was the procurement process fair and competitive?
 - g. Was the bid evaluation methodology reasonable?
 - h. Did Liberty CalPeco consider reasonable alternatives when conducting its analysis and evaluation?
2. How does this project and its estimated rate impact fit in with other upcoming projects that will be included in Liberty CalPeco's 2018 General Rate Case?

Need for Evidentiary Hearing

The Commission in Resolution ALJ 176-3410 also preliminarily determined that hearings are required.

At the PHC, parties agreed to a schedule that provides an opportunity for parties to file a motion for evidentiary hearings. At this time, we will leave the determination that evidentiary hearings are needed.

Schedule

The following schedule is adopted here and may be modified by the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the application:

Intervenors’ prepared direct testimony served	June 29, 2018
Prepared rebuttal testimony served	July 13, 2018
Deadline for Motion Requesting Evidentiary Hearings	July 20, 2018
Evidentiary hearing (if needed)	Early August
Opening briefs	August 24, 2018
Reply briefs [matter submitted]	September 5, 2018
Proposed decision	No later than 90 days after submission
Commission decision	No sooner than 30 days after the proposed decision

The proceeding will stand submitted upon the filing of reply briefs, unless the ALJ requires further evidence or argument. Based on this schedule, the proceeding will be resolved within 18 months as required by Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5.

Category of Proceeding/Ex Parte Restrictions

This ruling confirms the Commission’s preliminary determination that this is a ratesetting proceeding. (Resolution ALJ 176- 3410.) Accordingly, *ex parte* communications are restricted and must be reported pursuant to Article 8 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Public Outreach

Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1711(a), I hereby report that the Commission sought the participation of those likely to be affected by this matter by noticing it

in the Commission's monthly newsletter that is served on communities and businesses that subscribe to it and posted on the Commission's website.

The CPUC Business and Community Outreach Office directly sent a summary and link to the application to 13 contacts in the Alpine County/Markleeville area, including all five Alpine County supervisors, the Community Development Manager, County Counsel, and the Sheriff.

Additionally, a summary and link to the application was included on page four of the December 2017 "Filings at the CPUC" newsletter. The newsletter was distributed electronically to most elected (typically mayors and county supervisors) and executive (typically city managers) heads of local governments statewide, as well as public works directors for which have contact information, local councils of governments, community organizations, and other parties who have expressed interest in receiving the newsletter. It is also posted on the Business and Community Outreach Office's website.

Intervenor Compensation

Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a)(1), a customer who intends to seek an award of compensation must file and serve a notice of intent to claim compensation by May 4, 2018, 30 days after the prehearing conference.

Public Advisor

Any person interested in participating in this proceeding who is unfamiliar with the Commission's procedures or has questions about the electronic filing procedures is encouraged to obtain more information at <http://consumers.cpuc.ca.gov/pao/> or contact the Commission's Public Advisor at 1-866-849-8390 or 415-703-2074 or 1-866-836-7825 (TYY), or send an e-mail to public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov.

Service of Documents on Commissioners and Their Personal Advisors

Rule 1.10 requires only electronic service on any person on the official service list, other than the ALJ.

When serving documents on Commissioners or their personal advisors, whether or not they are on the official service list, parties must only provide electronic service. Parties must NOT send hard copies of documents to Commissioners or their advisors unless specifically instructed to do so.

Assignment of Proceeding

Martha Guzman Aceves is the assigned Commissioner and Brian Stevens is the assigned ALJ and presiding officer for the proceeding.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The scope of this proceeding is described above.
2. The schedule of this proceeding is as set forth above.
3. Evidentiary hearings are needed.
4. The presiding officer is Administrative Law Judge Brian Stevens.
5. The category of the proceeding is ratesetting.

Dated June 13, 2018, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MARTHA GUZMAN ACEVES

Martha Guzman Aceves
Assigned Commissioner