



FILED

04/06/23

11:36 AM

R2106017

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Modernize
the Electric Grid for a High Distributed
Energy Resources Future.

Rulemaking 21-06-017

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING DIRECTING RESPONSES TO
QUESTIONS ON TRACK 1 PHASE 1**

This Ruling directs parties to respond to questions regarding Track 1 Phase 1 of this proceeding. The questions focus on improvements to various utility distribution-related processes. Attachment 1 of this Ruling provides a list of questions on a variety of topics related to distribution planning for which the Commission is requesting input from parties.

No later than May 22, 2023, parties shall file comments responding to the questions contained in Attachment 1. Reply comments shall be filed no later than June 5, 2023.

1. Review of Track 1 Phase 1

The Commission initiated Rulemaking (R.) 21-06-017 to prepare the electric grid for a high number of distributed energy resources (DERs). The Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo) arranged the scope of this proceeding in three tracks: (1) Distribution Planning Process (DPP) and Data Improvements; (2) Distribution System Operator (DSO) Roles and Responsibilities; and (3) Smart Inverter Operationalization and Grid Modernization Planning. Issues in Track 1 Phase 1 will be conducted in two

phases. This Ruling focuses on Track 1, Phase 1 that addresses “the near-term evolution and improvement of the adopted [Distribution Resources Plans proceeding] frameworks, analytic tools, and planning processes into a more holistic DPP.”¹ As set forth in the Scoping Memo, the five Track 1, Phase 1 issues² are as follows:

1. Should the Utilities’ DPPs be modified to address policy-based issues such as forecasting scenarios for increased electrification, improved data sharing, electric vehicle adoption,³ adoption of real-time rates and related flexible load management technologies, and equity? Should policy-forecasting scenarios for higher electrification be used for determining potential grid investments needed to address electrification?
2. How should Utilities’ Grid Needs Assessment/Distribution Deferral Opportunity Reports be coordinated with the draft Transportation Electrification Framework and/or any existing or future Utility transportation electrification planning efforts stemming from the transportation electrification proceeding (R.18-12-006) and any successor proceeding?⁴
3. How can the Grid Needs Assessment/Distribution Deferral Opportunity Reports better reflect the types of Transportation Electrification investments identified in the

¹ Scoping Memo at 9-10.

² Scoping Memo at 4-5.

³ Including electrification of transportation, buildings, ports, rail, and industry.

⁴ See Section 3.1 and Appendix C in the draft Transportation Electrification Framework, Energy Division Staff Proposal, February 2020, regarding the proposal for Utility strategic, long-term Transportation Electrification Plans. Available at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/zev> and <https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M326/K281/326281940.PDF>.

draft Transportation Electrification Framework and the legislative directives from AB 841 (Ting, 2020)?⁵

4. How should Integration Capacity Analysis data and calculations be improved to enhance accuracy and usefulness for DER planning, siting, and interconnection, especially with respect to electrification load?⁶ Should the Data Portal design be improved to provide access to data for multiple stakeholders in the DPP?⁷

5. What initial analysis is needed for the Commission to determine in Track 1, Phase 2, of this proceeding how best to improve local engagement in utility distribution planning?

2. Building the Record for Track 1 Phase 1

To begin to build the record for this proceeding, a recent ruling directed Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company (Utilities) to provide information about their electric distribution planning processes. As explained in the March 9, 2023 Ruling, it is within the scope of the proceeding to determine “whether the

⁵ Statutes of 2020, Chapter 372 (Ting) requires the Commission to adopt a policy that allows certain customer-side costs associated with installing electric vehicle infrastructure to be treated as common-facility costs for each utility, to be recovered from all ratepayers. Resolutions E-5167 and E-5168, as adopted on October 7, 2021, approves the utilities’ requests to establish new electric vehicle infrastructure rules and associated memorandum accounts to track costs associated with implementing AB 841.

⁶ The January 27, 2021, Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling on Joint Parties’ Motion for an Order Requiring Refinements to the Integration Capacity Analysis, directs the Utilities to retain an independent technical expert to review their data validation plans and efforts.

⁷ Data Portals hosted by the three utilities provide ICA, Locational Net Benefit Analysis, Grid Needs Assessment/Distribution Deferral Opportunity Reports, and other data to the public. Confidentiality issues were resolved pursuant to the December 17, 2018 Ruling and July 24, 2018 Ruling for R.14-08-013. (A) The PG&E portal is available at https://www.pge.com/en_US/for-our-business-partners/distribution-resource-planning/distribution-resource-planning-data-portal.page; (B) the SDG&E portal is available at <https://www.sdge.com/more-information/customer-generation/enhanced-integration-capacity-analysis-ica>; and (C) the SCE portal is available at <https://ltmdrpep.sce.com/drpep>.

current electric DPP is adequate for selecting and deploying both traditional distribution infrastructure and [distributed energy resources] solutions to meet grid requirements and minimize utility customer costs accurately.” The questions in the ruling asked Utilities to identify barriers and opportunities that equitably affect the distribution of costs. Utilities were directed to file responses to the questions 30 days from the issuance of the March 9, 2023 Ruling.⁸ Parties will have an opportunity to review the information filed by Utilities.

The purpose of this ruling is to ask parties to consider how the Commission can improve upon the existing processes. With the Track 1 Phase 1 scoping issues in mind, parties are directed to respond to the questions contained in Attachment 1 of this ruling. The responses to the questions will be the basis of a staff proposal to be issued later this year. The staff proposal will address the Track 1 Phase 1 issues. To assist parties, Attachment 2 of this Ruling provides all the reports referenced in Attachment 1 and enters them into the record of this proceeding.

IT IS RULED that:

1. No later than May 22, 2023, parties shall file comments responding to the questions contained in Attachment 1 of this Ruling.
2. No later than June 5, 2023, parties shall file reply comments.

Dated April 6, 2023, at San Francisco, California.

 /s/ KELLY A. HYMES
Kelly A. Hymes
Administrative Law Judge

 /s/ MANISHA LAKHANPAL
Manisha Lakhanpal
Administrative Law Judge

⁸ See March 9, 2023 Ruling at 3.

R.21-06-017 ALJ/KHY/ML2/mph

ATTACHMENT 1

R.21-06-017 ALJ/KHY/ML2/mph

ATTACHMENT 2