



ALJ/SJP/RM3/jnf 12/18/2023

FILED

12/18/23

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

12:49 PM

R2305018

Order Instituting Rulemaking to
Update and Amend Commission
General Order 131-D.

Rulemaking 23-05-018

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES' RULING INVITING
COMMENT ON PHASE 2 ISSUES**

In Phase 1 of this proceeding, the Commission considered changes to General Order (GO) 131-D necessary to conform it to the requirements of Senate Bill 529 (Stats. 2022) and the updating of outdated references. In Phase 2, the Commission will broadly consider any other changes to GO 131-D that are needed. A Staff Proposal addressing Phase 2 issues is expected to be issued in the first quarter of 2024. To better inform the Staff Proposal and develop a record on Phase 2 issues, parties are invited to file comments on the questions set forth below. Any comments previously filed in this proceeding may be incorporated by reference and need not be repeated.

1. What definition, if any, should the Commission adopt for the term: "existing electrical transmission facilities" set forth in Public Utilities Code Section 564?¹ In your response, please explain:
 - whether modification of a facility below 50 kilovolts (kV) to a 200 kV facility should qualify for the permitting processes authorized in the statute;

¹ Unless otherwise specified, all section references are to the Public Utilities Code.

- whether modification of a facility between 50 kV and 200 kV to a 500 kV facility should qualify for the permitting processes authorized in the statute; and
 - whether the permitting processes authorized in the statute should only apply to modifications to “transmission lines” as defined in Section I of General Order 131-D (for instance, modifying a 200 kV line to 500 kV).
2. What definitions, if any, should the Commission adopt for the following terms listed in Section 564 and/or GO 131-D? For each of the terms, please provide at least three examples of potentially qualifying projects.
- “Expansion” (as used in Section 564 and Section III.A of GO 131-D)
 - “Extension” (as used in Section 564 and Section III.A of GO 131-D)
 - “Modification” (as used in Section 564 and Section III.A of GO 131-D)
 - “Upgrade” (as used in Section 564 and Section III.A of GO 131-D)
 - “Equivalent facilities or structures” (as used in the phrase “the replacement of existing power line facilities or supporting structures with equivalent facilities or structures” in Sections III.A and III.B.1.b of GO 131-D)
 - “Accessories” (as used in the phrase “the placing of new or additional conductors, insulators, or their accessories on or replacement of supporting structures already built” in Section III.A and similar phrases in Sections III.B.1.e and VI of GO 131-D)
3. On September 29, 2023, Southern California Edison Company, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company filed a Joint Motion for Adoption of Phase 1 Settlement Agreement on behalf of numerous settling parties. Notwithstanding its title as a settlement regarding Phase 1 revisions, the settlement

agreement addresses issues that are within the scope of both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this proceeding. On December 14, 2023, the Commission adopted a decision addressing Phase 1 issues, Decision (D.) 23-12-035. The Commission explained that submission of Phase 1 of the proceeding had not been set aside to consider the settlement agreement as relates to Phase 1 but directed that proposals in the settlement agreement within the scope of Phase 2 be given due consideration during Phase 2.²

- a. Are any modifications to the proposals in the settlement agreement warranted in light of the Phase 1 decision?
 - b. Are there any other issues related to the settlement agreement the Commission should consider that have not already been raised in the settlement agreement or party comments?
4. Are there any additional issues or proposals that the Commission should consider in Phase 2 that have not already been raised in the settlement agreement or other party comments?

IT IS RULED that:

Parties are invited to file opening comments on the questions set forth in this ruling by January 15, 2023, and reply comments by January 29, 2023.

Dated December 18, 2023, at San Francisco, California.

 /s/ SOPHIA J. PARK
Sophia J. Park
Administrative Law Judge

 /s/ RAJAN MUTIALU
Rajan Mutialu
Administrative Law Judge

² D.23-12-035 at p. 18.