



PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

FILED

03/24/26
11:40 AM
R1211005

March 24, 2026

Agenda ID #24092
Quasi-Legislative

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 12-11-005:

This is the proposed decision of Commissioner Karen Douglas. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's April 30, 2026, Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties of record may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE
Michelle Cooke
Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC:hma
Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS**
(Mailed 3/24/2026)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking
Regarding Policies, Procedures and
Rules for the California Solar
Initiative, the Self Generation
Incentive Program and Other
Distributed Generation Issues.

Rulemaking 12-11-005

**DECISION DISMISSING JOINT PETITION FOR MODIFICATION OF
DECISION 15-06-002 AS MOOT****Summary**

This decision dismisses the Joint Petition for Modification (Petition) of Decision (D.) 15-06-002 filed by the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) and Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition (LGSEC). The Petition seeks to provide four additional six-month extensions beyond the three presently authorized. The relief being sought in the Petition was granted in D.25-12-003, which was adopted by the Commission on December 4, 2025, making the Petition moot.

This proceeding is closed.

1. Background

The Commission adopted Decision (D.) 15-06-002 in Rulemaking 12-11-005 on June 11, 2015. The decision, among other matters, established that Self-Generation Incentive Program (SGIP) administrators could authorize three, six-

month extensions at commercial or government host customer sites, after the submission of an incentive claim form and receipt of a conditional reservation letter.¹ This benefit was also made available at all host customer sites, including residential SGIP projects.

On April 8, 2025, the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) and Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition (LGSEC), filed a Petition for Modification of D.15-06-002 (Petition) requesting four, six-month extensions, instead of three.

In their Petition, SCTCA and LGSEC argue that, “due to a cascading set of circumstances outside of SGIP Applicants’ control, which have acted to delay or stall project progress, including supply chain challenges, some of which are caused by the lingering impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic; financial market and funding uncertainties; and interconnection issues, which have in part been catalyzed by state electrification policies of the kind the SGIP program is intended to support.”² The Petition identified that difficulties meeting SGIP timeline requirements are ubiquitous among Equity and Equity Resilience projects.³ According to the Petition, approximately 21 percent of all SGIP Equity and Equity Resilience rebate reservations that were secured between 2020 and 2022 are still active. However, these reservations have a high likelihood of being at-risk due to timeline issues, with 49 percent of the total reservations made within this timeframe cancelled and 30 percent completed.⁴

¹ Decision (D.) 15-06-002 at 1-2.

² Petition at 2-3.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Id.* at 3-4.

The Petition also included a request to stay cancellation of non-residential projects past existing deadlines to provide relief to customers affected by circumstances outside their control.⁵

On May 8, 2025, the California Solar & Storage Association (CALSSA), the Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE), and the California Energy Storage Alliance (CESA) filed responses to the Petition. CALSSA expressed strong support for the Petition, mentioning that it “rightly identifies a growing set of challenges facing SGIP projects that serve disadvantaged communities, Tribes, and public institutions.”⁶ According to CALSSA, “the request to allow up to four additional six-month extensions for otherwise qualifying projects – without altering the program’s sunset date – offers a measured, responsible way to preserve projects that advance critical resiliency and public health objectives.”⁷

CESA also strongly supported the Petition stating, “it ensures that projects continue to make demonstrable progress during the extensions, requiring that customers provide ‘verified information’ that demonstrates the project is generally being pursued in good faith.”⁸ CSE urged the Commission to “approve the modification to provide up to four additional six-month extensions for non-residential equity and equity resiliency projects to avoid further depleting administrative funding for projects that have already proved eligible for the program at time of submission.”⁹

⁵ *Id.* at 8.

⁶ CSSA Response at 1.

⁷ *Id.* at 2.

⁸ CESA Response at 2.

⁹ CSE Response at 4.

2. Issues Before the Commission

The issue before the Commission is whether to grant four, six-month extensions to all eligible SGIP Equity and Equity Resilience projects.

3. Discussion and Analysis

In D.25-12-003, the Commission considered the issues raised in the Petition, as well as party comments associated with project extensions and granted up to four, six-month extensions with conditions.¹⁰ In granting the additional extension, the Commission's intent was to ensure that non-residential equity SGIP projects could successfully be completed, receive expected SGIP incentives, and benefit the host customer and ratepayers.¹¹ Because D.25-12-003 grants the relief requested in the Petition, the Petition is moot.

4. Summary of Public Comment

Rule 1.18 allows any member of the public to submit written comment in any Commission proceeding using the "Public Comment" tab of the online Docket Card for that proceeding on the Commission's website. Rule 1.18(b) requires that relevant written comment submitted in a proceeding be summarized in the final decision issued in that proceeding. A member of the public expressed support for granting time extensions requested in the Petition, mentioning supply chain and other challenges.

5. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of Commissioner Karen Douglas in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of

¹⁰ D.25-12-003 at 21.

¹¹ *Id.* at 20-21.

Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____, and reply comments were filed on _____ by _____.

6. Assignment of Proceeding

Kaen Douglas is the assigned Commissioner and Hazlyn Fortune is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. On April 8, 2025, SCTCA and LGSEC, filed a Petition for Modification of D.15-06-002.
2. The Commission adopted D.25-12-003 on December 4, 2025, which granted the relief requested in the Petition.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Petition should be dismissed because relief was granted in D.25-12-003.
2. This proceeding should be closed.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Joint Petition for Modification of Decision 15-06-002, filed by the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association and Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition, is dismissed.
2. Rulemaking 12-11-005 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.