Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF PRESIDENT ALICE REYNOLDS**
(Mailed 8/12/2024)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Establish Energization Timelines.	Rulemaking 24-01-018

DECISION ESTABLISHING TARGET ENERGIZATION TIME PERIODS AND PROCEDURE FOR CUSTOMERS TO REPORT ENERGIZATION DELAYS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECISION ESTABLISHING TARGET ENERGIZATION TIME PERIODS AND PROCEDURE FOR CUSTOMERS TO REPORT ENERGIZATION DELAYS

Summary

This decision establishes average and maximum energization targets and timelines for Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company (the large electric IOUs) in compliance with Public Utilities Code §§ 930-939. Energization activities include work associated with Electric Rules 15, 16 and electric capacity upgrades on the electric distribution system. Electric Rules 15 and 16 are tariffs that contain the rules and processes for extending electric distribution and service equipment to energize new customer load such as new homes, businesses, and charging stations for electric vehicles. This decision establishes new statewide energization targets for Electric Rules 15 and 16; upholds the timelines already established for Electric Rules 29 and 45; and establishes statewide timelines for certain upstream capacity upgrade activities. This decision requires that the three large electric IOUs plan and prioritize energization work to meet the new targets and timelines, report on time periods that exceed the targets, and adopt remedial actions if the targets are exceeded.

The adopted energization targets only focus on steps within the large electric IOUs' control, which can accelerate the overall energization process for customers and clarify the differences between utility and customer responsibilities. For Electric Rules 15, 16, 29, and 45, the large electric IOUs are directed to complete steps in their control for energization projects that require work associated with Electric Rule 15, 16 or both tariffs. The decision also adopts maximum targets that vary by tariff. The average and maximum tariff-based targets are intended to accelerate energization performance for all three large

IOUs. This decision also adopts new reporting requirements to inform the Commission's consideration of accelerating energization targets in the second phase of this proceeding and a mechanism for customers to report delays in the large electric IOUs' completion of their energization requests to the Commission.

Regarding upstream capacity upgrade activities, this decision adopts timelines instead of targets at this time given the complexity of this work and the lack of data submitted by large electric IOUs in this proceeding. Upstream capacity upgrades are associated with energization projects that require new infrastructure beyond the customer's project site, such as new or upgraded circuits, upgraded substations, or a wholly new substation to support the new load.

The large electric IOUs should utilize the preliminary upstream capacity timelines established in this decision to set expectations for their workplans regarding energization projects that trigger upstream capacity upgrades.

The primary goals of this decision are to require the large electric IOUs to:

- Accelerate energization of customers.
- Increase transparency around what steps of the energization process are in the utilities control and the time necessary for the large electric IOUs to complete the steps in customers' energization project request(s).
- Clarify the process for customers to report energization delays to the California Public Utilities Commission.

Rulemaking 24-01-018 remains open as a venue to address additional issues related to accelerating and improving energization timelines for utility customers.

1. Background

1.1 Factual Background

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) issued Order Instituting Rulemaking (R.) 24-01-018 on January 30, 2024, to serve as a venue for the Commission to implement certain provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 410 and Assembly Bill (AB) 50.[1] These bills require the Commission to establish reasonable average and maximum target energization time periods and a procedure for customers to report energization delays to the Commission, along with other requirements.[2] SB 410 and AB 50 authorize the Commission to modify or adjust the requirements considered in this rulemaking for utilities with 100,000 or fewer service connections in California.[3]

R.24-01-018 intends to adopt energization targets and timelines and track the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs) compliance, while providing customers with more information about the timing of these targets and timelines and improve methods for the customer to communicate with the large electric IOUs and the Commission. Prior to this decision, aside from the EV Infrastructure Rules adopted in Resolution E-5247, investor-owned utilities were not held to specific timelines when energization requests were submitted. The

[1] SB 410 (Becker) was codified as the Statutes of 2023, Ch. 394; AB 50 (Wood) was codified as the Statutes of 2023, Ch. 317.

[2] We note that Resolution E-5247 establishes an interim 125-business day average service energization timeline for projects taking service under Electric Rules 29 (PG&E and SCE) and Electric Rule 45 (SDG&E), which were adopted pursuant Resolution E-5167 for the large electric IOUs. Similar service energization timelines have not been established for Electric Rules 15 or 16 prior to being addressed in this decision.

[3] Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code §§ 932-939. Pub. Util. Code § 931 defines "electrification," "energization," and "energization time period" for the purposes of implementing SB 410. Pub. Util. Code § 933.5 (g) defines "energization" and "energize" for the purposes of implementing AB 50.

Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling outlines two Phases. This Phase 1 decision focuses on statutory requirements that the Commission must enact by September 30, 2024. Phase 2 will focus on other requirements of SB 410 and AB 50 that do not have a statutory deadline and explore improvements to the adopted timelines and targets. Other issues related to energization targets may be addressed in other Commission proceedings or in the second phase of this rulemaking.

1.2 Senate Bill 410

SB 410 was signed into law on October 7, 2023, as the Powering Up Californians Act. It addresses the time necessary to complete customer energization requests, including upgrades to the electric distribution system and the extension of new electric service. The bill sought to identify the reason(s) for delays customers of large electric IOUs may face when seeking new or upgraded electric service lines.[4]

SB 410 requires the Commission to, no later than September 30, 2024, establish the average and maximum time an electric IOU should take to complete a customer's request to upgrade or have new electric service provided to their property. It also directs the Commission to, no later than September 30, 2024, establish a method for customers to report instances when those energization targets are not met.[5] The bill recognizes that to meet California's decarbonization

[4] Pub. Util. Code § 931 (a) and (b). According to the Senate Bill Analysis dated September 14, 2023, the legislative intent for requiring the Commission to establish targets for energization time periods and related reporting by the large electric IOUs, SB 410 is intended to provide more accountability of the pace of energization projects in the hopes of preventing future delays and backlogs.

[5] Pub. Util. Code § 934. This decision applies to the largest utilities providing electric service in California: Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company.

goals, new customers must be promptly connected to the electrical distribution system, and existing customers must have their service level upgraded in a timely manner.[6]

SB 410 also mandates the Commission to direct the large electric IOUs to improve energization planning to reduce the time necessary to complete upstream capacity projects, distribution upgrades, and service extensions.[7] Specifically, when the large electric IOUs are conducting their annual distribution planning process for Commission review, they are now required to consider (a) federal, state, regional, and local air quality and decarbonization standards; (b) state transportation and building electrification requirements; (c) state and local housing and economic development plans, especially those related to electrification of critical facilities, transportation infrastructure, and building infrastructure; (d) known load and projections of load identified by the California Energy Commission (CEC); and (e) any identified load that may exceed the projected load identified by the CEC.[8]

Separately, SB 410 requires the Commission to ensure each large electric IOU has a mechanism to recover costs necessary to comply with the bill's findings, requirements, and policies, including the energization targets and timelines adopted in this decision.[9] If requested and deemed reasonable, the Commission should authorize a large electric IOU's request for a ratemaking mechanism to track and recover costs that exceed those approved in the large

[6] Pub. Util. Code § 932 (a) (2).

[7] Pub. Util. Code § 936-937.

[8] Pub. Util. Code § 936.

[9] Pub. Util. Code § 937.

electric IOU's General Rate Case.[10] The Commission's review of a large electric IOU's request must occur within 180 days after the request is submitted. SB 410 requires any large electric IOU to retain an independent third-party auditor before the Commission authorizes its proposed ratemaking mechanism. The third-party auditor "shall be selected by the Commission based on nonbinding recommendations from the electrical corporation, to review the electrical corporation's business practices and procedures for energizing new customers and how the electrical corporation is planning for demand growth, including new customer energizations."[11] The large electric IOUs shall not recover the costs of the third-party auditor from ratepayers.[12]

1.3 Assembly Bill 50

AB 50 was signed into law on October 7, 2023, and requires the Commission to determine the criteria for timely energization for electric customers, including

---

[10] Pub. Util. Code §§ 936-937.

[11] Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 938, the third-party auditor shall review (1) the electrical corporation's customer energization requests over the previous three years; (2) The electrical corporation's projections of customer demand growth included in the electrical corporation's distribution plan, including growth in new customers and growth in demand from existing customers; (3) the electrical corporation's qualified staffing levels and future anticipated staffing needs to meet projections for customer demand growth, including the ability of the electrical corporation to sufficiently build its workforce; (4) funding requested by the electrical corporation to support energization requests for the previous three years in the general rate case or any other proceeding, and the efficacy of those previous requests in meeting customer demand; (5) Commission authorized funding for the electrical corporation to support energization for the previous three years, future authorized funding, and authorized changes to the electrical corporation's business practices or structures to improve its ability to respond to changing customer demand; (6) The electrical corporation's performance in meeting energization time periods established by the commission pursuant to this article; (7) The electrical corporation's performance in meeting its internally established energization time periods over the prior 10 years or longer, as necessary; and (8) any other metrics deemed relevant by the commission or third-party auditor to support a thorough evaluation of the electrical corporation's energization performance, including to identify and correct past flaws and to identify future best practices.

[12] Pub. Util. Code § 938(a)(2).

among other things, categories of timely electric service through energization. AB 50 requires each electrical corporation that energized less than 35 percent of customers with completed applications exceeding 12 months in duration by January 31, 2023, to submit a report to the Commission on or before December 1, 2024, demonstrating that the electrical corporation has energized 80 percent of those customers with applications deemed complete as of January 31, 2023. To improve the accuracy of projected demand and facilitate the goal of timely service through energization, AB 50 requires each electrical corporation to evaluate and update, as necessary, its existing distribution planning processes. To inform the Commission's determination of criteria for timely service, the bill requires the Commission to annually collect certain information from each electrical corporation until the Commission establishes new reporting requirements.

Activities related to timely electric service through energization include but are not limited to (a) the timely start of service, and timely fulfillment of requests, for energization, including new service connections and increased load from existing service connections after a customer has submitted a request for new or increased electrical load; and (b) project types that justify unique or extended energization timelines.

Projects that may justify unique or longer energization timelines include, but are not limited to, those projects that require substantial upstream capacity upgrades or substation upgrades; unanticipated engineering or construction work; or projects requiring energization of significant, unanticipated new load.[13]

[13] Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(a).

To improve the accuracy of projected demand, AB 50 directs each large electric IOU to have annual meetings with interested parties and experts in customer energization, including, but not limited to, representatives from local governments and relevant county staff for each interested local, regional, and/or county government in its service territory. These meetings should discuss customer service; existing capacity; planned capacity upgrades; projected local demand; local, regional, and/or county development plans; significant delays in customer energization in local, regional and/or county; distribution planning; existing workflows; and potential improvements to planning, timelines, processes, customer communication, and customer education.[14]

For the purposes of implementing AB 50, "energization" and "energize" mean connecting customers to the electrical distribution grid and establishing adequate electrical distribution capacity, upgrading electrical distribution and/or increasing transmission capacity to provide electrical service for a new customer, or to provide upgraded electrical service to an existing customer. The determination of adequate electrical distribution capacity includes consideration of future load. As defined in Pub. Util. Code § 931, "energization" and "energize" do not include activities related to connecting electricity supply resources; these terms instead relate solely to the energization of new or upgraded electric service for end-use customers provided by an IOU.[15]

---

[14] Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(c)(1)(2).

[15] Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 931, (a)"Electrification" means any new, expanded, or change in use of electricity related to the policies described in Section 933, including, but not limited to, in the industrial, commercial, agricultural, housing, or transportation sectors; (b) "Energization" and "energize" mean connecting customers to the electrical distribution grid and establishing adequate electrical distribution capacity or upgrading electrical distribution or transmission capacity to provide electrical service for a new customer, or to provide upgraded electrical service to an existing customer. The determination of adequate electrical distribution capacity

Footnote continued on next page.

1.4 Procedural Background

R.24-01-018 determined that a prehearing conference on the near-term provisions raised in SB 410 and AB 50 was unnecessary.[16] The issues defined within Phase 2 of R.24-01-018 are not addressed in this decision.

The Commission's Energy Division hosted a full-day workshop on February 2, 2024, to better define the scope of issues in this proceeding. A link to the full recording of the workshop and slides presented were incorporated into the record of this proceeding through an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling dated February 14, 2024.

Opening comments on R.24-01-018 were filed on February 20, 2024, by: Advanced Energy United (AEU); California Broadband and Video Association (CalBroadband); Cal Net, Inc (CalNet); the Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates); California Solar & Storage Association (CALSSA); CALSTART Inc. (CALSTART); California Association of Small and Multi-Jurisdictional Utilities (CASMU); The Center for Biological Diversity (CBD); City and County of San Francisco (CCSF); California Hydrogen Business Council (CHBC); California Solar & Storage Association; County of Los Angeles (CLA); Clean Energy; California Manufactures and Technology Association (CMTA); Crown Castle Fiber LLC (Crown Castle); CTIA Wireless Association (CTIA); Coalition of California Utility Employees (CUE); Environmental Defense Fund and Natural Resources Defense Council

includes consideration of future load. The terms "energization" and "energize," as defined in Pub. Util. Code § 933.5, do not include activities related to connecting electrical supply resources; and (c) "Energization time period" means the elapsed time beginning when the electrical corporation receives a substantially complete energization project application and ending when the electric service is installed and energized.

[16] Rule 7.2(b).

(EDF/NRDC); Enchanted Rock; California Building Industry Association, the California Business Properties Association and the California Apartment Association (Industry Coalition); ChargePoint, EVgo, FLO EV Charging, Electrify America, and Tesla (Joint EV Industry Parties); Mainspring Energy, Inc. (Mainspring); Powering America's Commercial Transportation (PACT); Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E); Pilot Travel Centers, LLC (PTC); Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC); Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA); Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA); Southern California Edison Company (SCE); San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E); Terawatt Infrastructure (Terawatt); The Mobility House (TMH); Vehicle-Grid Integrations Council (VGIC); and Voltera Power, LLC (Voltera).

Reply comments on R.24-01-018 were filed on March 1, 2024, by: CalBroadband, Cal Advocates, CALSTART, CMTA, Crown Castle, CTIA, CUE, EDF/NRDC, EV Realty, Industry Coalition, PACT, PG&E, PTC, SBUA, SCE, SDG&E, SEIA, VGIC, and Voltera.

The Agricultural Energy Consumers Association, the Alliance for Automotive Innovation (Auto Innovators); the Alliance for Transportation Electrification (ATE); the Bay Area Housing Advocacy Coalition (Housing Advocacy Coalition); bp pulse; the California Community Choice Association (CalCCA); the Clean Coalition; Extenet Systems, LLC, Extenet Systems California, LLC, and Extenet Telecom Solutions, Inc (Extenet); the Interstate Renewable Energy Council (IREC); the Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition (LGSEC); Peninsula Clean Energy (PCE); the San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR); and Walmart were granted party status via ALJ Ruling.

President Alice Reynolds issued the Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo) on March 28, 2024. The schedule of the proceeding was modified via an ALJ ruling on April 8, 2024. The Scoping Memo directed parties to file opening comments no later than April 10, 2024, and reply comments not later than April 24, 2024. The April 8, 2024, ALJ ruling modified the schedule to allow opening comments to be filed and served on May 3, 2024, with replies due on May 17, 2024.

The following parties filed opening comments in response to guidance in the Scoping Memo and the April 8, 2024, ALJ Ruling on May 3, 2024: Auto Innovators, ATE, AUE, EDF/NRDC, CalBroadband, CalCCA, CALSTART, CMTA, Crown Castle, CalSSA, CTIA, Extenet, IREC, Joint EV Industry Parties, PACT, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, SEIA, Terawatt, VGIC, Voltera, and Walmart. Reply comments on the Scoping Memo were filed by ATE; AUE; CALSTART; the California Building Industry Association, California Business Properties Association (CBPA), and the California Apartment Association (CAA); CMTA; CUE; CalSSA; CalBroadband; Crown Castle; CTIA; EDF/NRDC; Industry Coalition; IREC; PACT; PG&E; Pilot; SCE; SDG&E; SEIA; VGIC; and Voltera.

On June 6, 2024, the assigned ALJs issued a ruling directing parties to respond to specific questions to build a more robust record related to the energization related processes that are outside of the large electric IOUs' control, including specific geographical issues and items that would fall under other authorities having jurisdiction (AHJ). Parties filed opening responses to this

ruling on June 18, 2024, and provided replies on June 28, 2024.[17] The ruling and the parties responses are incorporated into the record of this proceeding.

2. Submission Date

Phase 1 of R.24-01-018 was submitted on June 28, 2024, upon receipt of reply comments to the June 6, 2024, ALJ Ruling. R.24-01-018 remains open to consider additional statutory requirements defined in SB 410 and AB 50 that may not be addressed in other Commission proceedings.

3. Jurisdiction

SB 410 requires the Commission and all California electrical corporations to undertake a variety of activities to promote timely energization of customer connections in California. AB 50 requires the Commission to determine the criteria for timely service for electric customers to be energized, including, among other things, categories of timely electric service through energization. AB 50 also requires all California electrical corporations to meet certain energization timeliness targets and make changes to their distribution planning process, as determined by the Commission. Both SB 410 and AB 50 provide the Commission discretion to adjust the targets for electrical utilities that provide electricity to 100,000 or fewer service lines. The energization targets adopted in this decision only apply to PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E, as the largest electric IOUs operating California. The small and multi-jurisdictional IOUs operating in California (Bear Valley Electric Service, Liberty Utilities, and PacifiCorp) are not subject to the targets adopted in this decision at this time.

[17] Opening Comments on the June 6, 2024, ALJ Ruling were filed by AEU, Alliance for Automotive Innovation, CalCCA, Cal.net, CalSSA, CALSTART, Clean Energy, CMTA, Crown Castle, CTIA, Extenet, Industry Coalition, IREC, NRDC, PACT, SPUR, Tesla, VGIC, and Walmart. Replies were filed by AEU, CalBroadband, Clean Coalition, Clean Energy, CALSTART, Crown Castle, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, and Voltera.

This rulemaking is being conducted in accordance with Article 6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules).

4. Issues Before the Commission

Phase 1 of this proceeding addresses issues the Commission must address by September 30, 2024. Issues identified in the Scoping Memo for Phase 2 of this rulemaking are not addressed in this decision.

The Phase 1 issues in this Rulemaking, as identified in the Scoping Memo, are as follows:

1. What average and maximum energization time periods should the Commission establish as target timelines on or before September 30, 2024, in order to comply with Pub. Util. Code § 934(a)(1) for electric utility customers?
    a. What are the typical steps in the energization process, or energization of electric service under Rules 15, 16, 29, and 45?[18]
    b. How long does it take for a utility to complete each step in an energization request?
        i. Does it differ for new service line requests and upgrades to existing service lines, or across different customer types?
        ii. If so, how?
    c. What steps in the utilities' energization process should have assigned target timelines?
    d. How should the Commission determine whether an energization timeline is reasonable?

[18] In this proceeding, a "step" is defined incrementally, such as a customer acquiring property or expanding their electrical needs, filing an application with a utility, receiving confirmation from a utility that the application is accepted, permitting process, the utility's initiation of work, and final energization.

e. How should energization targets be structured to minimize delays when addressing existing and future customer energization requests?

f. What information should be tracked to assess improvement in utility timelines for energization after the targets set on or before September 30, 2024, are established?

2. Should the utilities be required to establish reporting processes for Commission review of their compliance with the targets set no later than September 30, 2024, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 934(a)(2)?

3. What procedure(s) for customers should exist to report energization delays for new and upgraded electric service? What additional procedure(s) or improvements should be made for customers on or before September 30, 2024?

   a. How do utilities currently engage with customers that may have pending or missed deadlines in their energization project requests?

   b. How should utilities improve engagement with customers?

   c. How should the Commission improve the existing processes for how customers report ongoing energization delays to the Commission?

4. Are there end-use project types that justify unique energization timelines pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(a)(1)(B)? If so, what types of end-use projects, and for which electric tariffs?[19]

5. What are the existing utility timelines for upstream capacity upgrades that are triggered by energization projects including, but not limited to, new substation construction?

[19] For this decision, "project types" are defined as customer requests for energization for different types of end-use project requests, such as upgrades to support electric vehicle infrastructure, residential subdivision construction, or other building-electrification projects.

a. Should upstream requests justify a unique energization target pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(a)?

b. If so, why, and which steps of upstream capacity upgrade projects are unique?

c. What type of upstream infrastructure projects should receive unique timelines, if any?[20]

6. What specific criteria should the Commission establish as annual reporting requirements for the electrical corporations pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(a)(2)?
7. What potential impacts on environmental and social justice (ESJ) communities should be considered or prioritized in the development of energization timelines and reporting processes to ensure the processes adopted in this rulemaking are in alignment with the Commission's ESJ Action Plan?
8. How often should the Commission update the average and maximum energization targets, and what factors should trigger updates to the targets?
9. Should the energization targets be phased over time?

5. Definitions of Technical Terms

SB 410 directs the Commission to develop average and maximum energization targets. AB 50 further specifies that the Commission shall establish criteria for "timely service" for electrical customers to be energized.[21] For the purposes of this decision, the Commission defines the following terms:

1. **Average energization target**: a specific goal set for the average number of days it should take a utility to complete the steps in the energization process under their control for

[20] Infrastructure projects here refer to different types of upstream capacity projects such as: new bank replacement, new feeder installation, new substation, etc.

[21] Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(a).

any given energization request based on electric tariff or type of capacity upgrade, adjusted for outliers.[22]

2. **Maximum energization target**: a specific goal set for the maximum number of days it should takes a utility to complete the steps in the energization process under their control for any given the energization request based on the electric tariff or type of capacity upgrade type, adjusted for outliers.[23]
3. **Baseline**: what would occur if no action is taken by the Commission, (i.e., "business-as-usual").
4. **Combined Electric Rule 15/16 Project**: an energization project in which utility work associated with both Electric Rules 15 and 16 is required based on the utility engineering assessment.
5. **Combined Electric Rule 16/29/45 project:** an energization project for which utility work is associated with Electric Rule 16 and Electric Rule 29 (PG&E and SCE) or Electric Rule 45 (SDG&E) is required based on the utility engineering assessment.
6. **Dependencies:** steps outside of the large electric IOUs' direct control, including, but not limited to, customer actions necessary to acquire permits, acquisition of easements, and other requirements as identified by the

[22] An outlier adjustment was performed on the data received in the Joint Utility Response to March 21, 2024, Ruling. The adjusted data was used to calculate the average and maximum energization targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization targets. Outliers were identified for each combination of IOU, tariff type, and energization step independently as each has unique characteristics. Outliers were defined as datapoints that were either negative (as no energization step could take negative days) or two standard deviations above the average for that step, tariff type, and IOU.

[23] Like the outlier adjustment described for the average energization target, above, the maximum energization target used the data received in the Joint Utility Response to March 21, 2024, Ruling. Outlier adjustments were made for each combination of large electric IOU, tariff type, and energization step independently as each has unique characteristics. Outliers defined for the maximum energization targets included datapoints that were either negative (as no energization step could take negative days) or 2 standard deviations above the average for that step, tariff type, and large electric IOU.

local, regional, or state authority/authorities having jurisdiction (AHJ) over the site.

7. **Distributed Energy Resources (DER)**: small-scale units of local generation or controllable load connected to the grid at the distribution level. Examples include solar photovoltaic panels, grid-responsive heat-pumps, wind turbines, and battery storage systems. DERs, whether load reducing or load increasing, play a role in energization discussions as they impact grid management and reliability.
8. **Electrical Distribution Infrastructure**: utility owned physical equipment including, but not limited to, cables, capacitators, conduit, fuses, meters, poles, service drops, transformers, mounting pads, substation and associated equipment trenching, vaults, wires, other equipment as necessary, and associated engineering work.
9. **Electric Rule 15-only Projects:** projects that only require utility work associated with Electric Rule 15 based on the Engineering and Design step. The work for Electric Rule 15 involves activities that extend electric distribution to service facilities under Electric Tariff 16.
10. **Electric Rule 16-only Projects:** projects that only require work associated with Electric Rule 16 as identified during the Engineering and Design step. The work for Electric Rule16 involves activities that extend electric service facilities to the utility meter from the nearest point of distribution under Electric Rule15.
11. **Overdue project**: any project that exceeds the maximum energization target will be deemed an "overdue project."
12. **Project types:** the specific project for which the customer is requesting new or upgraded electric service(s), such as electric vehicle infrastructure, residential subdivision development, agriculture, etc.
13. **Statewide targets**: uniform energization requirements that are applicable to all three large electric IOUs (PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E).

6. Information Utilized for Analysis and Discussion

On March 21, 2024, the assigned ALJs issued a ruling that directed PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to provide more detailed data about the timing for their existing energization processes. The large electric IOUs' responses were filed on April 15, 2024, utilizing templates attached to the ALJ Ruling.

The large electric IOUs' data was analyzed to identify the average, median, standard deviation, and maximum timelines for energization.

Reply Comments were filed on May 17, 2024, by the following parties: ATE, CalBroadband, CALSSA, CMTA, Crown Castle, CTIA, CUE, EDF/NRDC, IREC, PACT, PG&E, PTC, SCE, SDG&E, SEIA, SPUR, and Voltera.

In addition to the Opening and Reply comments on the issues raised in the Scoping Memo, the assigned ALJs convened a telephonic status conference on May 21, 2024, to solicit feedback on Phase 1 issues from active parties to the proceeding.[24] Parties also provided status conference statements in advance of the telephonic hearing.

On June 6, 2024, an ALJ Ruling was issued directing parties to respond to specific questions on energization issues. This ruling aimed to better inform the record for Phase 1 of the instant proceeding.[25]

We utilize comments on the Scoping Memo, statements and discussions at the telephonic status conference, and responses to the June 6, 2024, ALJ Ruling in our analysis of Phase 1 issues.

---

[24] Phase 2 issues as defined in R.24-01-018 were not discussed during the May 21, 2024, Status Conference.

[25] Party responses to the June 6, 2024 ALJ Ruling were filed by AEU, Auto Innovators, CalBroadband, CalNet, CALSSA, CALSTART, Clean Energy, CMTA, Crown Castle, CTIA, Extenet Systems, LLC, Industry Coalition, IREC, LGSEC, NRDC, PACT, SEIA, SPUR, VGIC, Voltera, and Walmart. Replies were filed by AEU, CalBroadband, CALSTART, Clean Coalition, Clean Energy, Crown Castle, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, and Voltera.

7. Energization Targets

Pub. Util. Code § 934 (a) requires the Commission to establish "reasonable average and maximum target energization periods." The energization targets established in this decision are intended to expedite California's electrification efforts, which are necessary to meet and sustain the state's carbon neutrality goals as soon as 2045. This decision's targets aim to enable customers seeking to electrify to have their requested new or upgraded services electrified more quickly than the baselines provided by the large electric IOUs in response to the May 21, 2024, ALJ Ruling, as described in more detail in Appendix A, Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report.

The large electric IOUs raised that this decision's requirements may require additional funding for staffing and other incremental resources. The costs of any new staff or upgraded systems cannot be addressed in this quasi-legislative proceeding but may be raised in separate applications by the large electric IOUs, as provided in Pub. Util. Code §§ 933 and 937 or through General Rate Cases.

7.1 Discussion Regarding Statewide versus IOU-specific Average and Maximum Energization Targets

At the February 2, 2024, Energization Workshop, staff from the Energy Division of the California Public Utilities Commission (Energy Division) and attending parties discussed whether the Commission should adopt statewide energization targets or IOU-specific targets. In opening comments to the Rulemaking, six parties supported statewide targets (CalBroadband, Crown Castle, EDF/NRDC, SBUA, SEIA, and SVCE), while PG&E and SDG&E supported IOU-specific targets. Parties supporting statewide targets spoke to the importance of having consistent timeframes across all three IOUs to avoid a

patchwork approach across the state.[26] EDF/NRDC asserted that uniform energization targets will allow for more effective comparison between the IOUs performance, relative to their ability to meet the targets, which could help identify areas where the energization timelines could be improved in this or future proceedings.[27] PG&E and SDG&E noted the demographic and geographic differences between and within the large electric IOUs' service territories, and that the large electric IOUs' unique information technology systems and processes for completing an energization request justify the need for IOU-specific targets.[28]

Upon review of party comments, we agree with parties supporting statewide targets that are focused on energization of new or upgraded load. One of the primary goals of this decision is to increase transparency around the steps the large electric IOUs must complete and accelerate the associated time necessary for the large electric IOUs to energize new or upgraded electric service requests. A statewide energization target that accounts for all new or upgraded load will provide the large electric IOUs with the same "goal post" for all energization requests. All large electric IOU customers would therefore have the same experience and expectation of the time necessary to complete their energization requests.

While the large electric IOUs have suggested that that the demographics and geography of their service territories may differ, the urgency to energize

[26] CalBroadband Reply Comments on the OIR at 1; Crown Castle Reply Comments on the OIR at 7; EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on the OIR at 7; SBUA Opening Comments on the OIR at 5; SEIA Opening Comments on the OIR at 10-11; SVCE Opening Comments on the OIR at 7.

[27] EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on the OIR at 7.

[28] PG&E Opening Comments on the OIR at 9; SDG&E Opening Comments on the OIR at 12.

customers in light of California's economic electrification and climate adaptation goals is the same across the entire state, regardless of the large electric IOU service territory. In short, all customers need timely electric service, and the targets defined in this decision will accelerate energization processes statewide based on the tariffs for which customers are requesting new or upgraded electric service.

Large customers, such as medium and heavy-duty electric vehicle charging developers and residential housing subdivision developers, serve customers throughout the state and should be able to rely on a standard timeline, rather than keeping track of different IOU-specific targets across California. The unique demographics and geography associated with each of the large electric IOUs may be further considered in Phase 2 of this proceeding.

Further, we agree with EDF/NRDC that making the targets and processes as identical as possible for the Electric Rules identified in Section 7.2, Adopted Statewide Average and Maximum Energization Targets, below, will enable customers and the Commission to more accurately compare how long it takes each large electric IOU to meet the targets and timelines adopted in this decision, and in turn, determine when and how the timing to complete each step can be further accelerated.[29] SDG&E's claim that the large electric IOUs have different billing and customer tracking systems does not align with the directives adopted in SB 410 and AB 50, which require the Commission to adopt consistent, efficient processes that minimize the timing associated with customer energization requests.[30]

[29] EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 3-4.

[30] SDG&E Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 11-12.

In the Joint IOUs' response to the March 21, 2024, ALJ Ruling filed April 15, 2024, the large electric IOUs recommended a five-step list of typical steps to complete the energization process and what party is responsible for completing each step:

1. Customer Intake (this includes the steps a customer must take to initiate an application, and the steps the large electric IOU must complete to intake the energization request);
2. Engineering & Design (steps taken by the large electric IOU to develop the site plan for the energization request);
3. Dependencies (time necessary to complete steps of the energization process that are not fully under the large electric IOUs' control, such as applications and receiving local, regional, and/or state authority having jurisdiction approval);[31]
4. Site Readiness (time necessary to complete site readiness processes that are outside of the large electric IOUs' control); and
5. Construction (steps taken by the large electric IOU to construct the site).[32]

ATE, CMTA, EDF/NRDC, and Walmart agreed that the IOUs' recommended five-step list was reasonable.[33] CALSTART, CALSSA, Crown Castle, PACT, and SEIA recommended modifications to the IOUs' propose five-

[31] *See,* generally, the definition of Dependencies in Section 5, Definition of Technical Terms, above.

[32] Joint Utility Response to March 21, 2024, Ruling at 4.

[33] ATE Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 7; CMTA Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 2; EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 3; Walmart Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 5-6.

step energization process.[34] For example, CALSTART noted that the five steps outlined by the IOUs are not sufficiently granular for project tracking purposes, because some steps may occur concurrently, while other steps cannot occur until a prior step is complete.[35] Crown Castle agreed, stating that customers can, and often do, begin certain site readiness work before the IOUs secure permits.[36] CalSSA suggested that the customer initiation/intake phase should occur almost instantaneously and the IOUs could use photos taken by a customer's contractor to consider virtual meter spots, rather than requiring IOU employees to visit a site before approving an application.[37] AUE, CalCCA, and EDF/NRDC suggested that the targets adopted in this decision should be considered as preliminary and that additional work will be necessary to refine them in Phase 2 of this proceeding. [38]

We agree with parties that modifications to the Joint IOUs' five step proposal could better ensure each step accurately reflects the actions being taken to complete the energization process, and the party responsible for completing the step. Considering this, we adopt the following steps:

1) **Customer Intake:** the customer submits service energization request; the large electric IOU reviews customer submission, educates customer on the energization process and submission requirements; the Applicant Final Submittal (AFS) date is established. The

[34] CALSTART Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 6-7; CALSSA Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 2; Crown Castle Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 4; PACT Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 9; SEIA Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 3-4.

[35] CALSTART Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 3.

[36] Crown Castle Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 3.

[37] CalSSA Reply Comments on the Scoping Memo at 1-3.

energization clock starts once the large electric IOU notifies the customer that its application is deemed complete.

2) **Engineering and Design:** the large electric IOU completes its field visit(s), engineering study, creates project design and determines cost of project.

3) **Customer Dependencies:** the customer obtains necessary permits, secures easements, signs contracts, pays necessary fees, and receives and documents any other required third-party approvals.

4) **Utility Dependencies:** the large electric IOU submits documentation for all permits and easements, and completes other large electric IOU-required approvals related to the specific project and/or site.

5) **Customer Site Readiness:**

   (a) For non-Rule 29/45 projects: the step reflects the time when a customer requests pre-construction meeting and inspection from utility; and the customer-required onsite construction is deemed complete after the customer schedules and completes all civil construction. For these projects, the energization clock starts when the customer is cleared for construction and stops when the customer releases the site to the large electric IOU for utility-side construction and energization.

   (b) For Rule 29/45 projects: the customer requests a pre-construction meeting and inspection from a large electric IOU. The energization clock would stops once a date for preconstruction meeting and inspection is scheduled.

6) **Large Electric IOU Site Readiness:**

   (a) For non-Rule 29/45 projects: large electric IOU completes pre-construction meetings and inspections. The energization clock would starts when the customer requests the preconstruction meeting and inspection, and pauses at the first available date the

utility representative is able to perform the inspection and meeting.

7) **Construction:** the large electric IOU schedules and completes electrical construction, including traffic control, scheduling outages, and other construction activities.
8) **Service Energization Provided to Customer:** all final inspections are scheduled, and if performed by the large electric IOU, completed; the site is "energized", allowing the customer to start receiving service.

In their Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision filed on August 29, 2024, the Joint EV Industry parties recommended splitting the "Site Readiness" step into two distinct steps that recognizes the roles and responsibilities of the large electric IOUs and the customer in completing the steps.[42] They further highlight that Electric Rule 29/45 expressly makes the large electric IOUs the primary party responsible for all site readiness work.[43] We agree with the Joint EV Industry's recommendation and split the "Site Readiness" step between "Large Electric IOU Site Readiness" and "Customer Site Readiness", and further clarified how these steps should be tracked for Electric Rule 29/45 projects.

The Commission considers steps 2, 4, 6, 7, and 8 as solely under the large electric IOUs' control. Some steps, such as engineering and design, dependencies, and site readiness may occur concurrently with the other steps described above. Thus, it is reasonable to adopt an overall average energization target for each tariff-related energization request, based on the data provided by the large electric IOUs, rather than establish separate targets for each step described above. The targets adopted in this decision apply only to portions of the energization process(es) that are fully under the electric corporation's control for each tariff.

Commission staff worked with a consultant to develop assumptions to better align the large electric IOU data to the adopted seven steps of the energization process as presented in Appendix A of this decision, the Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report. Staff and the consultant also performed an outlier adjustment to remove any data that might otherwise skew the average. The analysis identified outliers for each of the large electric IOU's electric tariffs, and energization steps independently given the difference in the scope of Rule 15 and 16 projects. The analysis defined these outliers as datapoints that were either negative (as no energization step could take negative days) or well above the average by two standard deviations (or more) for each large electric IOU's individual steps and electric tariffs. More information on the assumptions and outlier adjustment can be found in Appendix A. In their comments on the Proposed Decision, SCE noted that they had already performed an outlier adjustment on their timeline data. This meant that the Staff and consultant outlier adjustment excluded additional data points from SCE's data set, bringing the average and maximum values down. Commission staff acknowledge that this was an oversight and recommend that SCE note this point in their first biannual data reporting. However, we find that the changes in the acceleration rates when considering SCE's original outlier-adjusted data are not substantial enough to warrant a change in the energization targets adopted in Table 1, Average Energization Targets effective September 2024.

The Joint IOUs provided data on dependencies that did not differentiate between steps that the customer or the utility is responsible for. As a result, the analysis makes assumptions about which portion of the dependencies timeline falls under the large electric IOUs' control and which does may fall on customers

or other entities and/or processes the large electric IOUs cannot control.[39] The large electric IOU dependencies are preliminarily determined to be one half of the dependencies' timelines, because Energy Division did not receive more specific data from parties to further refine this allocation of responsibility. Phase 2 of this proceeding may further refine this allocation of the dependencies as more data becomes available.

The Joint IOUs did not provide data for the Service Energization Provided to Customer Step (defined as Step 8, above), but it is a critical step in the energization process. The Service Energization Provided to Customer Step was added to the five steps that the large electric IOUs originally identified in an effort to make clear that the energization process cannot be complete until the customer's new or upgraded service can be utilized. No data associated with the timeframe for this Service Energization Provided to Customer step (Step 8) was included in the responses from the large electric IOUs throughout Phase 1 of this proceeding. Therefore, the large electric IOUs shall ensure the last step of the energization process described above (Service Energization Provided to the Customer, or Step 8), is completed within the average and maximum targets for Electric Rules 15, 16, 15/29/45, and 29/45 defined in Table 1 below. The average and maximum targets are intended to encompass the time necessary for large electric IOUs to complete their portion of the energization steps described above for all energization requests, even those that trigger upgrades for more than one tariff. For example, a project that triggers Electric Rule 15 upgrade and an Electric

[39] SDG&E did not provide data related to the dependencies that could impact the timing of its completion of energization requests related to Electric Rules 15, 16, 15/16, and/or Electric Rule 45. The target established in this decision, as it relates to the dependencies step, is based on data provided by PG&E and SCE and does not reflect any information (null value or otherwise) related to SDG&E's current dependencies within their energization timeline(s).

Rule 29 or Electric Rule 45 upgrade should be completed in the same amount of time for a project that triggers any Electric Rule 15 or Electric Rule 16 upgrade (or a combination of Electric Rules 15/16).

The large electric IOUs also did not provide enough data for Energy Division staff to independently analyze Electric Rule 29/45 timelines; therefore, the timelines for these projects are set to match those of Electric Rule 16.

7.2 Adopted Statewide Average and Maximum Energization Targets

The adopted statewide average energization targets for each electric tariff are listed in Table 1, and the adopted statewide maximum energization targets for each electric tariff are listed in Table 2 below. The Statewide Energization Timeline Analysis Report, included as Appendix A of this decision, has more information regarding the calculation of these average and maximum energization targets, including the assumptions used. As discussed in more detail in Section 10 of this decision, Annual Energization Reporting Requirements, and Section 14 of this decision, Enforcement of Energization Targets, the Commission expects the IOUs to accelerate the time it takes to energize all customers' requests, rather than targeting certain industry types or customer groups.

Table 1:
Average Energization Targets effective September 2024[40]

Tariff	Average Energization Target (business days)	Average Energization Target (calendar days)
Electric Rule 15	125	182
Electric Rule 16	125	182
Combined Electric Rule 15/16 or Rule 15 and 29/45	125	182
Electric Rule 29/45[41]	125	182

The Electric Rule 15-only or Electric Rule 16-only targets are for projects that only require utility work associated with one tariff. The Combined Electric Rule 15/16 target is for projects that require work associated with both tariffs. The Electric Rule 29/45 row reflects the targets that were already established in Resolution E-5247 dated December 15, 2022, and are intended to align with the targets established for other projects that require work under one or more tariffs.[42]

Typically, coordination of projects deemed as Electric Rule 15- or Electric Rule 16-only that result in separate infrastructure projects are more complex,

[40] These targets apply only to the portions of the energization process(es) that are fully under the control of the large electric IOUs. The data received from the large electric IOUs was converted between calendar days and business days as necessary according to the formula Business Day = [(4.8/7)*Calendar Day].

[41] PG&E and SCE's EV infrastructure tariffs are identified as Electric Rule 29 for each large electric IOU. SDG&E's EV infrastructure tariff is identified as its Electric Rule 45.

[42] The Energization Timing Target adopted in Resolution E-5247 only applied to projects receiving service through Electric Rule 29/45, and excluded projects that required an Electric Rule 15 upgrade, exceeding 2MW of new load, and projects that triggered upstream capacity upgrades. This decision removes the exemptions, thus all Electric Rule 29/45 projects must meet the targets adopted in this decision.

while projects that implicate both tariffs (Combined Electric Rule 15/16 Projects) are considered less complex because it is one infrastructure project and may be streamlined.[43] As mentioned earlier, a project can be considered a Combined Electric Rule 15/16 project if scope involving both tariffs is identified in the Engineering and Design step. A project is classified as Electric Rule 15-only or Electric Rule 16-only if the project only involves scope under one of the tariffs during the Engineering and Design step. In many cases, the large electric IOUs can complete the Combined Electric Rule 15/16 Projects in equal or less time than Electric Rule 15- or Electric Rule 16-only projects, because many of the steps described above can occur concurrently for both Electric Rule 15 and Electric Rule 16/29/45 projects. Therefore, the Combined Electric Rule 15/16 Projects shall have a timeline that reflects that they may be completed within the same timeframe as Electric Rule 15-only or Electric Rule 16/29/45-only projects.

If the large electric utility identifies the need for an Electric Rule 15 upgrade after an Electric Rule 16/29/45 project goes through Engineering and Design, the applicable timeline for the Electric Rule 15 project shall be applied as if the upgrade was identified at the end of the Electric Rule 16/29/45's Engineering and Design phase. This is to prevent an excessive extension of a customer's energization timeline if there is a late identification of the need for an Electric Rule 15 upgrade, such as in the Construction phase. The large electric utilities are expected to expedite the development of this newly identified project so as not to overly extend the overall energization timeline for that customer. As

[43] For example, if an Electric Rule 15 distribution upgrade is identified as a result of an Electric Rule 16 service upgrade request in the Engineering and Design phase, those projects can be considered separate and have timelines running independently starting at the time of tariff identification.

discussed in Section 11 below, Customer Reporting Procedures for Delays in Providing New or Upgraded Electric Service Requests, customers will have the opportunity to report delays, and as required in Section 10 below, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, the large electric IOUs shall report instances when a customer's project is delayed due to a change in project scope.

The large electric IOUs shall clearly communicate with the customer which targets apply to their requested project and why. As additional data is collected, as required in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, the Commission may refine what types of projects fall into these Electric Rule 15-only, Electric Rule 16/29/45-only, and Combined Electric Rule 15/16 or 16/29/45 classifications.

The data for Electric Rule 15-only projects and Electric Rule 16-only projects resulted in the same average timeline: 125 business days. This may seem counterintuitive seeing that Electric Rule 15 projects are typically more complex than Electric Rule 16 projects and thus take longer. However, Energy Division's analysis of the large electric IOUs' energization data showed that the separation of large electric IOU and customer-steps contributed to this result. Evidently, the customer-responsibility steps take longer for Electric Rule 15 than Electric Rule 16 projects on average, while the large electric IOU-responsibility step timelines are very similar between the tariffs.

In addition to requiring the Commission to establish average targets, Pub. Util. Code § 934 directs the Commission to establish maximum targets that reflect the longest amount of time the large electric IOUs should take to complete an energization request. The maximum targets, as adopted in Table 2 below, require every large electric IOU to have at least a five percent acceleration of their reported maximum energization timelines provided in the Joint IOUs' response

to the March 21, 2024, ALJ Ruling, filed on April 22, 2024. Any project that exceeds the maximum energization targets established in Table 2 of this decision will be considered overdue.

Table 2:
Maximum Energization Targets effective September 2024[44]

Tariff	Maximum Energization Target (business days)	Maximum Energization Target (calendar days)
Rule 15	245	357
Rule 16	230	335
Combined Rule 15/16 or Rule 15/29/45 Projects	210	306
Rule 29/45	230	335

Table 3:
Rates of Acceleration Necessary to Meet the Average and Maximum Energization Targets[45],[46]

Tariff	Timeline Type	PGE Rate of Acceleration	SCE Rate of Acceleration	SDG&E Rate of Acceleration
Rule 15	Average	38%	-16%	45%
Rule 15	Maximum	42%	5%	53%
Rule 16	Average	7%	-39%	-40%
Rule 16	Maximum	18%	5%	8%

[44] These maximum targets apply only to the portions of the energization process(es) that are fully under the control of the large electric IOUs.

[45] Note: a negative rate of acceleration reflects that the utility is currently energizing customers at a faster rate than the target. The utility(ies) shall not slow down current processes if they currently process energization requests faster than the mandated target.

[46] SDG&E did not provide data for Step 3: Dependencies; therefore, the rates of acceleration are likely not entirely reflective of the change required to meet the timeline targets. Information on this and other assumptions used in interpreting the IOUs' data can be found in Appendix A.

Tariff	Timeline Type	PGE Rate of Acceleration	SCE Rate of Acceleration	SDG&E Rate of Acceleration
Rule 15/16 or Rule 15/29/45 Combined	Average	39%	-28%	-61%
Rule 15/16 or Rule 15/29/45 Combined	Maximum	49%	14%	5%

We note that some utilities may already be meeting or exceeding certain targets as illustrated by negative values in the "Rates of Acceleration" chart above. To account for this, PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E shall either meet the targets adopted above, or maintain their current timelines for energization processes, whichever is the shortest timeframe for completing customer requests.[47]

7.3 Specific End-Use Customer or Industry Considerations

Multiple parties, including CTIA, the Joint EV Industry Parties, EDF/ NRDC, PACT, CBD, SBUA, and CUE, suggested that the Commission develop timelines specific to different industries or customer types to prioritize certain projects over others in light of state goals, such as the California Air Resources Board's Advanced Clean Trucks and Fleets policy.[48] While the Commission

[47] Each large electric IOU's current timelines for energization processes can be found in Appendix A, Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report.

[48] CTIA Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 4; Joint EV Industry Parties Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 9; EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 9; PACT Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 7; CBD Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 5; CUE Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 4; SBUA Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 3.

recognizes the urgency created by such policy, Pub. Util Code § 934 must be reconciled with Pub. Util. Code § 453.[49],[50]

Pub. Util. Code § 934(a)(1) requires the Commission to establish reasonable average and maximum target energization periods that, in part, prioritize work consistent with Pub. Util Code §§ 932 and 933. Pub. Util. Code § 453, however, prohibits utilities from engaging in discriminatory practices when providing electric services. Given the lack of data provided by the large electric IOUs, as identified below, we cannot adopt a specific prioritization method or manner that this time that also reflects reasonable targets for all industry sectors, consistent with § 453. Rather, the adopted average and maximum statewide energization targets set forth in Table 1, Average Energization Targets effected September 2024, and Table 2, Maximum Energization Targets effective September 2024, will support California's economic sectors, including transportation, by accelerating timelines for all applicants.

However, the Commission recognizes that there may be inherent differences in providing or upgrading electric service among project types, for example, extending service to an agricultural water pump in a rural area may require different treatment, and thus a different timeline, than extending service to an EV charging station in an urban commercial development. Both may trigger work under the same electric tariff (Rule 16), but because of the nature of the project and location, still see differences in timelines. Observations of the data

[49] CTIA Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 4; Joint EV Industry Parties Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 9; EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 9; PACT Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 7; CBD Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 5; CUE Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 4; SBUA Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 3.

[50] SCE Reply Comments on the Scoping Memo at 5; SDG&E Reply Comments on the Scoping Memo at 4-6.

collected to date, in this proceeding, indicate that there is not a normal distribution of energization timelines. This is likely a result of a high variability in energization timelines driven by the many different types of projects the large electric IOUs serve. There may be a more even distribution at the project type level. The data provided by the large electric IOUs did not specify project types and so for this decision the Commission adopts a single timeline that is project neutral. To meet the accelerated statutory deadlines in Phase 1 of this proceeding, we adopt the average and maximum energization targets set forth in this decision for all applicants.[51]

In Opening Comments of the Proposed Decision, PACT and Auto Innovators disagreed with the Commission's interpretation of Pub. Util. Code § 453 and argue that "prioritizing specific industries or customers does not violate § 453. The Commission is not persuaded by the arguments presented and maintains its interpretation of Pub. Util. Code § 453. While Pub. Util. Code § 453 requires parity, timelines at the "project type" level may be considered in the future so long as they do not require prioritization over other projects, which disadvantages other customers. The Commission and stakeholders will be able to better assess this structure as the large electric IOUs provide more data, particularly regarding customers' desired energization date. This will be helpful because some types of projects may desire a longer energization timeline than others for various reasons (e.g., longer time to complete work under customer responsibility), which may enable the large electric IOUs to meet shorter timelines for other types of projects. Also, the Commission's recognition of parity among customers does not prevent this proceeding from considering sector-

specific evidence, such as modeling based on regulatory compliance requirements (e.g., CARB's Advanced Clean Trucks and Advanced Clean Fleets regulations) that could inform the development of future timelines.[52]

An additional topic raised in Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision by multiple parties, such as PACT, EDF/NRDC, IREC and others is the need for a working group.[53] The Commission may consider this request in Phase 2 of this proceeding, which will commence after the conclusion of Phase 1.

7.4 Average and Maximum Targets for Other Energization Requests

Pub. Util. Code § 934(a)(1) also directs the Commission to establish average and maximum targets for the time needed to complete customer requests that are not associated with existing electric rules and do not require upstream capacity upgrades.[54]

SEIA stated the legislature adopted SB 410 to support not just new electric service requests, but also projects where electric service can be upgraded without additional infrastructure. SEIA suggested that the timelines for main panel upgrades or residential service upgrades should be shorter than those that require new infrastructure built by a large electric IOU.[55]

---

[52] These regulations focus on the electrification of medium- and heavy-duty vehicle fleets to reduce transportation-related emissions.

[53] IREC's Opening Comments on the PD at 14.

[54] These projects would include, for example, a main panel upgrade that does not require any front-of-the-meter upgrades or upgrades to a service line. All upgrades that increase the amperage capacity from the pole to the residential meter require a main panel upgrade. *See* SEIA Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 2, footnote 3, and SEIA opening comments on the Scoping Memo at 2, footnote 6, and Crown Castle Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 2.

[55] SEIA Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 2-5.

CalBroadband noted that due to a lack of standard processes, the parties it represents frequently face delays in the deployment of new power supplies necessary to support upgrades to communications services.[56] It also recommended differentiating communications network-related energization activities between new service requests and service restoration requests.[57]

Upon review of the information provided by parties, it is reasonable to require each large electric IOU to initiate communication for a customer's inquiry for all new or upgraded service connection, including those that do not require any large electric IOU's infrastructure development, within 10 business days of receiving the customer's request. As recommended by CalBroadband, each large electric IOU shall provide the customer with a written notice of approval or rejection of their application within a maximum of 45 business days. If the application is denied, the large electric IOU must list all the reason(s) for the denial, what the customer must do to resolve the issues, and provide a list of large electric IOU resources they can utilize to ensure their application is complete prior to refiling.

SEIA specifically noted that larger, more complicated, projects may warrant differing timelines between the large electric IOUs to consider variances between their service territories. SEIA also note that the types of projects necessary for residential electrification, such as service-level and main panel upgrades, could be streamlined with a statewide target.[58] SEIA state that residential electrification projects, unlike larger commercial-scale electric service requests, are typically similar and do not require consideration of differences

[56] CalBroadband Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 1-3.

[57] CalBroadband Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 4-5.

[58] SEIA Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 10-11.

between the large electric IOU service territories or other location-based requirements.

We agree with SEIA that main panel upgrade work that is fully under the large electric IOUs' control should be completed more quickly than more complex projects described in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 above. The targets adopted in this decision apply solely to work that is fully under the utility's control and is necessary to complete main panel upgrades that do not require any distribution system or upstream capacity upgrades within an average time period of 30 business days and a maximum time period of 45 business days.[59] Residential and small business customer energization requests do not always require major infrastructure upgrades beyond the customer's property site, so the utility work necessary to complete these requests shall be completed within this 30- to 45-day period by all of the large electric IOUs in California.

8. Statewide Maximum Timelines for Upstream Capacity Upgrades

Upstream capacity upgrades that are triggered by energization projects are a part of the overall energization process. Setting targets for upstream capacity activities often include more complicated work by the large electric IOUs that require the Commission to treat upstream capacity activities differently than work associated with the Electric Tariffs.

First, there are unique differences for each upstream capacity upgrade project that complicate the Commission's efforts to develop standardized average and maximum targets for upstream capacity upgrade projects. Second, the three large electric IOUs provided insufficient and inconsistent data regarding timelines for upstream capacity work. SDG&E did not provide data

[59] SEIA Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 10.

for certain categories of capacity upgrade work as indicated in Table 4 below, some utilities provided timelines that included time when the utility had not initiated a project as discussed more below, and the utilities provided summary statistics instead of raw data for in-depth analysis. Together, these factors make it difficult to compare data and determine targets.

In Opening Comments on this PD, parties including IREC, EDF/NRDC, PACT, CALSTART, and others expressed concerns regarding the Commission's decision not to establish targets for upstream capacity upgrades. These parties highlight that upstream capacity projects are important for the Transportation Electrification sector because EV charging stations tend to require significant electrical capacity to operate. These parties also argue that the Commission is not fulfilling the statutory obligations of SB 410 by not setting targets and request clarification on whether the proposed capacity timelines are averages or medians. [60, 61] On the other hand, SDG&Eand SCE assert that the timelines are too aggressive and should either be longer as requested by SDGE or revisited in Phase 2 as suggested by SCE.[62],[63] PG&E mainly highlights that the adopted timelines omit key capacity upgrade timeline factors and requests assurances regarding their ability to recover incremental costs of meeting the timelines adopted in this decision.[64]

It is important that the Commission address these concerns, starting with the parties who argue that the Commission is not meeting its statutory

[60] IREC Opening Comments on the PD at 5.

[61] Joint EV Industry Opening Comments on the PD at 9

[62] SDG&E's Opening Comments on the PD at 12.

[63] SCE's Opening Comments on the PD at 6.

[64] PG&E's Opening Comments at 6.

obligation. This decision maintains that AB 50 enables the Commission to set unique or extended timelines for project types that "include, but are not limited to, projects requiring substantial upstream capacity upgrades or substation upgrades, unanticipated engineering or construction work, or projects requiring energization of significant, unanticipated new load". Upstream capacity projects not only fit this description but are explicitly called out in the code. However, the Commission acknowledges that timely completion of upstream capacity work is critical to achieving California's economic and climate goals and adopts the timelines described below with the intention of speeding up this work. Regarding SCE's position, the Commission agrees that the timelines adopted herein should be revisited in phase 2 but reaffirms the importance of setting timelines now to establish expectations for planning and performance in advance of further refinement. SDG&E's request that the timelines be longer does not align with the spirit of SB 410, which is to accelerate energization"[65].

Considering the aforementioned challenges and the Opening Comments, this decision adopts maximum timelines for certain portions of upstream capacity work that the large electric IOUs are responsible for completing. Instead of "targets" like those adopted for the Electric Tariffs, the Commission adopts statewide maximum timelines that set expectations for utility performance and planning when an energization request triggers upstream capacity work. These timelines are based on the limited data reported by the Joint IOUs' responses to the March 21, 2024, Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Directing Utility Responses to Questions Regarding Energization Timelines. The timelines are intended to reflect the very different timeframes necessary to complete each

[65] SB 410 932(a)(5).

upstream capacity project, given the customer request(s) and the site(s) customers are requesting to energize.

Several parties recommended that the upstream capacity portion of the timeline improvement efforts should occur in the High DER proceeding (R.21-06-017), given the efforts that have already occurred in that rulemaking.[66] While related and conducted in close coordination, the scopes of these proceedings differ enough to address overall distribution capacity planning and execution improvements in the High DER proceeding and the timelines for upstream capacity upgrades that are triggered by energization projects in this proceeding.

EDF/NRDC proposed that the Commission should set unique maximum timeline targets for different categories of upstream capacity projects, while setting a single average timeline target for these projects.

> Setting a single maximum timeline target for these projects would lead to one of two results; either the [large electric] IOUs would regularly exceed the maximum timeline for those long-lead time projects like new substations and may be dissuaded from even pursuing those projects, or the maximum timelines are based on the longest lead-time projects and smaller projects are functionally never found to exceed the maximum timeline targets even when egregiously delayed.[67]

We agree that upstream capacity projects have various timelines and setting the average or maximum timelines may not lead to desired outcomes. Nevertheless, this decision sets maximum timelines so that utilities will incorporate these timelines into their planning processes, and the Commission can continue to gather evidence to help address the concerns of EDF/NRDC in

[66] *See* EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 10, VGIC Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 5, and SCE Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 8-9.

the next phase of this proceeding. On March 21, 2024, an ALJ Ruling requesting information from the large electric IOUs regarding energization timelines directed PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to provide data about their current timelines for three different types of upstream capacity upgrade projects:

1. New or upgraded circuit;[68]
2. Substation upgrade;[69]
3. New substation.[70]

The three categories of upstream capacity projects are aligned between the large electric IOUs and are broad enough to cover all the associated aspects of an upstream capacity project. This recommendation was generally supported by parties in comments.[71] The data reported by the large electric IOUs in response to that ALJ ruling are depicted in Table 4 below. It should be noted that the data has been converted between calendar days and business days as necessary according to the formula Business Day = [(4.8/7)*Calendar Day].

---

[68] Constructing a new circuit can include any of the following: install a new 12 kilovolt (kV) circuit, install new 16 kV circuit, install a new 33 kV circuit, install a new or upgraded kilovolt ampere-reactive (kVAR) capacitor, install a new switch/sectionalizing, construct civil projects, and/or install a new circuit breaker. A single project could be as simple as installing a new 12 kV circuit or require all of the steps listed above. When considering the variability of project complexity, data shows that the timeline for circuit upgrades that require many individual components is similar, on average, to the timeline to build a new circuit. Therefore, it is appropriate to combine the circuit upgrades and new circuits into a single category.

[69] Substation upgrades include any project within the substation fence of a preexisting substation. This includes but is not limited to projects to increase substation capacity, upgrade substation transformer, replace substation banks, and install new substation banks. Individual projects that include both substation upgrade work and new or upgraded circuit work shall fall into the substation upgrade category.

[70] New substations include all projects in which a substation is built where one did not previously exist.

[71] *See* CALSTART Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 4-5, PG&E Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 10, SCE Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 10, EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 9.

Table 4:
Large Electric IOU Energization Timeline Data Reported April 22, 2024

Large Electric IOU	Upstream Capacity Upgrade Type	Average (calendar days)	Median (calendar days)	Standard Deviation (calendar days)
PG&E	• New/Upgraded Circuits • Substation upgrades • New Substation	• 1002 • 1490 • No Data	• 731 • 1233 • No data	• 670 • 707 • No data
SCE	• New/ Upgraded Circuits • Substation upgrades • New Substation	• 907 • 1492 • 3242	• 607 • 1607 • 3242	• 316 • 1005 • 0
SDG&E	• New/ Upgraded Circuits • Substation upgrades • New Substation	• 942 • No data • No data	• 913 • No data • No data	• 264 • No data • No data

The data provided by the large electric IOUs does not provide adequate granularity to establish targets for each type of upstream capacity upgrade project for each separate large electric IOU. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, each large electric IOU reported data differently by each utility, with PG&E submitting both a "pre-funding timeline" and a separate "energization timeline" in its response to the March 21, 2024, ALJ ruling.

PG&E asserts that the pre-funding time is "the time from when a project is identified until when the project is approved and funded by regulatory bodies"

and the energization timeline includes the actual completion of the project including phases such as material sourcing, permitting, and licensing. SCE and SDG&E only filed a single timeline that includes both the time in which the project is waiting to begin and the time to complete the project. These discrepancies in reporting pose a challenge in comparing the data. However, the Commission finds that PG&E's energization timeline data, which reflects the time to complete projects, more closely aligns with the intent of establishing timelines in this decision—accelerate steps in the energization process that utilities have control over. The "pre-funding" time period, or time period before a project needs to be initiated to meet customers' desired energization dates, is not relevant given that it includes the time that a project is not yet started. In PG&E's Opening Comments, they argue that the Commission should include the "pre-funding" timeline "until the revision of the SB 410 caps can be considered."[72] The Commission denies this request but finds PG&E's recommendation that capacity work should only "begin once the customer has both signed the contract and paid the required fees" reasonable.[73] This means the large electric IOUs should begin upstream capacity upgrades according to the adopted maximum timelines once there is a signed contract and required customer payment is received for energization request(s).

Regarding PG&E's requests for certainty of cost recovery, SB 410 provides an expedited pathway for utilities to request additional funding necessary to achieve the policies of the statute without delay, which includes the energization timelines. Put simply, there should not be a "pre-funding" period where SCE,

[72] PG&E Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision at 7.

[73] PG&E Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision at 8.

SDG&E and PG&E are awaiting Commission funding decisions to energize customers. In PG&E's case, there is already an active application where PG&E was authorized an additional approximate $2.2 billion in spending authorization with an option to file a motion for a higher cap in 2025-2026.

In Opening Comments to the Proposed Decision, multiple parties including the Joint EV Industry expressed concerns regarding existing backlogs of capacity projects and how they could slow progress in achieving state goals.[74] The Commission shares these concerns and emphasizes that in order to meet the maximum timelines for all upstream capacity projects energization work should start once the customer has both signed the contract and paid the required fees.

The Commission finds that each type of upstream capacity project should have its own maximum timeline to track progress within each large electric IOUs' project execution and help identify barriers that could delay or impede project completion. Contrary to EDF/NRDC's claim that segmentation of timeline targets will obscure overall progress, we find it reasonable to begin to improve the large electric IOUs' tracking and recording of upstream capacity upgrade projects by adopting maximum statewide timelines the large electric IOUs will be required to meet as they collect more information about the different energization steps in each project type. [75]

The Commission acknowledges that these maximum timelines are based on average values provided by the utilities and that there are some projects that may exceed the maximum. However, the Commission finds it appropriate at this time to utilize the provided averages as maximums to drive reductions in

[74] Joint EV Industry Opening Comments on Proposed Decision at 2.

[75] EDF/NRDC Open Comment at 9.

timelines for capacity projects that normally take longer than the average timelines presented. At this time, we also find it difficult to adopt average timelines without better data from the utilities to determine caps on the number of projects that can or should be allowed to exceed the average as was done for tariff-based projects. Since capacity projects take a longer time to complete, it could delay getting better data to establish these caps and so setting a conservative maximum at this time will encourage acceleration of performance over an already lengthy process. Therefore, we utilize the lowest average among the three IOUs to adopt the following maximum statewide timelines for the upstream capacity projects defined above as (1) new or upgraded circuit; (2) substation upgrade; and (3) new substation.

Table 5: Large Electric IOU Maximum Timelines for Upstream Capacity Upgrade Projects [76]

Upstream Capacity Project Type	Statewide Maximum Timeline (calendar days)	Statewide Maximum Timeline (business days)
New/Upgraded Circuit	684	469
Substation Upgrade	1021	700
New Substation	3242	2223

In Opening Comments to the Proposed Decision, PG&E recommended that the Commission consider the need for distinct timelines between how the energization process and targets adopted in Section 7, Energization Targets, above are tracked and how the upstream capacity upgrades timelines adopted

[76] PG&E did not provide data related to new substation projects. SDG&E did not provide data related to substation upgrade or new substation projects. The timelines in Table 5 therefore reflect the fastest available timeline for the three upstream capacity project types that were provided by the large electric IOUs in the record of this proceeding.

in Table 5 of this decision, Large Electric IOU Maximum Timelines for Upstream Capacity Upgrade Projects, are tracked[77]. PG&E notes that when an energization timeline involves both types of projects, the eight-step process adopted in Section 7, Energization Targets, which reflects the targets for tariff-based projects described above, is already in progress before a capacity project is identified. PG&E argues that all energization projects that relate to the tariff-based projects defined in Section 7, Energization Targets, above work should be paused until work on any upstream capacity upgrades triggered by the tariff-based energization request(s) is completed. We agree with PG&E that a distinction between the two types of projects and processes is necessary to accurately track the time it takes the large electric utilities to complete any tariff-based energization request that triggers an upstream capacity upgrade. For all new or upgraded service requests that identify a need for an upstream capacity upgrade, the large electric IOUs are authorized to pause tracking the energization target tracking process, as defined in Section 7.2, Adopted Statewide Average and Maximum Energization Targets, once the large electric IOU identifies the need for an upstream capacity project and alerts the customer of the need for the upstream capacity project.

The large electric IOU shall first, alert the customer of the required fees and associated contracts necessary to begin the upstream capacity project. Then, the large electric IOU shall start tracking the time to complete the upstream capacity project utilizing the maximum timelines. The large electric IOUs shall include the timing up to identifying the need for the upstream capacity project within their tracking of the time to complete such projects (e.g., if the large

[77] PG&E Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision at 4.

electric IOU identified the need for the upstream capacity upgrade 30 business days into the Engineering & Design step, they must include the 30 business days within their tracking of the time to complete the upstream capacity project). When the upstream capacity upgrade is completed, the large electric IOUs shall resume the tariff-based process from the point at which the upgrade capacity project was identified and include the time tracked prior to identifying the upstream capacity upgrade to complete the energization request within the targets adopted in Section 7, Energization Targets.

Further, as provided in Appendix B of this Decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements, the large electric IOUs must collect and report project -specific data based on each Electric Rule tariff that shall, where appropriate, identify projects for which an upstream capacity upgrade is identified, the progress of each project's completion, and the number of energization projects that are delayed or cancelled due to an identified upstream capacity project. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E shall track and report the number of energization projects, as identified in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, that trigger any of the categories of upstream capacity projects identified in this section of this decision. PG&E already tracks this information to some extent and reported that of all circuit and substation upgrades documented for the data set in 2023, ~50 percent and ~27 percent, respectively, were triggered by energization requests.[78] This type of information will be helpful to understand from all utilities.

Additional information regarding the timing and planning for upstream capacity projects is expected to be provided in both R.21-06-017 and this

[78] PG&E Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision at 9.

proceeding and may be considered to establish targets in Phase 2.. In the meantime, these maximum timelines shall be used by the three large IOUs to begin planning and executing now and will also incentivize the large electric IOUs to gather information on customer plans through proactive outreach and develop their efforts to improve their distribution planning process, in alignment with Pub. Util. Code §§ 933.5 and 936(a).

9. Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Community Impacts

The Commission's ESJ Action Plan serves as both a commitment to furthering principles of environmental and social justice, as well as an operating framework with which to integrate ESJ considerations throughout the agency's work. Since the adoption of Version 1.0, the Commission has made significant progress in incorporating ESJ considerations into its work, as well as creating a culture that takes into serious account the lived experiences of ESJ communities.[79] Version 2.0 of the ESJ Action Plan, adopted April 7, 2022, reflects a continuation of efforts to systemize the consideration of ESJ principles across the Commission's regulated industries, which is hereby incorporated into today's decision on energization timelines for California's electric utilities.

Goal 2 of the ESJ Action Plan is a primary focus of this proceeding -- increasing investment in clean energy resources to benefit ESJ Communities, especially to improve local air quality and public health. This includes the following objectives: (1) Outreach and Engagement: Broaden and deepen outreach and engagement with ESJ Communities early in proceedings and processes related to resilient, clean energy; (2) Research and Analysis to Understand Impact: Further research and analytical opportunities to understand

[79] *See* The California Public Utilities Commission ESJ Action Plan, Version 2.0, at 2.

impacts in ESJ communities; (3) Move Towards Mutual Eligibility and Maximizing Impacts: Better leverage ongoing work by fostering cross-division, cross-Commission, and cross-agency dialogues to move towards a mutual eligibility and maximizing impact; (4) Address Impacts in ESJ Communities: Continue to address ongoing and legacy impacts in ESJ communities in the resilient, clean energy space; and (5) Continue Ongoing Investment Continue to make prioritized resilient, clean energy investments in ESJ communities.[80]

Many parties provide recommendations to achieve Goal 2 of the ESJ Action Plan. Auto Innovators suggested the Commission ensure the utilities energize facilities to enable transportation electrification in ESJ communities at a rate that matches or exceeds their performance elsewhere.[81] Crown Castle offered that ESJ community access to high-quality communications services will improve by adopting energization timelines for communication services,.[82] EDF/NRDC provided that proactive load forecasting and grid planning improvements underway in the Transportation Electrification Policy and Investment (R.23-12-008) and High DER proceedings can help meet Goal 2 of the ESJ Action Plan by prioritizing upstream capacity upgrades in ESJ communities to facilitate greater electrification.[83] Moreover, EDF/NRDC noted that in setting energization targets, the Commission should ensure the large electric IOUs are providing timely service in response to customer requests in ESJ communities.[84]

---

[80] *See* The California Public Utilities Commission ESJ Action Plan, Version 2.0, at 24 and 35; EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 10.

[81] Auto Innovators Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 13.

[82] Crown Castle Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 11.

[83] EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 10.

[84] EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 10.

CALSTART suggested that the timelines for priority populations be compared with timelines for projects outside of such communities to ensure the Commission and the large electric IOUs have the information necessary to analyze any discrepancies.[85]

PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E suggest this rulemaking is in alignment with the ESJ Action Plan, and that the Commission should not prioritize service for any specific set of customers, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 453(a) and (c).[86] Additionally, SDG&E suggests consideration of overall customer equity.[87]

As CALSTART, EDF/NRDC, and PACT note, this proceeding provides an opportunity to collect data for customers located in areas that are identified as economically or environmentally disadvantaged communities to identify discrepancies.[88] Collection of transparent data is necessary to ensure that the energization timelines adopted are not only feasible, but to identify what specific issues ESJ communities may face in deployment of energization infrastructure.

More data would be necessary to evaluate whether ESJ-priority communities face energization delays that differ from communities that are not identified as ESJ regions by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. As directed in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual

---

[85] CALSTART Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 13.

[86] PG&E Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 12, SCE Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 11, and SDG&E Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 12.

[87] SDG&E Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 12.

[88] The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment oversees and updates CalEnviroScreen, which is a mapping tool that helps identify California communities most affected by pollution. It provides a way to compare how pollutants affect different communities and population centers. D.22-08-023 implemented affordability metrics to be used across the Commission's proceedings that consider the cost of essential utility service across all utilities and geographic areas of California.

Energization Reporting Requirements, and Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements, the Commission requires the large electric IOUs to track data that will enable it to assess equity issues raised by the energization targets. The Commission will evaluate the biannual data reported by the large electric IOUs as described in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, to ensure energization requests within ESJ communities are being addressed equitably.[89]

As discussed further in Section 12 of this decision, Improved Customer Outreach, the large electric IOUs shall also provide clear descriptions and data to support their efforts to engage local and Tribal governments to ensure their energization processes are clear to all customers and support energization needs of local and Tribal governments.

10. Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements

Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(a)(2)(B) requires the Commission to establish annual energization data reporting processes and identifies minimum energization reporting requirements the large electric IOUs must submit to the Commission. The goal of these reporting requirements is to reflect the large electric IOU's efforts of timely completion of customer energization requests. At a minimum, the reporting requirements shall include: (1) the average, median, and standard deviation time between receiving an application for energizing the electrical service; (2) explanations for energization time periods that exceed the target maximum for energization projects; (3) constraints and obstacles to each type of energization, including funding limitations, qualified staffing availability,

[89] CA Hydrogen Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 11.

or equipment availability; and (4) any other information required by the Commission.[90]

Parties provide different approaches on reporting requirements in opening comments to the Scoping Memo. AEU, Auto Innovators, CALSTART, CCSF, CMTA, Crown Castle, EDF/NRDC, Joint EV Industry, SCE, and Terawatt are supportive of an annual reporting process, due April 1st of each year.[91] PACT supports more frequent, but less data-intensive reporting.[92] A number of parties encourage the Commission to adopt a regularly updated public platform that provides notification regarding status of requests to address energization issues, such as the California Distributed Generation Statistics website (DGStats).[93]

DGStats is a website funded by the large electric IOUs and maintained by a contractor to the Commission that provides the public with data and infographics about the state's implementation of distributed generation resources and associated programs provided by the large electric IOUs in California, such as net metering and solar photovoltaic installations.

The parties listed above suggest the Commission should direct the large electric IOUs to maintain similar databases, drawing from the online system

---

[90] Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(2)(B)(i-iv).

[91] CalBroadband Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 10-11; SCE Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 8-9; AEU Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 13-14; Cal.net OIR Opening Comments at 3; Crown Castle OIR Reply Comments at 6; Auto Innovators Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 13; CALSTART Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 11-13; EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 9-10; and Joint EV Industry Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 8-9.

[92] PACT Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 14.

[93] SPUR Opening Comments on the OIR at 3 to 4; CalCCA Opening Comments on the OIR at 6; CALSTART Reply Comments on OIR at 3; CALSSA Opening Comments on the OIR at 6; ExteNet Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 7; HAC Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 5; and IREC Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 12.

calculating average and maximum energization periods by customer class and project size, and provide that reporting to the Commission in the large electric IOUs' annual energization target reports. Other parties suggested the large electric IOUs should provide additional data on energization projects supporting EV charging infrastructure separately for projects which will support medium- and heavy-duty EV charging facilities.[94]

Generally, the large electric IOUs must complete the engineering study, scoping, design, and construction, as described in Section 7, Energization Targets, and Upstream Capacity Upgrade Targets, as described in Section 8. For utility-owned facilities, the large electric IOUs must obtain easements, permitting, licensing, and materials, although external factors can heavily impact these processes and the responsibilities for customers and large electric IOUs vary greatly by AHJ. At customer-owned sites, the large electric IOUs have little input into the easements, permitting, licensing, or other AHJ-related steps in the process, other than responding to customer requests.

PG&E and several other parties reported that circumstances outside of the large electric IOUs' control, such as a delay in local permitting processes or problems accessing the customer's site, can often result in a longer than expected energization timeline.[95] SCE stated that the large electric IOUs should not be required to monitor progress or completion of phases of the processes for which

[94] Terawatt Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 8; VGIC Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 9; and Voltera Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 12.

[95] Alliance for Transportation Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 4; CMTA Opening on the Scoping Memo at 2; and PG&E Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 1.

timing is primarily controlled by the customer, AHJ, or other third party or parties.[96], [97]

The Commission understands that there are portions of the energization process the large electric IOUs cannot complete, which is why those steps will not count against the large electric IOUs' efforts to meet the adopted targets. However, we still find value in tracking the time necessary for steps that are not fully within the large electric IOUs' control, including instances when customers choose to change the scope of their energization project request.

In order for the Commission to better understand the time necessary for the large electric IOUs to coordinate with customers and other jurisdictional requirements, the large electric IOUs shall track the time to complete the steps outside their full control, as described herein and Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements. Although the large electric IOUs may not have full control of, or insight into, reasons for any non-utility-side delays, they shall still track both the timing of steps outside of their control and the reasons for any delays whenever that information is available. The large electric IOUs shall also report the customer's requested energization date and the changes that were necessary to complete the new or upgrade electric service request. This information should inform process improvements in future Commission decisions related to energization targets.

We also direct the large electric IOUs to report the timing of each specific step identified in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, and Section 8,

---

[96] AHJs can include local permitting authorities and/or local and tribal governments, and third parties could include homeowner associations and other parties that may affect the timing of site energization.

[97] SCE Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 1-3, SCE Reply Comments on the Scoping Memo at 3-4.

of this decision, Upstream Capacity Upgrade Targets, using the requirements outlined in Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements.

Additional data is necessary because the information provided by the large electric IOUs on the record of this proceeding, to date, is inadequate to support full implementation of Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(a)(2)(B). While the large electric IOUs reported that they currently collect some of the data necessary to evaluate timeliness of customer energization requests, there are many gaps in the data on this proceeding's record that must be addressed to ensure statutory compliance.

Pub. Util. Code § 933.5 requires the electric IOUs to "demonstrate improvement in energization performance and the resolution of backlogs of customers waiting for electricity." Specifically, it requires each electrical corporation that energized less than 35 percent of customers with completed applications in a timeframe that exceeds 12 months to submit a report to the Commission, on or before December 1, 2024, demonstrating that the electrical corporation has energized 80 percent of customers with applications deemed complete as of January 31, 2023. The 80 percent target defined in statute excludes applications that have been withdrawn, canceled, or with customer-requested energization dates beyond December 1, 2024. Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(b), each large electric IOU shall submit a report to the commission, on or before December 1, 2024, demonstrating the large electric IOU has energized at least 80 percent of customers that had completed applications for energization projects pending as of January 1, 2023. This data shall be considered part of the record of this proceeding and shall be filed and served to the service lists of R.24-01-018 and R.21-06-017.

Considering the requirements discussed above and provided in statute, we direct the large electric IOUs to jointly develop a new data reporting template that aligns with the data requirements codified in Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(2)(B), the requirements adopted in Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements, and the energization targets described in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets. The large electric IOUs shall collect and report data for energization steps that are within their direct control using a consolidated template that is served via a Tier 1 Advice Letter within 60 days of the issuance of this decision. Once the large electric IOUs file and serve their jointly proposed reporting template to the service lists of this proceeding and the High DER proceeding, parties may comment on the proposal through the advice letter process. The large electric IOUs shall work with Energy Division and stakeholders to finalize the template before the first biannual energization reports are due in March 2025.

Initially, the large electric IOUs shall file their energization reports biannually (once every six months), beginning no later than March 31, 2025, to the Energization OIR service list (R.24-01-018) or any succeeding proceeding(s) for analysis. The Energy Division will post the biannual reports on the existing Energization OIR website. Data to improve the Commission's understanding of the time necessary to complete energization requests is crucial to consider when and how to accelerate the targets adopted in Section 7.2 above. The initial deadline of March 2025, and the initial biannual reporting, should provide that incremental data. Changes to the data reporting timing may be considered in a later phase of this proceeding.

The large electric IOUs shall provide data related to all energization projects that have submitted complete applications as of January 31, 2023, in their

first biannual report filed no later than March 31, 2025. The large electric IOUs' biannual reports shall track the amount of time between each of the steps the large electric IOU has full control over to better inform the Commission of the amount of time that typically lapses while the large electric IOU(s) wait for the completion of customer permitting efforts, local or state compliance review(s) for necessary permits, and/or customer lag time to respond to requests from the large electric IOU(s). The full reporting requirements the large electric IOUs shall comply with are defined in Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements.

The large electric IOUs may achieve the data collection necessary to comply with the directives of this decision using existing data collection tools and analysis processes. The incremental data collection requirements shall be implemented as of the date of the issuance of this decision, but data going back to January 31, 2023, is required to be reported pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(b). The large electric IOUs shall provide information describing how the timelines they track align with the energization targets adopted herein, using the data reporting tools that each large electric IOU already uses, and complying with the adopted data template by providing more individualized narrative explanations where necessary.[98] If a large electric IOU's timelines do not meet the targets, their biannual reports shall explain why and the anticipated steps they anticipate are necessary to meet the targets in the following year.

[98] The template and directives adopted in this decision are not intended to require any information technology or billing system upgrades; the utilities should instead use the systems already available to track the information sought in Appendix C and provide a narrative explanation if the information collected does not meet the targets adopted in this decision. More discussion on improving data collection efforts may be discussed in Phase 2 of this proceeding.

All parties support the use of data collection efforts to inform the large electric IOUs' ability to meet the adopted average and maximum energization targets, and to inform future work on accelerating the energization process. To comply with the requirement of Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(a)(3), Commission staff shall host a public workshop within 90 days of the large electric IOUs' submission of their first biannual data to the Commission (due no later than March 31, 2025) to discuss the large electric IOUs' data and inform the need for and the potential revisions to the adopted energization targets. The workshop and annual reporting requirements will ensure the large electric IOUs are able to collect enough data to show a significant sample of how they are meeting adopted targets and can minimize the administrative efforts that more frequent data reporting would have on the large electric IOUs and Commission staff.

To support the improvement of Energy Division's ability to analyze, collect, track, evaluate and report the large electric IOU biannual energization data and progress toward meeting the targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, and Section 8 of this decision, Upstream Capacity Upgrade Targets, to the general public, we authorize the Commission's Executive Director to enter into a contract of $1 million per year over five years, or $5 million total over five years, and recover the cost via reimbursement from PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E based on their respective share of their California-jurisdictional annual electric sales as of the issuance date of this decision. Funding for the Commission-managed evaluation budget will be sought pursuant to the California Legislature's Annual Budget Act, which gives the

Commission certain specific and limited ongoing reimbursable expenditure authority.[99]

To track the costs associated with the contract described above, PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E are directed to file motions in this proceeding requesting authority to establish memorandum accounts specifically associated with the contract to support Energy Division in analyzing in analyzing energization data collected through the template to be developed in compliance with this decision. The costs tracked in each large electric IOU's separate memorandum accounts cannot be recovered from ratepayers until the costs are reviewed and approved by the Commission in a ratesetting proceeding.

Finally, we delegate any necessary modifications and updates to the biannual energization target reporting template that is finalized by the large electric IOUs pursuant to Section 10 of this decision to Commission staff, should staff determine changes are necessary to the template prior to a future decision in this proceeding. The Commission finds that providing Commission staff with the authority to modify the energization target reporting template in the near term is the most effective way to ensure the Commission is collecting the necessary data to inform improvements to the energization process(es) moving forward. No updates to the data collection template shall be required prior to September 30, 2025. The updates shall occur through a resolution process, led by Commission staff, to ensure parties have adequate information to review the proposed changes to the data collection template and how often the energization data reported to the Commission.

[99] AB 107 (Stats. 2024, Ch. 22, as amended by SB 108 (Stats. 2024 Ch. 35) , Item 8660-001-0462(6).

11. Customer Reporting Procedures for Delays in Providing New or Upgraded Electric Service Requests

This decision adopts a new process to enable customers to report delays they experience when requesting new or upgraded electric service from the large electric IOUs. Any forms submitted by customers will provide the Commission with information about why and when energization projects face delays, when the large electric IOUs may be responsible for the delays, and when other authorities, such as local permitting agencies or customers themselves, may be creating delays, issues, or roadblocks in customers' project requests.

Parties provide different suggestions as to how customer reporting may be accomplished. SCE recommended that the Commission create a simple form that would include guidance on what constitutes a reportable delay to help inform future Commission policy.[100] Walmart suggested the Commission require the large electric IOUs to develop a standardized portfolio view of all in-process applications for energization projects for a given customer with metrics that could be shared as a dataset for dispute resolution.[101] Terawatt recommended the Commission direct the large electric IOUs to develop and manage an online energization project management system to allow customers to report energization delays; the management system should include a pathway for customers to report energization delays if the large electric IOU exceeds the timeline set by the instant decision.[102] SDG&E reported they are engaged closely with customers throughout the energization process and do not believe there is a need for the Commission to improve the existing processes available to

[100] SCE Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 7.

[101] Walmart Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 10.

[102] Terawatt Opening Comments on Scoping Ruling at 7 to 8.

customers.[103] Alternatively, PG&E is open to the Commission establishing an email box or webform for customers to submit timeline concerns directly to the Commission for routing or escalation.[104] Crown Castle suggested the Commission require the large electric IOUs to adopt a practice utilized by PG&E – an online portal for customers to track the status of their applications and energization requests.[105]

Given the potential number of customer reports related to energization delays across the large electric IOUs' service territories, we adopt a form intended to streamline customer reporting. This form shall be included in the large electric IOUs' customer information packages whenever a customer submits an energization application request, and be provided on any webpages that that explain the energization process and the targets adopted in this decision, as discussed further in Section 12 of this decision, Improved Customer Outreach.

Customers must utilize the Energization Delay Reporting Form (Appendix C) when submitting reports of projects that exceed the maximum targets adopted in Section 7.2, Adopted Statewide Average and Maximum Energization Targets, to provide Commission staff with the appropriate information to log the customer delay report. This form aims to provide the Commission with useful information as to why a customer may face an energization delay and attempts to resolve the delay. Customers may email energizationcustomer@cpuc.ca.gov if they are unable to utilize the online form, but should still provide the same information described in Appendix C,

[103] SDG&E Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 9.

[104] PG&E Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 8.

[105] Crown Castle Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 8.

Energization Delay Reporting Form. Customers may also contact the Commission's Public Advisor's Office with questions on the customer complaint format public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov or 1-866-849-8390 – toll free, or 1-415-703-2074. This streamlined approach to address customer reporting delays will ensure the Commission's Energy Division has a full accounting of current scenarios an individual customer may face that create energization delays across the large electric IOU service territories.

12. Improved Customer Outreach

To meet requirements established in AB 50 and SB 410, the communication between the large electric IOUs and customers seeking new or upgraded service must improve such that customers have more insight into the time necessary for each step of the energization process that the large electric IOUs can fully control. In particular, it is important for the large electric IOUs to improve communication with customers between the steps identified in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets.

This decision adopts targets specific to energization steps that the large electric IOUs have complete control over, and sets reporting requirements for, when feasible, tracking and reporting the time for customers or AHJs to complete steps the large electric IOUs may not have full control over.

It is important for the large electric IOUs to improve communication with customers between steps. For example, if a customer's application is complete but there are outstanding issues the large electric IOUs control that could delay the project, the large electric IOU shall provide the customer information about the specific issues that are outstanding and the anticipated timing for completion of each incremental step necessary to complete the energization request. Once a customer files an application for new or upgraded electric service, the large

electric IOUs shall provide clear information regarding the targets adopted in this decision for requests that fall under Electric Rule Tariffs 15, 16, 29, and 45. This information shall also be included on the large electric IOUs' websites for customer review prior to applying for new or upgraded electric service.

If a large electric IOU cannot complete a new electric distribution line or electric distribution line upgrade until an upstream capacity upgrade is complete, the large electric IOU shall inform the customer of the reason and expected timeline of the delay, and include the upstream capacity project in its projected load forecasts. Individual customers whose projects are delayed due to a scheduled upstream capacity project shall receive quarterly updates about the status of the upstream capacity upgrade process until it is feasible to move on to the next step in their individual energization request.

PG&E and SCE commented that large electric IOUs can demonstrate they are making efforts to avoid and/or resolve energization delays through established customer and stakeholder engagement processes that provide transparency and manage customer energization timing expectations.[106] The Joint EV Industry recommended that the large electric IOUs provide customers with a clear understanding of the energization process to help set expectations for project completion, provide regular updates about the status of achieving the requested energization date, and discuss any delays to the energization process to the customer.[107] PACT also recommended that to improve timely communication and transparency, especially from large electric IOUs to the customer, one or more specific member of the electric IOUs personnel should be

[106] PG&E Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 15, SCE Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 14.

[107] Joint EV Industry Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 6-7.

assigned to particular energization projects to provide subject matter expertise to the customer.[108] CALSSA, Crown Castle, Terawatt, Voltera, and Walmart recommended the Commission require the large electric IOUs to adopt an online portal for customers to track the status of their applications and energization requests.[109]

To better improve customer understanding of the energization process and provide them with transparency of the status of their project, we direct the large electric IOUs to assign an account/project manager to each approved application for new or upgraded electric service within 10 business days of an application being approved. This dedicated account/project manager shall ensure the customer receives detailed information about the steps and targets adopted in this Section 7 of decision, Energization Targets, for Electric Rules 15, 16, 29, and 45, and when necessary, information regarding the steps and targets adopted in Section 8 of this decision, Upstream Capacity Upgrade Targets. The account/project manager should be available to support multiple customers' energization projects. This decision does not establish any requirement for the large electric IOUs to hire a separate account manager for each project application.

The account/project manager shall serve as the main point of contact throughout the life of the energization request application process for all customer questions, provide periodic updates to the customer on the status of their energization request, and address concerns related to the customer's

[108] PACT Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 12.

[109] CALSSA Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 10; Crown Castle Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 8; Terawatt Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 7; Voltera Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 9; and Walmart Opening Comments on the Scoping Memo at 10 (all filed and served on May 3, 2024).

project. To comply with this decision, the large electric IOU's account/project manager shall provide the customer with the following once an energization request for a new or upgraded service line is requested:

- Recurring meetings between the customer and/or third-party speaking on behalf of the customer. The frequency and duration of the meetings must be determined based on discussions with the customer once the application for service is approved.
- The account/project manager must provide the customer with an overview of the energization process, including the steps to complete an energization request, the party responsible for completing the energization steps, the adopted average and maximum energization targets, and the efforts a customer can take to avoid energization delays.
- Monthly project status updates to:
    1) Identify the current step the project falls within the energization process as defined in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets;
    2) Provide the current number of business and calendar days the project has been open for work that can be completed by the large electric IOU, work that may be outside of the large electric IOU(s) control, and the total business days the project has been open; and
    3) Define the status of the large electric IOU(s) efforts to complete the pending work to complete the customer's energization request, and the anticipated completion date of this work.
- For projects awaiting pre-scheduled work to be performed by the large electric IOU(s) (i.e., site-visit, construction, inspection, etc.), the large electric IOU shall provide notice no less than 72 prior to the scheduled task and explain the reasons why the large electric IOU must reschedule or cancel the scheduled electrification step. The large electric IOU's account/project manager must ensure any delayed

energization task is rescheduled within 20 business days (one month).

- Within 48 hours of knowing delays are occurring, or are expected to occur, the large electric IOUs and/or the large electric IOU's representative must have a discussion with the customer to fully explain the cause of the delay, who is responsible for resolving the delay, an estimate timeframe for when the delay will be resolved (if the delay is caused by the large electric IOU), and potential options to remediate the delay.
- If the large electric IOU identifies any issue(s) that could cancel or delay a customer's energization request, the large electric IOU shall provide customers notice within no more than 10 business days if the large electric IOU identifies and provide the customer with clear steps necessary to ensure a requested project is not cancelled or delayed.
- The large electric IOU(s) must report all energization delay(s) and any associated complaint resolution(s) in each biannual (every six months) report as directed in Section 10 of this decision, Annual Energization Reporting Requirements, and Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements.
- Each large electric IOU shall notify the customer requesting a new or upgraded electric service line of a change in their account/project manager notifying their employer (IOU) within five days of the prior account/ project manager providing the large electric IOU notice that they are leaving their current position at the company.
- The large electric IOUs must provide all customers with outstanding requests for new or upgraded electric service with the contact information of the new account/project manager filling the prior account/project manager role and ensure the new account/project manager is provided full information on the details and status of each project at the time of their assignment.

This decision directs the large electric IOUs to submit a Tier 1 Advice Letter within 60 days of approval of this decision proposing a customer engagement and communication plan. The plan must describe what existing customer communication systems can be utilized to provide customers that file energization applications with more detailed information about the energization process and the timing of their requests. The customer engagement and communication plan shall not only be used to improve customer outreach, but also be used by the large electric IOUs to inform their recruiting, training, and retaining programs for employees needed to promptly respond to customer energization requests, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 932(a)(9). The large electric IOUs shall ensure all energization-related collateral and customer outreach efforts are developed in multiple languages for the communities within their service territories.

As recommended by CalCCA, the large electric IOUs can alternatively develop a web portal to automate the process outlined above. If the large electric IOUs opt for an online web portal, it shall include, at minimum:

1) dynamic energization status updates that identify the step of the energization process the project is currently in;
2) the total number of business and calendar days the energization project has been open, and the total number of business and calendar days the project has been pending in the individual energization step;
3) direct communication pathways between the customer and large electric IOU project/account manager to discuss any outstanding questions and/or concerns regarding their project; and
4) information regarding the energization process, specifically, the adopted target timelines adopted in this decision, the party responsible for completing each step of the energization process, and what is needed to complete

these steps, and how the energization timing tracking changes between the large electric IOU and the customer.

Further, the large electric IOUs customer-engagement and communication plan shall include a tool that notifies individual customers when each step under the large electric IOU's control, as described in Section 7, Energization Targets, and Section 8, Upstream Capacity Upgrade Targets, above, is complete. This notification process must not require incremental information technology or billing system upgrades; instead, it must fall on the large electric IOUs to directly correspond with the customer once an energization application is received to (1) describe the adopted energization targets adopted in this decision, and (2) keep the customer informed about each stage of the energization process, as necessary. Should a large electric IOU determine it needs incremental funding to implement this notification process or further meet the customer outreach requirements adopted in this decision, it must request a ratemaking mechanism to track and recover associated costs, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 937.

In developing their efforts to meet the adopted average and maximum energization targets, as discussed in Section 7, Energization Targets, and Section 8, Upstream Capacity Upgrade Targets, and to accelerate the energization process going forward, the large electric IOUs shall identify any unique barriers that cause delays to the energization process for projects located in and/or service ESJ communities. The large electric IOUs shall include a description of these unique barriers within their energization data collection and reporting efforts, as directed in this decision and outlined in Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements. In each annual report directed in this decision, the large electric IOUs shall discuss the efforts they've made to overcome barriers and delays specific to ESJ communities and

the steps they have taken to improve the timing of providing new or upgraded electric service to ESJ communities.

Each large electric IOUs' Tier 1 Advice Letter proposing improved customer outreach shall also explain how any existing customer outreach systems and customer notification processes can be used to improve communication with customers seeking new or upgraded electric service(s). The goal of this Advice Letter is to ensure each large electric IOUs' customer-engagement and communication plans will lead to customers being provided with more clarity on their energization process(es), more certainty that their project's progress is being tracked by the IOU, and that their project is moving forward even in times when there is little activity occurring. The large electric IOUs' Tier 1 Advice Letters to address improved customer outreach must, at minimum, include the following:

1) An explanation for how the large electric IOU will explain the scope of each step of the energization process adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets and Section 8 of this decision, Upstream Capacity Upgrade Targets. The explanation must include:
    a. The party responsible for completing each step of the energization process;
    b. The documentation the large electric IOU will need from the customer and/or third party to demonstrate a step that is not fully within the large electric IOU's control is complete;
    c. How the large electric IOU will communicate to the customer when a step fully within the large electric IOU's control is completed; and
    d. How the large electric IOU will communicate the identification of a delay(s) and, if the delay is on any step that is fully within the large electric IOU's control, the process to resolve the delay.

2) An explanation for how the adopted average and maximum energization targets apply to each project, including:
    a. How the IOU will communicate the expected timing for the customer/third-party/large electric IOU to complete their step(s) in the energization process.
    b. An outline of the different timing needs to complete non-tariff, tariff, and upstream capacity energization projects (e.g., the inherent need of a multi-year process to complete an upstream capacity project and how this impacts a tariff-based upgrade).
    c. An explanation of how the site's/project's characteristics (i.e., geographic barriers that impact the speed of trenching, local permitting barriers, lack of known upstream capacity availability, etc.) may impact the timing needed to complete the customer's energization request.
    d. An explanation for how the large electric IOU will timely and clearly communicate an expected delay(s) to the customer, and how the delay will be addressed.
    e. When a delay occurs within a step that is fully within the large electric IOU's control, the large electric IOU shall provide customers with clear information about how long the delay will take to remedy.
3) If opting to develop an online web portal, an explanation of the following:
    a. The process(es) to develop the online web portal.
    b. The information that will be presented to customers and how it will be presented.
    c. How long it will take for the large electric IOU to develop the online web portal.
    d. The total expected costs to develop, operate, and maintain the online web portal.

13. Timing of Compliance with Energization Targets

Issue 9 of the Scoping Memo discusses the Commission's potential to adopt energization targets that are phased over time, such that acceleration could occur once more data is collected regarding the status of the large electric IOUs' energization processes. AEU, SCE, SDG&E, and Terawatt all provide comments in support of phasing, while Auto Innovators, CalBroadband, CALSTART, CMTA, EDF/NRDC, Joint EV Industry, and PG&E oppose phasing.

AEU provides that the Commission should consider setting multi-year target pathways that become more stringent over time with learning and dedication of resources; a multi-year phased target provides visibility to the IOU about its future performance expectations, while allowing for annual review and adjustment.[110] Similarly, SCE believes the Commission should delay the effective date of the adopted energization timelines and implementation of annual reporting requirements to allow the large electric IOUs sufficient time to operationalize the new requirements and modify their data systems.[111] Terawatt supports a phased-in approach but notes that, as discussed above, the Commission and large electric IOUs should prioritize phasing in energization targets for medium/heavy duty EV charging infrastructure projects.[112] SDG&E believes phased targets will allow for internal process and system changes, additional training to comply with new process and reporting requirements, and continuous learning and change implementations to improve the large electric IOUs' ability to meet timeline targets and comply with reporting requirements.[113]

[110] AEU Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 14.

[111] SCE Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 12.

[112] Terawatt Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 9.

[113] SDG&E Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 13.

Auto Innovators pushes for non-phased energization timelines that are effective immediately.[114] CMTA believes it is imperative the Commission adopt all energization targets as soon as possible to address customer concerns about energization delays, regardless of customer group or type or size of projects.[115] EDF/NRDC feel the initial targets should be ambitious but achievable that drive IOU behavior.[116] Joint EV Industry believe there is no compelling reason to delay the implementation of energization targets, while CALSTART notes that the Commission should immediately establish energization timelines for project types.[117] Finally, PG&E notes if the data the large electric IOU(s) provide the Commission indicates an inability to achieve set targets, a phased approach could be implemented to create a glidepath to achieve the targets.[118]

In addition to party comments, we look to the intent of SB 410 to evaluate whether energization targets should be phased. SB 410 declared the Commission must "establish target deadlines."[119] The Commission interprets "targets" as specific goals that the utilities will plan for and aim to achieve. Considering the costly impacts of delays discussed in the bill and the urgency in connecting new load, it is imperative that utilities begin planning and aiming to achieve these targets now. Therefore, the targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, are compliance requirements that go into effect immediately.

---

[114] Auto Innovators Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 13.

[115] CMTA Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 7.

[116] EDF/NRDC Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 12.

[117] Joint EV Industry Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 9; CALSTART Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 9.

[118] PG&E Opening Comments on Scoping Memo at 12 to 13.

[119] Pub. Util Code § 932(a)(10) and § 934(a)(1).

As discussed in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, above, we direct the IOUs to collectively develop and propose a new reporting template that provides all of the data listed in Appendix B, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements. The data collected through this reporting template is intended to support our consideration of (1) the IOUs' compliance with the energization targets established in this decision; (2) the ability of IOUs to coordinate energization projects within their service territories to accelerate energization; and (3) additional data for considering methods to allow intermediate energization solutions for larger projects that may necessitate larger upstream capacity upgrades.

As identified in Table 3, Rates of Acceleration Necessary to Meet the Average and Maximum Targets, meeting the adopted energization targets will largely accelerate PG&E's energization efforts, with SDG&E also seeing some acceleration. The targets also reflect an incremental five percent acceleration for all large electric IOUs, which speeds PG&E and SDG&E's processes further and requires SCE to also accelerate its energization processes. Although the energization targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, may primarily result in acceleration of energization processes in PG&E and SDG&E's service territories, all large electric IOUs must either meet the targets adopted herein, or accelerate their current timelines for energization processes by five percent, whichever is the shortest timeframe for completing customer requests.[120] Further acceleration of the timelines adopted in this decision may occur in Phase 2 of this rulemaking. The need for an additional working group or

[120] Each IOU's current timelines for energization processes can be found in Appendix A, Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report.

Commission-led workshop(s) to determine how to accelerate the energization targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, may be considered in Phase 2 of this proceeding.[121]

14. Enforcement of Energization Targets

During the May 21, 2024, Status Conference, parties sought assurance that the energization targets established by this Commission would be enforced and requested details on how enforcement would occur. Pub. Util. Code § 932 (a)(11) requires the Commission to establish reporting requirements that ensure the large electric IOUs report compliance with the targets adopted in this decision, or explain why the large electric IOU is out of compliance. Pub. Util. Code § 934(b) establishes that if a large electric IOU exceeds the targets established by the Commission, it should provide a detailed strategy for meeting the targets adopted in this decision in the future. Further, Pub. Util. Code § 934(d) states that the Commission shall require all large electric IOUs to take remedial actions necessary to achieve the targets adopted by the Commission.

In Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, above, we direct the IOUs to develop a standard reporting template using the data reporting requirements listed in Appendix B, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements, to track each step of their energization processes. The average energization targets defined above must be achieved within a 12-month period, between January 1 and December 31 of each year. No more than 5 percent of all energization projects that do not trigger upstream capacity upgrades shall exceed the maximum energization target, as described in Section 7, Energization Targets, above, within a 12-month period. Any project that exceeds the maximum energization target will be deemed an "overdue project." If any large electric IOU exceeds the maximum statewide

target for 5 percent or more of their customer's energization requests in one year, they will be out of compliance with the Commission's directive. This directive is adopted in this Phase 1 decision to comply with SB 410 and AB 50. The Commission may consider additional compliance requirements, and potential enforcement mechanisms, in a future phase of this or a subsequent proceeding if the large electric IOUs fail to comply with the targets, timelines and associated requirements adopted herein.

The large electric IOUs shall reduce timelines for all customers seeking new or upgraded electric service, rather than specifically targeting certain customer or project types that are easier to accelerate. Energization requests shall be processed based on customer application completion and will be completed within the timeline of the targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets.

Moving forward, the Commission will keep track of whether acceleration of all energization processes is occurring across all customers, and may adjust the targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, and the timelines adopted in Section 8 of this decision, Upstream Capacity Upgrade Targets, if necessary, to ensure all customers benefit from the targets' implementation.

The biannual energization reports shall be filed by the IOUs every six months to the R.24-01-018 service list, with the first submission required to be served no later than March 31, 2025, and the second no later than September 30, 2025. These biannual energization reports shall reflect customer energization requests submitted after the issuance of this decision and align with the large electric IOUs' template directed in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual

Energization Reporting Requirements, and Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements.

The biannual energization reports will be filed and served on the service list of R.24-01-018 and posted on the Commission's Energization website, for the purposes of improving Commission, customer, and party insight into customer-reported energization delays. Although Commission staff does not have the bandwidth to respond to each customer delay complaint on a case-by-case basis, these collective reports will help identify trends in energization delays, such as the impact geographical locations have on the energization timing. Additional methods of responding to customer complaints may be addressed in Phase 2 of this rulemaking. The collective reports will also protect customer privacy and prevent personal information from being publicized on the Commission's website.

Customers filing energization requests on or after of the issuance of this decision have the ability to report project delays that exceed the large electric IOUs' maximum targets, as defined in Section 11 of this decision, Customer Reporting Procedures for New and Upgraded Service Requests, above, and the enforcement policy may be developed in more detail either in Phase 2 of this proceeding, or individual customer requests, depending on the specifics of the customer's energization request.[121] Individual customer complaints related to issues that may exceed the average energization targets adopted in this decision are to be submitted consistent with the direction above in Section 11, Customer Reporting Procedures for New and Upgraded Service Requests, and Appendix C

[121] Customers may use the temporary reporting solution adopted in this decision or wait until a more formal penalization process is adopted in this or another proceeding, whichever would most expedite their energization request(s).

of this decision, Draft Customer Energization Delay Reporting Form. Nothing in this decision modifies or limits a person's or entity's right to file a complaint pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure or any applicable statutory law.

15. Small/Multijurisdictional Utilities

SB 410 and AB 50 both authorize the Commission to modify or adjust the statutory requirements for electrical corporations with fewer than 100,000 service connections, as individual circumstances merit.[122]

CASMU filed comments on behalf of Bear Valley Electric Service, Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric), LLC, and PacifiCorp (doing business as Pacific Power) on both R.24-01-018 and the scoping memo, noting that the legislative history behind the development of SB 410 and AB 50 focused on the growing backlogs and delays for large IOU customers' energization requests. CASMU argued there is no reason to create new energization requirements for the parties it represents because no customer complaints have been raised for BVES, Liberty, or PacifiCorp at this time.[123] CASMU also stated the customers served by small or multijurisdictional utilities in California face "disproportionately large rate impacts" when new statewide requirements are implemented, particularly when those requirements are intended to address issues faced more frequently by customers of PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E.[124]

The Commission has previously found, given the small customer base and staffing limitations of the CASMU parties, that some flexibility for compliance

[122] Pub. Util. Code §§ 939 and 933.5(e).

[123] CASMU Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 3-6.

[124] CASMU Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 5-7.

with new requirements is appropriate.[125] No party opposed CASMU's suggestion that their compliance with SB 410 and AB 50 could be delayed if the Commission allows it.

While we agree with CASMU that the energization targets required by SB 410 and AB 50 may have been primarily targeted to the larger California IOUs, it is reasonable to require BVES, Liberty, and PacifiCorp to begin steps that would align their energization timelines and reporting ability with directives adopted in this decision. Given the CASMU parties' staffing at this point, however, the CASMU parties are not required to align with the requirements adopted in this decision at this time, and we will address the compliance deadlines for BVES, Liberty, and PacifiCorp in Phase 2 of R.24-01-018.

16. 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.

As of September 9, 2024, there have been three public comments filed on the Docket Card for this proceeding. The first comment requests "no more rate hikes," and the second underscores the importance of energization targets to ensure EV charging infrastructure may be deployed in a timely manner. The third supports the directives in the proposed decision as a mechanism to accelerate energization projects in Ontario, California.

[125] CASMU Opening Comments on R.24-01-018 at 8, footnotes 8-11, describe multiple instances where the Commission granted small and multijurisdictional utilities more flexible timelines or requirements to meet the deadlines and targets set for the large IOUs.

17. Conclusion

This decision implements the near-term statutory provisions of SB 410 and AB 50 within the timeframe allocated by the California State Legislature. These adopted energization targets and data reporting requirements aim to accelerate energization activities, increase transparency for stakeholders, and improve the process of reporting delays to the Commission. These are important steps as California continues its path to decarbonization. The reporting requirements outlined in the body of this decision, as well as the appendices will provide necessary information on the time it takes to complete energization projects throughout PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E service territories, and can serve as models for other states embarking on statewide energization goals.

Phase 2 of this proceeding will continue work on timelines, discuss compliance and enforcement, and tackle other issues not contemplated in Phase 1. The Commission appreciates the wide participation from parties, with representatives from transportation, housing, telecommunications, and environmental organizations, and looks forward to continued participation in the next phase of this proceeding.

18. Procedural Matters

This decision affirms all rulings made by the assigned ALJs and assigned Commissioner in Phase 1 of this proceeding. All motions related to Phase 1 issues that are not ruled on are deemed denied.

19. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of President Alice Reynolds in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Pub. Util. Code § 311 and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and

Procedure.[126] Comments were filed on August, 29, 2024, by Advanced Energy United, Alliance for Automotive Innovation, Bay Area Housing Coalition, California Broadband & Video Association, California Community Choice Association, California Solar & Storage Association, CALSTART, Clean Coalition, CUE, Crown Castle, CTIA, ExteNet, Industry Coalition, Interstate Renewable Council, Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition, NRDC and EDF, PG&E, PACT, SCE, SDG&E, Silicon Valley Clean Energy, Small IOUs, Solar Energy Industries Association, Tesla, Vehicle-Grid Integration Council. . Reply comments were filed on September 4, 2024, by EDF and NRDC, Cal Advocates, Cal.net, California Broadband and Video Association, California Community Choice Association, California Solar & Storage Association, Clean Coalition, CUE, PG&E, Pilot Travel Centers, PACT, San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association, SCE, SDG&E and the Interstate Renewable Energy Council.

Comments have been incorporated throughout the proposed decision to improve clarity. We touch on some specific changes here for ease:

Comments have been incorporated to improve reporting procedures for customers (Section 11, Customer Reporting Procedures for Delays in Providing New or Upgraded Electric Service Requests) and some edits have been made to Appendix C to this decision, Energization Delay Reporting Form, to incorporate those improvements. Comments regarding the updating or acceleration of energization timelines have been incorporated in Section 13, Timing of Compliance with Energization Targets, and Section 14, Enforcement of

[126] Pursuant to Rule 14.3(b), opening comments on the proposed decision are limited to 15 pages. Reply comments on the proposed decision are limited to 5 pages, pursuant to Rule 14.3(d).

Energization Targets. As discussed in Section 13, above, CALSTART, CalCCA, IREC, and EDF/NRDC all request a working group be established in or before Phase 2 of this proceeding. The Assigned Commissioner will consider this request during a prehearing conference and scoping ruling for Phase 2 matters.

20. Assignment of Proceeding

Alice Reynolds is the assigned Commissioner and Carolyn Sisto and Sasha Goldberg are the assigned Administrative Law Judges to this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. All data used to develop the average and maximum targets energization targets described in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, was reported to the service list of this proceeding by the large electric IOUs. The data reported by the large electric IOUs reflects the time it has recently taken for each large electric IOU to complete new or upgraded service requests. The Commission analyzed this data and developed assumptions to align the reported data across the large electric IOUs to develop statewide energization targets, as discussed further in Appendix A of this decision, Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report.

2. The average statewide energization targets for the large electric IOUs adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, provide customers and the Commission with more certainty about the time the large electric IOUs currently take to complete the steps of the energization processes that are fully within the large electric IOUs' control and will shorten the average time the large electric IOUs take to complete the steps of the energization processes that are fully within the large electric IOUs' control by at least five percent.

3. The maximum statewide energization targets adopted in this decision will shorten the longest amount of time the large electric IOUs may take to complete

the steps of the energization processes that are fully within the large electric IOUs' control by five percent.

4. The data collected through the requirements adopted in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements can improve the Commission's ability to identify the appropriate amount of future acceleration of the large electric IOUs' energization target(s) in Phase 2 of this proceeding.

5. Observations of the data reported in this proceeding's record indicate there is not a normal distribution of energization timelines, due to a high variability in the different types of energization project requests the large electric IOUs receive and complete. There may be a more even distribution of timelines at the project-type level.

6. The data provided by the large electric IOUs in this proceeding did not specify project types.

7. Data provided by the large electric IOU was used to develop average and maximum targets for completion of customers' new or upgraded electric service project requests that fall under the tariffs of Electric Rule 15, Electric Rule 16, Electric Rules 15/16 combined, Electric Rule 29 (PG&E and SCE), and Electric Rule 45 (SDG&E).

8. The analyses and assumptions used to develop the energization targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, are provided in Appendix A of this decision, Statewide Energization Timeline Analyses Report.

9. The data analyzed to establish the Energization Targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision indicate that the maximum statewide targets could be met for up to 95 percent of the projects seeking new or upgraded electric service.

10. It is reasonable to require each large electric IOU to communicate with any customer that requests a new or upgraded service connection within

10 business days of receiving the customer's request to accelerate the Customer Intake step identified in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets.

11. The record indicates that the utility work necessary to complete a main panel upgrade (defined as upgrades that do not require that the IOU perform in front of the meter upgrades such as an upgrade to the service line) can reasonably be completed within an average of 30 days and a maximum of 45 days, which is consistent with the directives of Pub. Util. Code § 934(a)(1).

12. Larger, more complicated, projects that require upstream capacity upgrades may warrant differing energization targets to account for variances between the large IOUs' service territories.

13. The data on the record of this proceeding, as analyzed in Appendix A of this decision, Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report, is not sufficient to establish varying energization targets across the different large electric IOUs' service territories because not all of the large electric IOUs provided responses to all of the data requested in the March 21, 2024, ALJ Ruling.

14. The types of projects necessary for the large electric IOUs to complete an energization service request, such as new or upgraded electric service lines and main panel upgrades, can be streamlined with a statewide target.

15. The average targets for new or upgraded electric service requests adopted in this decision are based on the approximate average project timelines, as reported by the large electric investor-owned utilities and further described in Appendix A of this decision, Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report.

16. The maximum targets for the large electric IOUs to complete new or upgraded electric service requests adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, are based on the average plus one standard deviation. The data analyzed, and assumptions used, to develop the average and maximum

targets for the large electric IOUs to complete new or upgraded service requests adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization, are further described in Appendix A of this decision, Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report.

17. Establishing an energization target for the large electric IOUs to complete requests upgrades that do not require service line upgrades is required under Pub. Util. Code § 934(a)(1).

18. Upstream capacity projects have various timelines and setting an average or maximum timeline in this decision may not accelerate any projects that require upstream capacity upgrades.

19. The start date of an energization request begins on the date the customer's application is deemed complete and the energization request ends when the customer's new or upgraded service request is energized.

20. If a customer expands or changes the scope of its project, the start date of the energization request could change.

21. More data is necessary to understand the energization timelines in ESJ communities.

22. The data collected pursuant to Section 10 of this proceeding, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, will include specific information about energization requests within ESJ communities to inform whether additional data should be collected for specific communities.

23. Requiring the large electric IOUs to track data to align with the ESJ Action Plan will enable the Commission to assess equity issues raised by the energization targets by providing information about the large electric IOUs' timelines for completing energization requests in ESJ communities.

24. While we are currently excluding steps outside the large electric IOUs control in the energization targets and timelines established in this proceeding

from the timeline targets, we still find value in tracking the time necessary for non-utility processes to be completed.

25. Adopting average and maximum targets for the overall energization processes within direct control of each large electric IOU, as described in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, meets the requirements Pub. Util. Code § 934.

26. Pub. Util. Code § 937 authorizes the electric IOUs to seek incremental funding by filing an application with the Commission requesting to implement a ratemaking mechanism to track and seek recovery of costs that may accrue when complying with the Commission's directives to comply with SB 410 and AB 50.

27. Collecting and analyzing data regarding the large electric IOU's compliance with the targets established in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, is critical to the Commission's ability to support the energization processes.

28. Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(b) requires each large electric IOU that energized less than 35 percent of customers with completed applications in a timeframe that exceeds 12 months to submit a report to the Commission, on or before December 1, 2024, demonstrating that each large electric IOU has energized 80 percent of customers with applications deemed complete as of January 31, 2023.

29. Consistent with the reporting requirements in AB 50 and SB 410, the Customer Energization Delay Reporting Form adopted in Appendix C of this decision provides customers with the ability to report energization delays directly to the Commission's Energy Division.

30. The directives established in Section 12 of this decision, Improved Customer Outreach, can help the Commission and the large electric IOUs meet

the requirements established in AB 50 and SB 410 related to improved communication between the large electric IOUs and the customers seeking new or upgraded service.

31. The large electric IOUs' customer engagement and communication plans, as described in Section 12 of this decision, Improved Customer Outreach, will improve customer outreach, and inform the large electric IOUs' recruiting, training, and retaining programs for employees needed to promptly respond to customer energization requests, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 932(a)(9).

32. Pub. Util. Code § 937 authorizes the large electric IOUs to file applications with the Commission seeking approval of a ratemaking mechanism to track and seek recovery of costs associated with implementing SB 410.

33. Consistent with Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(2)(B) it is reasonable to direct the large electric IOUs to develop a data reporting template consistent with the steps outlined in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, and Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements.

34. Public comments can improve the biannual data reporting template as required in in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, and Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements. Public comments may identify potential revisions to the proposed data reporting template before the large electric IOUs' initial biannual energization reports are filed.

35. Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 939, the Commission may defer compliance with the energization targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Electrification Targets, and Section 8 of this decision, Upstream Capacity Upgrade Targets, for

electric corporations operating in California that have fewer than 100,000 service connections.

36. It is reasonable for BVES, Liberty, and PacifiCorp to begin preparing to align with the energization targets established in this decision in the near future.

Conclusions of Law

1. The statewide energization targets adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, should improve the Commission's ability to identify the appropriate acceleration target(s) in Phase 2 of this proceeding because they establish targets for the Electric Rule tariff-based energization processes identified in this proceeding.

2. Pub. Util. Code § 453 prohibits the large electric IOUs from engaging in discriminatory practices when providing electric services.

3. Given the lack of data provided by the large electric IOUs, it is not reasonable to adopt a specific prioritization method or manner in this decision.

4. The targets established today meet the requirements of SB 410 and AB 50, set customer expectations for energization timelines, and should be achievable with the large electric IOUs' existing resources.

5. Incorporating feedback from parties and Energy Division staff on the energization target reporting template proposed by the large electric IOUs will ensure the template tracks the necessary data.

6. The energization target reporting template directed in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, can incorporate party feedback before the large electric IOUs file their first biannual energization reports.

7. To comply with Pub. Util. Code § 933.5(a)(3), the Commission's Energy Division should host a public workshop within 90 days of the submission of the large electric IOUs' initial biannual data, due March 31, 2025, to the Commission.

8. It is reasonable to direct the large electric IOUs to use ratepayer funding to improve Energy Division's ability to analyze, collect, track, and report IOU data to the public.

9. This decision does not authorize any ratemaking mechanisms for the large electric IOUs.

10. Commission staff should be authorized to modify or update the final energization target data reporting template developed by the large electric IOUs if staff discovers the data reported does not fulfill the statutory requirements, but no sooner than the first full year of biannual data collection is complete in September 2025.

11. Amendments to the required data fields adopted in Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements, shall be proposed through an Energy Division resolution and will require full Commission approval before changes to the template take effect.

12. To meet requirements established in AB 50 and SB 410, the communication between the large electric IOUs and the customers seeking new or upgraded service should meet the requirements established in Section 12 of this decision, Improved Customer Outreach, and Appendix C of this decision Draft Customer Energization Delay Reporting Form.

13. The customer engagement and communication plans proposed in the large electric IOUs' Tier 1 Advice letters, as described in Section 12 of this decision, Customer Outreach, should be used to improve customer outreach and to inform the large electric IOUs' recruiting, training, and retaining programs for

employees needed to promptly respond to customer energization requests, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 932(a)(9).

14. The maximum exceedance limit that will ensure no more than five percent of the large electric IOUs' energization projects will exceed the maximum statewide target adopted in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets aligns with the data analyzed in Appendix A of this decision, Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report.

15. Consistent with Pub. Util. Code § 939, the Commission should not require electrical corporations with 100,000 or fewer electric service connections in California to comply with the directives adopted in this decision at this time.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The statewide large investor-owned utility energization targets established for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) (the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs)) as described in Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets, are adopted.

   (a) The large electric IOUs shall provide all customers with written notice of approval or rejection of their application within an average of 10 business days and a maximum of 45 business days.

   (b) The energization steps each large electric IOU must take to complete an Electric Rule 15, Electric Rule 16, combined Electric Rule 15/16, Electric Rule 29 (PG&E and SCE),Electric Rule 45 (SDG&E), or combined Electric

Rule 15 and Electric Rule 29/45 energization request shall take no longer than 125 days, on average.

(c) No more than five percent of customer requests for new or upgraded electric service that falls within the energization steps each large electric IOU must take to complete an Electric Rule 15 energization request shall exceed 357 calendar days (325 business days).

(d) No more than five percent of customer requests for new or upgraded electric service that falls within the energization steps each large electric IOU must take to complete an Electric Rule 16 energization requests shall exceed 335 calendar days (290 business days).

(e) No more than five percent of customer requests for new or upgraded electric service that falls within the energization steps each large electric IOU must take to complete a combined Electric Rule 15/16 energization request shall exceed 306 calendar days (310 business days).

(f) No more than five percent of customer requests for new or upgraded electric service that falls within the energization steps each large electric IOU must take to complete an Electric Rule 29 (PG&E and SCE) or Electric Rule 45 (SDG&E) energization request shall exceed 335 calendar days (290 business days).

(g) If a customer's application for new or upgraded electric service is denied, the large electric IOU must provide the

customer a list of the reason(s) for the denial, what the customer could do to resolve the issue(s) and provide a list of large electric IOU resources the customer can utilize to ensure their application is complete prior to refiling.

2. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOU)) shall complete all work within the control of the large electric IOU that is necessary to implement a main panel upgrade within an average of 30 business days and a maximum of 45 business days. If any large electric IOU cannot complete the main panel upgrade within the maximum of 45 business days, it must provide the customer with information about the cause of the delay and any steps a customer can take to complete its request, based on the Customer Energization Delay Reporting form adopted in Appendix C of this decision.

3. Consistent with Section 8, Statewide Maximum Timelines for Upstream Capacity Upgrades, of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs)) shall collect and report data to reflect the number of energization projects for which an upstream capacity upgrade is identified; the number of times an energization project is delayed or cancelled due to an identified upstream capacity upgrade; and the timeline between the date the upstream capacity project is initiated and the date for energization of the requested project(s). The large electric IOUs shall apply the proposed upstream distribution capacity project steps identified in Section 8 of this decision, Statewide Maximum Timelines for Upstream, and record and report the time taken for each step in each project type, by providing all data identified in

Appendix B, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements, as adopted in this decision.

4. Consistent with Section 8, Statewide Maximum Timelines for Upstream Capacity Upgrades, of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs)), shall pause the energization target timelines adopted in Section 7, Energization Targets, of this decision, once a customer has been notified that its tariff-based energization request triggers and upstream capacity upgrade. After the upstream capacity upgrade is complete, the large electric IOUs shall reinstate work to complete the energization request in compliance with Section 7 of this decision, Energization Targets.

5. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company must comply with the data reporting requirements set forth in Section 10, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, and Appendix B, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements, as adopted in this decision.

6. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company must submit a Tier 1 Advice Letter no later than 60 days after the issuance of this decision that proposes a consolidated reporting template to track the data requirements listed in Section 10, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, and Appendix B, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements, as adopted in this decision.

7. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company must track the time between completion of each step that is fully with the large electric investor-owned utility's (IOU's) control, how long it takes to complete steps that are not fully within the large

IOU's control, and when the next large electric IOU-controllable step(s) can begin, once the work the IOU does not have full control over is complete.

8. No later than December 1, 2024, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company must file individual reports to the California Public Utilities Commission demonstrating that each large electric investor-owned utility has energized at least 80 percent of customers with applications deemed complete as of January 31, 2023, pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 933.5(b).

9. Commission staff are authorized to amend the template developed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Electric Company, no sooner than September 30, 2025, if modifications are necessary to improve data collection that would support accelerated energization processes. The template amendments shall be provided through an Energy Division Resolution and shall require the full Commission's approval prior to taking effect.

10. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall ensure the data collection template proposed pursuant to Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, and Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements, aligns with the goals of the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan.

11. The proposed data collection template directed in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, and Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Requirements, shall provide clear descriptions of the strategies Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company (the large electric

investor-owned utilities (IOU)) will employ to engage local and tribal governments to ensure their energization processes are clear to all customers.

12. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company (the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOU)) must jointly file and serve the proposed data template, as required in Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements, via a Tier 1 Advice Letter on the service list for Rulemaking (R.) 24-01-018 no later than 60 days after the issuance of this decision. The large electric IOUs shall incorporate any comments from the Commission's Energy Division and parties to this proceeding to refine the template as needed. The reporting template shall include the full list of data required to be collected as provided in Appendix B, Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements. The large electric IOUs must submit the final template with recorded data in their first biannual energization report no later than March 31, 2025.

13. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall provide information about energization projects that trigger, are delayed by, or are cancelled due to an identified upstream capacity upgrade in their biannual reports filed pursuant to Section 10 of this decision, Biannual Energization Reporting Requirements.

14. Within 90 days of receiving the first biannual data reports from Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs)), the Commission shall host a public workshop to discuss the large electric IOUs' data submissions and consider parties' suggestions for potential revisions to the adopted energization data reporting requirements.

15. Within 60 days of the date of issuance of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs)) shall each submit a Tier 1 Advice Letter proposing a customer-engagement and communication plan consistent with the requirements outlined in Section 11, Customer Reporting Procedures, and Appendix C, Draft Customer Energization Delay Reporting Form, as adopted in this decision.

(a) The large electric IOUs' plan must describe what existing customer communication systems can be utilized to provide customers that file energization applications with more detailed information about the energization process and the timing of their requests.

(b) The large electric IOUs must ensure all energization-related collateral and customer outreach efforts are developed in multiple languages for the communities within their service territories.

16. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs)), must jointly fund $1 million per year over five years, for a total of $5 million dollars, to support the improvement of the California Public Utilities Commission's Energy Division's ability to analyze, collect, track and report the large electric IOUs' data to the public. The respective annual share of this fund from each large electric IOU shall be based off its respective percentage of California-jurisdictional electric revenues as of the issuance date of this decision.

17. The California Public Utilities Commission's Energy Division is authorized to make any necessary updates to the biannual energization target reporting template upon review of the initial reports from Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company (the large electric IOUs), if, following the workshop described in Ordering Paragraph 13 and the analysis of two biannual report from the large electric IOUs, Commission staff determines that changes are necessary to improve data collection prior to the next decision in this proceeding. The reporting template shall not be updated before September 30, 2025.

18. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall each file and serve biannual energization reports to the California Public Utilities Commission every six months to demonstrate compliance with the statewide targets outlined in Section 7, Energization Targets, of this decision, with the first biannual energization data report filed and served to the service list of Rulemaking 24-01-018 by March 31, 2025, and the second by September 30, 2025.

19. The biannual energization reports required in Ordering Paragraph 17 must reflect data for all customer energization requests submitted as of January 31, 2023, to the best of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison (the large electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs)) abilities, and meet the requirements adopted in Appendix B of this decision, Energization Target Reporting Requirements, for projects that are fully submitted after the issuance of this decision. The biannual energization reports required in Ordering Paragraph 17 shall be posted on the Commission's Energization website, for the purposes of improving Commission, customer, and

party insight into energization delays occurring in the large electric IOU service territories.

20. Rulemaking 24-01-018 remains open.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at Sacramento, California.

APPENDIX A

Statewide Energization Timelines Analyses Report

APPENDIX B
Energization Target Reporting Template Requirements

APPENDIX C

Customer Energization Delay Reporting Form

APPENDIX D
List of Acronyms