

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

Rulemaking 23-05-018
(Filed May 18, 2023)

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION
ON PROPOSED DECISION ADDRESSING PHASE 1 ISSUES**

Roger E. Collanton
General Counsel
Anthony Ivancovich
Deputy General Counsel
Sarah E. Kozal
Counsel
California Independent System
Operator Corporation
250 Outcropping Way
Folsom, CA 95630
Tel.: (916) 956-8838
Fax: (916) 608-7222
skozal@caiso.com

Attorneys for the California Independent
System Operator Corporation

Dated: November 20, 2023

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

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

Rulemaking 23-05-018
(Filed May 18, 2023)

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION
ON PROPOSED DECISION ADDRESSING PHASE 1 ISSUES**

I. Introduction

The California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) submits reply comments on the October 26, 2023 *Proposed Decision Addressing Phase 1 Issues* (Proposed Decision) in this proceeding.

II. Discussion

The CAISO’s Opening Comments offered support for the Proposed Decision in incorporating language to operationalize the requirements of Senate Bill (SB) 529 into General Order 131-D (GO 131-D). While the CAISO believes that the language reflects the intent of SB 529, the CAISO offers these Reply Comments to agree with the important revisions suggested by the investor-owned utilities and the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) to avoid ambiguity.

Southern California Edison (SCE), Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), and San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) offer proposed revisions to remove a caveat that in order for the processes authorized by SB 529 to apply, a transmission facility must have been previously “authorized.”¹ The CAISO agrees that this caveat is not included in or required by the SB 529 language and creates the potential for ambiguity around what “authorized” refers to. With the initial adoption of GO 131, and subsequent revisions to the general order, which specific facilities historically required “authorization” from the Commission at time of construction may be difficult to trace.

¹ PG&E Opening Comments at 4; SCE Opening Comments at 6; SDG&E Opening Comments at 2.

It may be the case that an existing transmission facility was constructed prior to the need for any authorization from the Commission, and thus with the Commission's proposed language could be interpreted as not falling under the exemption created by SB 529.

EDF similarly offers a clarification to utilize a parenthetical rather than the proposed commas around the clause identifying some, but not all, types of electrical transmission facilities that may be streamlined.² The CAISO agrees this revision is more consistent with SB 529 and provides clarity that there is no limitation on the location of such projects.

III. Conclusion

The CAISO appreciates the opportunity to provide reply comments on the Proposed Decision.

Respectfully submitted

By: /s/ Sarah E. Kozal

Roger E. Collanton

General Counsel

Anthony Ivancovich

Deputy General Counsel

Sarah E. Kozal

Counsel

California Independent System

Operator Corporation

250 Outcropping Way

Folsom, CA 95630

Tel.: (916) 956-8838

Fax: (916) 608-7222

skozal@caiso.com

Attorneys for the California Independent
System Operator Corporation

Dated: November 20, 2023

² EDF Opening Comments at 4-5.