

**BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE SAFETY
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety
Natural Resources Agency

**COMMENTS OF THE GREEN POWER INSTITUTE
ON THE POLICY DIVISION PROCESS GUIDELINES**

February 6, 2025

Gregory Morris, Director
Zoe Harrold, Scientist
The Green Power Institute
a program of the Pacific Institute
2039 Shattuck Ave., Suite 402
Berkeley, CA 94704
ph: (510) 644-2700
fax: (510) 644-1117
gmorris@emf.net

COMMENTS OF THE GREEN POWER INSTITUTE ON THE POLICY DIVISION PROCESS GUIDELINES

The Green Power Institute (GPI), the renewable energy program of the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security, provides these *Comments of the Green Power Institute on the Policy Division Process Guidelines*.

The staggered release of the Draft WMP Guidelines - Package 1, followed by the Revised Draft WMP Guidelines – Package 1 (limited to comments on redlined changes), the Draft Energy Safety Policy Division Process Guidelines, the Draft Data Guidelines, the 2026-2028 WMP Schedule, and the yet to be issued Maturity Survey documents has created some assessment challenges. Critical information has been moved and removed between documents, and its disjointed presentation is creating holistic review challenges. For example, with the only recently issued WMP cycle schedule it remains to be seen how much time stakeholders will be afforded for Base WMP review in 2025, which affects the need assessment and argumentation we are able to make regarding access to Pre-submission WMPs. Within these limitations, we provide the following recommendations:

- Minor Revisions
- [Section 4.4 Workshops] Standardize advanced notice requirements and the recording of all public workshops, and commit to making the recordings and materials publicly available.
- [Section 6 Data Requests from Stakeholders] Clarify and revise the instructions, deadlines, and intentions of the Data Request Stakeholder Designation request process.
- Provide a schedule for 2026-2028 WMP filings in the Process Guidelines.

Minor Revisions to Revised Draft WMP Guidelines Package 1 Redline

Page No. Draft ESPD Process Guidelines	Issue - Revision
p. 3	<p>Section 4.3 Submitting Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The following GPI recommended additions (underlined) and deletions (strikethrough) improve clarity and align process guidelines with the guidelines issued in the OEIS cover letters for both the Draft Process Guidelines and Draft WMP Guidelines: <p>Comments submitted through e-filing from an electrical corporation or stakeholder must include the person or entity’s name followed by “Opening Comments” or “Reply Comments” and then the relevant abbreviations set forth in Table 1 in Section 8.1. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>Document title:</u> <u>[Commenter Name]</u> Opening comments on the initial version of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) 2023-2025 Base WMP Submission: <u>Filename:</u> “ORGNAME[CommenterName]_OpeningComments_PGE_2023-2025_Base-WMP_R0.”²² o <u>Document title:</u> <u>[Commenter Name]</u> Reply comments on the initial version of San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) 2023 Executive Compensation Structure Submission: <u>Filename:</u> “ORGNAME[CommenterName]_ReplyComments_SDGE_2023_ECS S_R0”²²
As applicable	Update “2023-2025 WMP” to “2026-2208 WMP” throughout the document.

[Section 4.4 Workshops] Standardize advanced notice requirements and the recording of all public workshops, and commit to making the recordings and materials publicly available.

Restore the statement that “Notice of workshops will be posted to the relevant year’s WMP docket and on Energy Safety’s website, www.energysafety.ca.gov. Energy Safety will issue written notice of the workshop at least 10 days prior to the workshop. Workshop notices will include information on the workshop topic, date, location, format, etc.”¹ It is customary and necessary to provide advanced notice of workshops allowing stakeholders, electrical corporations, and the public to rearrange scheduling conflicts and to prepare materials and questions, ensuring that workshops offer maximum benefit to all participants, especially given participant’s busy schedules and the cost of hosting such events.

To date public workshops that address WMP topics have been recorded and made publicly available online. GPI supports this approach since it provides increased public transparency, public access (e.g. for members of the public who are unable to attend meetings during business hours), and can facilitate stakeholder and agency review by entering the workshop contents into the public record. GPI recommends standardizing the recording of all public workshops and committing to making the recordings publicly available through the following revisions (additions are underlined):

4.4 Workshops

Energy Safety may hold public workshops on designated topics. All Energy Safety workshops and corresponding agendas will be noticed to the applicable docket and service lists. Public workshops and materials presented therein will be recorded and posted online for public access within 5 days of the workshop date.

[Section 6 Data Requests from Stakeholders] Clarify and revise the instructions, deadlines, and intentions of the Data Request Stakeholder Designation request process.

Section 6.1 Data Request Stakeholder Designation states:

A request for designation as a Data Request Stakeholder must include:

¹ 2023-2025_WMP_Process_Guidelines, p. 12

1. The docket matter (Docket #) the person or entity intends to participate in (e.g., #2023-2025-WMPs).²

Please clarify if stakeholders must file an “initial request for designation as a Data Request Stakeholder” to every OEIS docket they wish to make a data request in, or if they can file one designation request as a Data Request Stakeholder for the suite of dockets in the Case “Electrical: Wildfire Mitigation Plans (WMPs).” GPI prefers the latter option as this improves administrative efficiency for OEIS and stakeholders alike. We see no apparent benefit to filing designation requests to nearly every docket with the Case “Electrical: Wildfire Mitigation Plans (WMPs),” excepting any Data Response dockets.

Section 6.1 Data Request Stakeholder Designation states:

A request for designation as a Data Request Stakeholder must include:...

2. The position and interest of the person in the docket matter,
3. Disclosure of the persons or entities on whose behalf the person may be seeking the designation, if any,
4. The electrical corporations for which the person or entity seeks stakeholder status. This may include a request for all electrical corporations ...³

GPI recommends revising request requirement (2) to reflect that in many cases persons requesting data are doing so on behalf of their organizations and not necessarily their personal position or interest in a docket matter. We recommend the following revision (additions are underlined):

2. The position and interest of the entity or person in the docket matter,⁴

GPI interprets requirements (3) and (4) to request the same information but for “entities” versus “electrical corporations.” For example, in response to (3) Dr. Zoë Harrold would request status as a Data Request Stakeholder on behalf of the Green Power Institute. For requirement (4) GPI has no response, since it would not “seek stakeholder status” for “PG&E” since we are not a representative of PG&E. If this is the correct interpretation, requirement (4) is redundant to (3)

² Draft Energy Safety Policy Division Process Guidelines, p. 5.

³ Draft Energy Safety Policy Division Process Guidelines, p. 5.

⁴ Draft Energy Safety Policy Division Process Guidelines, p. 5.

and is not needed. “Entities” in requirement (3) is a general term that includes but is not limited to stakeholders, agencies, and electrical corporations. However, if requirement (4) is asking a stakeholders to request “Data Request Stakeholder” permissions to issue data requests to specific electrical corporation – then we especially recommend eliminating request requirement (4). For CPUC intervenors (e.g. GPI, MGRA) and employees (e.g. Cal Advocates), CPUC jurisdiction electrical corporations are in scope. The CPUC already regulates what is “in scope” for intervenors, which are only compensated for work that applies to CPUC-jurisdictional load serving entities or utilities. It is pointless, inappropriate, and inefficient to require a stakeholder to request data request permissions for specific electrical corporations or to purport that any approved Data Request Stakeholder should be limited to issuing data requests to specific electrical corporations. In either case, GPI recommends deleting requirement (4) for requesting designation as a Data Request Stakeholder.

Section 6.1 Data Request Stakeholder Designation states:

An initial request for designation as a Data Request Stakeholder can be submitted any time prior to a submission but must be submitted to the relevant docket no later than five business days following a submission deadline from an electrical corporation.⁵

Clarify if this statement is intended to create a cutoff date for when Data Request Stakeholder Designations can be requested for a given docket. The term “submission” in the phrase “any time prior to a submission,” used alone in this context means any submission by any entity. We interpret this to mean that any time beginning from the opening of a new Docket to before the last document is filed prior to the Docket closing, qualifies as “any time prior to a submission.” Meaning that even if it is 6 days after a “submission deadline from an electrical corporation” is it also “any time prior to a [new] submission.”

We suspect that OEIS is attempting to create a Data Request Stakeholder Designation cutoff while offering a “good faith” “loophole” at the end of Section 6.1. GPI does not support this approach. We recommend against this since the WMP could benefit from an as yet unidentified and unrepresented entity that could in turn benefit from becoming a Data Request Stakeholder.

⁵ Draft Energy Safety Policy Division Process Guidelines, p. 5.

There is no clear reason offered to reasonably eliminate qualified entities or individuals from becoming Data Request Stakeholders due to a deadline unless OEIS is seeking to prevent qualified input on the WMP development and review. The CPUC has a formal Request for Party Status process available over the duration of an open proceeding and requests are approved or denied in a ruling, often issued via email to the proceeding listserv and documented on the Docket.⁶ Given (1) the current very small number of WMP stakeholders (i.e. Cal Advocates, GPI, and MGRA), the WMP should not arbitrarily and/or preemptively eliminate other potential qualified contributors;⁷ and (2) The OEIS has already established that it will make the final determination of whether any Data Request Stakeholder Designation is awarded, whether before the deadline or after based on “good faith,” which allows for a form of “gate-keeping” under all circumstances. It seems against the best interest of OEIS to create arbitrary barriers to stakeholder engagement in the 2026-2028 WMP cycle and it does not comport with the value and purpose of public stakeholder engagement.

If the OEIS retains a Docket or Case specific Data Request Stakeholder Designation request deadline, please clarify the Data Request Stakeholder Designation request cutoff date in both the Process Guidelines and include a specific date for every Docket, or for the entire Case, in the anticipated WMP schedule.

Provide a schedule for 2026-2028 WMP filings in the Process Guidelines.

Updated footnotes in Draft WMP Guidelines Package 1 state “See Energy Safety Policy Division Process Guidelines for additional information regarding submission schedules.”^{E.g.8} Add a 2026-2028 WMP schedule that includes deadlines for Data Request Stakeholders requests for each Docket in the Case “Electrical: Wildfire Mitigation Plans (WMPs).” Alternatively, provide the schedule in a separate public document and update the WMP Guideline footnotes.

⁶ For example, see <https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=555977650>, and 2/4/2025 Docket entry <https://apps.cpuc.ca.gov/apex/f?p=401:57:.....>

⁷ Note that the IRP proceeding currently has at least 29 active parties, See CPUC Docket for R.20-05-003.

⁸ Revised Draft WMP Guidelines Package 1, Redline, p. 3

Conclusion

We urge the OEIS to adopt our recommendations herein.

Dated February 6, 2025.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Gregory Morris", is positioned above a horizontal line.

Gregory Morris, Director
The Green Power Institute
a program of the Pacific Institute
2039 Shattuck Ave., Suite 402
Berkeley, CA 94704
ph: (510) 644-2700
e-mail: gmorris@emf.net