



Proposal for Further Prioritizing Energy Proceedings



Cynthia Walker/Maryam Ebke

June 24, 2015



Overview

- Discuss the purpose of the proposal.
- Provide some background on what we did and why
- Solicit feedback on criteria, rating process, and suggested next steps.



Purpose of Proposal

- Identify the proceedings that have high priority and have additional importance or urgency.
- Engage the Commissioners in an exercise to rank proceedings based on agreed-upon criteria.
- Report to oversight agencies on process and outcome.
- Use the list to guide the work in ALJ and Energy Divisions.



What Were the Steps?

- Identified current system to prioritize IT projects and modified for proceedings.
- Developed 7 criteria with ratings of “0”, “1” and “2” to assign to each proceeding.
- Defined the criteria.
- Ranked 31 proceedings.



Criteria and Ratings

Criteria for Determining Priority	Low Priority (0)	Priority Energy Work (1)	Critical Priority Energy Work (2)
Safety	No safety impact	Proceeding addresses some aspect of safety policy	Must be completed to address direct safety concern
Statutory or Other Mandate	No mandate	Legislative mandate exists	Legislative mandate with active proponents to complete
Legislative Deadline	No deadline	Mandate with deadline	Mandate with deadline of 1 year or less
Foundational Policy Proceeding	No foundational issues or questions to answer	Would facilitate, help or inform decision-making in another proceeding	Needs to be completed before other critical proceeding can be initiated/resolved
Rate and or service Impact	No rate/service impact	Some rate/service impact	Rate/service impacts are central to proceeding scope
Assigned Commissioner's Priority	Not a priority for the Assigned Commissioner	A priority for the Assigned Commissioner	A high priority for Assigned Commissioner
Risk of Delay	Can be delayed reasonably	Some delay is possible	Delay will negatively impact other Comm business



Definitions of Proposed Criteria

- **SAFETY:** Safety impacts on public, utility workers, and CPUC employees in their work, the environment and for utility infrastructure and systems
- **STATUTORY OR OTHER MANDATE:** Legislative requirement to perform work/complete proceeding.
- **LEGISLATIVE DEADLINE:** Required to complete a proceeding or implement a program by a date certain.
- **FOUNDATIONAL POLICY PROCEEDING:** A proceeding that is a prerequisite to other proceedings or program implementation. Will inform, guide or define direction in another proceeding (e.g., RPS procurement dependent upon RPS procurement plans being approved).
- **RATE IMPACT:** Resolves factual matters dealing with just and reasonable rates.
- **ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER PRIORITY:** A proceeding that deals with issue areas that are important to the assigned commissioner.
- **RISK OF DELAY:** Completion of some proceedings can be deferred with minimal impacts on overall state policies and goals while others cannot or should not be delayed.



Current Criteria for Prioritization of Proceedings

- Complying with and Enforcing the Law
- Furthering the Public Interest
- Addressing the Needs of Vulnerable Groups
- Considering the Dollars at Stake
- Considering the Number of People and Businesses Affected
- Placing Essential Services Ahead of Nonessential Services
- Focusing on Monopoly Activities



Results/Assessment

- 13 proceedings identified
- Ratings were in the “eye of the beholder”
- Commissioner priority criteria was difficult for staff to consider
- Some overlap with current priority criteria



Conclusions and Recommendations

- Weight the criteria
- Remove “Assigned Commissioner Priority” and replace with “Requires Coordination with Other Agencies”
- Allow Energy and ALJ Divisions to pilot the tool and share results with Commission offices
- Incorporate proceedings from other Industry Divisions