

Agenda for Prehearing Conference (PHC) In Rulemaking 13-11-006
April 29, 2014 - 10:00 am - CPUC Hearing Room

1. Introduction
2. Appearances and Service List
 - a. If your name is not on the service list, complete an appearance form.
 - b. Address pending motion (Communities for a Better Environment) for party status, and other appearance requests for “Parties” status (e.g. Utility Workers Union of America). (See Rule 1.4.)
3. Scope of Issues to be addressed in this proceeding.
 - a. Describe background of the development of this proceeding to date.
 - b. The following are the scope of issues to be covered in this proceeding.
 - (1) How can the Rate Case Plan (RCP) for the energy utilities be modified or updated to develop and incorporate a risk-based decision-making framework that places a priority on safety, reliability, and security concerns, along with the related revenue requirements to achieve those priorities at reasonable rates?
 - (2) Is the refined straw proposal an acceptable framework to adopt, or are there alternative proposals the CPUC should consider?
 - (3) Will the risk-based framework that is adopted provide the CPUC with the right tools for evaluating the safety and reliability issues that are in the rate case proceedings of the energy utilities?
 - (4) Should elements of the RCP be modified to promote more efficient and effective management of the rate case proceedings?
 - (5) Discuss at the PHC whether there are any other issues to include in the scope of this proceeding?
 - c. Parties have the opportunity to file comments on refined straw proposal, and to address possible alternatives, and related issues in comments.
 - (1) Address your position on the refined straw proposal, and any refinements to that proposal, in your **opening comments** in accordance with schedule. (File with the Docket Office and serve, and deliver print copy to Commissioner and ALJ.) Explain how the proposal fulfills the first three “scope of issues” in 3.b. of the agenda.
 - (2) If the refined straw proposal is not workable in your view, explain in your **opening comments** why that is so, and provide specifics of your alternative proposal. Explain how the alternative proposal fulfills the first three “scope of issues” in 3.b. of the agenda.
 - (3) Since OIR also addresses possible revisions to the Rate Case Plan (RCP), you may include in your **opening comments** proposals for revising various elements of the RCP, such as the following:
 - (a) Since risk assessment may involve looking at all of the gas operations and services of a gas utility, should PG&E’s gas distribution be addressed with PG&E’s gas transmission and storage proceeding?
 - (b) Refined straw proposal raises the issue of whether the Notice of Intent process is necessary or not.
 - (c) Should the rate cycle be changed from a three-year to a four-year cycle?

- (d) If the refined straw proposal is adopted, will there be sufficient time in the RCP to separately address the S-MAP (safety model assessment proceeding), and the RAMP (risk assessment and mitigation phase) of the general rate cases, and the time needed between the two proceedings?
 - (4) Your **opening comments** may also want to address the following related issues:
 - (a) Whether the proposed reporting requirement in the refined straw proposal overlap or duplicates other reporting requirements, such as PU Code Section 958.5 (and applicable decisions) gas safety reports, GO 118-E reports, or other reports. If so, identify the other reports, describe the similarities and differences between the two reporting requirements, and your recommendations to avoid overlap or duplication of reports. If other reporting requirements complement what this OIR is trying to achieve, how can those other reporting requirements be adapted to assist in that effort?
 - (b) Are there any particular code sections or decisions that the decision should take into account in resolving this proceeding?
 - (c) If the S-MAP process is adopted by the CPUC, should there be workshops before the S-MAP proceeding is underway so that the utilities and other parties have an understanding of what is to be presented and discussed in the S-MAP proceeding?
 - (d) Is the S-MAP process capable of developing common risk assessment elements that each utility's model should have, or because of the differences between the gas and electric utilities, and among each utility, will there always be different risk assessment models for each utility?
 - (e) For the S-MAP and RAMP process, do other parties see a need for CPUC staff (whether Safety and Enforcement Division or another division), and whether other parties depend on CPUC staff, to review the safety model(s), and to produce the report in the RAMP phase. (This raises the issues of whether: the CPUC staff needs to hire consultants; whether the Office of Ratepayer Advocates and other parties have sufficient resources to effectively participate in the review of the safety model(s) in the S-MAP proceeding, and during the RAMP phase; and should certain CPUC staff be a party to the proceedings.)
 - (5) Your **reply comments** should respond to opening comments, and not propose any new ideas or proposals.
- 4. Discuss procedural schedule.
 - a. Discuss filing dates for opening and reply comments on refined straw proposal and related issues.
 - b. Preliminary categorization as quasi-legislative, and whether evidentiary hearings are needed or not. (See Rules 1.3.(d) and 7.3.)
 - c. Scoping memo and ruling to issue.
 - 5. Any other issues to address?
 - 6. Adjournment