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ORDER ON INFORMATIONAL FILING

(Issued September 15, 2017)

1. In this order, we accept San Diego Gas & Electric Company’s (SDG&E)   
   fourth annual informational filing (Cycle 4) made under its Fourth Transmission Owner Formula Rate (TO4 or TO4 Formula Rate), effective January 1, 2017.[[1]](#footnote-2)

**I. Background**

1. SDG&E’s TO4 Formula Rate was determined as part of a settlement[[2]](#footnote-3) approved   
   by the Commission on May 27, 2014.[[3]](#footnote-4) The TO4 Settlement requires, among other things, that SDG&E submit annual informational filings to the Commission showing the base transmission revenue requirements in effect for the succeeding calendar year.[[4]](#footnote-5) In addition, any party to the TO4 Settlement may challenge the justness and reasonableness of SDG&E’s implementation of the TO4 Formula Rate, but not the formula itself.[[5]](#footnote-6)
2. On December 1, 2016, SDG&E filed its TO4 Cycle 4 formula rate, which includes a revised base transmission revenue requirement reflecting the following components: (1) prior year revenue requirement for the 12-month period ending December 31, 2015; (2) forecast capital addition revenue requirement for a 24-month period covering 2016 and 2017; (3) true-up of actual costs from January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015; and (4) interest true-up adjustment.[[6]](#footnote-7)
3. Under the TO4 Formula Rate, the Cycle 4 base transmission revenue requirement for wholesale customers of the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) is $700.7 million, which reflects a $94.8 million reduction from the Cycle 3 revenue requirement of $795.5 million.[[7]](#footnote-8) The Cycle 4 base transmission revenue requirement for retail end-use customers is $785.297 million, which reflects an   
   $85.955 million increase from the Cycle 3 revenue requirement of $699.342 million.[[8]](#footnote-9) SDG&E explains that the changes in transmission rates are due to various reasons,   
   such as a decrease in operation and maintenance and administrative and general expenses, an increase in Transmission Rate Base and depreciation expenses primarily   
   due to the completion of transmission projects, and the under-collection of $37 million from retail end-use customers and the over-collection of $47.2 million from wholesale customers.[[9]](#footnote-10) The Cycle 4 base transmission revenue requirement will remain in effect for the Rate Effective Period, which is January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017.[[10]](#footnote-11)

**II.** **Notice of Filings and Responsive Pleadings**

1. Notice of SDG&E’s TO4 Cycle 4 Filing was published in the Federal Register,   
   81 Fed. Reg. 88,674 (2016), with interventions and protests due on or before   
   December 22, 2016. Timely motions to intervene were filed by Southern California Edison Company, Six Cities CA,[[11]](#footnote-12) City of Santa Clara, California and the M-S-R Public Power Agency, Imperial Irrigation District, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), California Department of Water Resources State Water Project, Transmission Agency of Northern California, State Water Contractors, Modesto Irrigation District, and Trans Bay Cable LLC. On December 22, 2016, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) filed a notice of intervention and protest.
2. On January 6, 2017, SDG&E filed a Motion for Leave to Answer and Answer to the CPUC’s protest (SDG&E January 6 Answer). On January 24, 2017, the CPUC filed   
   a Motion for Leave to Answer and Answer to the SDG&E January 6 Answer (CPUC January 24 Answer). On January 30, 2017, SDG&E filed a Motion for Leave to Answer and Answer to the CPUC January 24 Answer (SDG&E January 30 Answer). On February 14, 2017, the CPUC filed a Motion for Leave to Answer and Answer to the SDG&E January 30 Answer (CPUC February 14 Answer). Finally, on February 28, 2017, SDG&E filed a Motion for Leave to Answer and Answer to the CPUC February 14 Answer (SDG&E February 28 Answer).
3. **CPUC’s Protest**
4. The CPUC requests that the Commission set the TO4 Cycle 4 filing for hearing, arguing that SDG&E’s proposed rates may be unjust and unreasonable.[[12]](#footnote-13) Specifically, the CPUC contends that SDG&E failed to adequately explain and justify the difference between its proposed retail and wholesale rates.[[13]](#footnote-14) The CPUC states that SDG&E seeks to recover approximately $785 million from its retail customers, which represents an increase of approximately $85 million over the prior year’s retail revenue requirement while crediting wholesale customers approximately $47 million, which results in a   
   10 percent decrease in the current unit rate from the prior year.[[14]](#footnote-15) The CPUC asserts   
   that SDG&E should be required to support its request.[[15]](#footnote-16)
5. The CPUC also argues that certain SDG&E capital additions may not be needed at this time. The CPUC explains that as part of the TO4 Settlement, SDG&E and the CPUC jointly select a reviewing engineer[[16]](#footnote-17) to conduct an engineering audit.[[17]](#footnote-18) The CPUC states that the reviewing engineer recommended that SDG&E proceed with sixteen projects, defer four projects, and recommended against one project.[[18]](#footnote-19) Based on the foregoing analysis, the CPUC contends that SDG&E should not pursue certain projects at this time and that the Commission should ascertain whether these projects are needed prior to obligating ratepayers to pay for them.[[19]](#footnote-20)
6. The CPUC next alleges that SDG&E is seeking to recover approximately   
   $300 million for projects in its 2017 rate base for which no stakeholder review was provided.[[20]](#footnote-21) The CPUC asserts that the Commission should require SDG&E to demonstrate that these projects and related costs are needed prior to including such costs in its rates.[[21]](#footnote-22) In support, the CPUC explains that the Commission issued the PJM Show Cause Order[[22]](#footnote-23) to determine whether PJM Transmission Owners were complying with their Order No. 890[[23]](#footnote-24) obligations and the preliminary evidence shows that stakeholders are not being provided with the opportunity to offer early and meaningful input and participation in the PJM transmission planning process.[[24]](#footnote-25)
7. **SDG&E January 6 Answer**
8. In its answer to the CPUC’s protest, SDG&E asserts that it adequately explained the basis for the cost differential between the wholesale and retail revenue requirements as part of the instant filing, including work papers which detail the retail and wholesale true-up calculations.[[25]](#footnote-26) In addition, SDG&E states that it discussed the wholesale and retail true-up revenue calculations along with the overall mechanics of how the wholesale and retail adjustments operate during two pre-filing technical conferences and related discovery during which CPUC representatives participated in the technical conferences.[[26]](#footnote-27) SDG&E argues that the CPUC fails to point to any error or inconsistency with cost inputs or calculations of the TO4 Cycle 4 formula, and thus the CPUC has failed to identify any specific basis for its objection.[[27]](#footnote-28)
9. In regard to the CPUC’s contention that, based on the engineering audit and the reviewing engineer’s recommendations, certain capital additions may not be needed at this time, SDG&E contends that each of these projects has been analyzed by the CAISO in an open and non-discriminatory Commission approved transmission planning process (TPP) in which the CPUC has an opportunity to participate.[[28]](#footnote-29) Of the projects disputed by the CPUC, SDG&E states that CAISO concluded that each project was needed as part of the entire Southern California bulk power system and that deferring these projects would have negative impacts on reliability for all CAISO ratepayers, not just SDG&E’s customers.[[29]](#footnote-30) SDG&E notes that nothing in the TO4 Settlement allows the CPUC to trump the reliability determinations of CAISO and SDG&E. Moreover, SDG&E argues that the CPUC should not be allowed to challenge the results of the TPP process given that the CPUC was free to participate in the process, but chose not to raise its concerns at the appropriate time.
10. SDG&E notes that the CPUC raised similar project specific concerns with SDG&E’s TO4 Cycle 3 filing which were addressed by the Commission in a 2016 order.[[30]](#footnote-31) Of the six projects highlighted in the engineering audit for deferral or termination, four of the six projects are outside the scope of the TO4 Cycle 4 filing, i.e., SDG&E is not seeking cost recovery of these projects in the instant filing.[[31]](#footnote-32) SDG&E argues that only two[[32]](#footnote-33) of the six projects in question are within the scope of this proceeding and that while the CPUC may challenge the reasonableness of the costs for the transmission projects that are within the scope of this TO4 Cycle 4 Filing, which it has not done, the CPUC is not permitted to challenge CAISO’s determination that the projects are needed to enhance grid reliability and meet mandatory reliability criteria.[[33]](#footnote-34)
11. Finally, with respect to the PJM Show Cause Order, SDG&E contends that the CPUC improperly conflates the CAISO TPP with the PJM transmission planning   
    process in arguing that the Commission should require SDG&E to demonstrate that the $300 million for projects for which no stakeholder review was provided are needed prior to including them in rate base.[[34]](#footnote-35) Contrary to the CPUC’s assertion, SDG&E argues that CAISO’s TPP clearly provides for stakeholder review, that the process is well-defined in CAISO’s Commission-approved Tariff, and the details are clearly outlined in CAISO’s relevant Business Practice Manual.[[35]](#footnote-36) SDG&E explains that CAISO’s annual TPP includes four meetings that are open to the public and are also available by webcast. SDG&E asserts that the meetings allow stakeholders to provide input on the annual study plan, review study results by CAISO and the participating transmission owners (PTOs), and comment on proposed transmission projects and the proposed annual transmission expansion plan before approval by CAISO’s board of governors.[[36]](#footnote-37) SDG&E notes that the stakeholder meetings are almost always held in Folsom, California. Thus, SDG&E argues that the CPUC’s suggestion that stakeholders are precluded from reviewing and providing timely input on projects during CAISO’s TPP is not credible.[[37]](#footnote-38) Therefore, SDG&E argues that the PJM Show Cause Order is irrelevant to this proceeding because the Commission has already determined that CAISO’s TPP is a fair and open regional transmission planning process.[[38]](#footnote-39)
12. **CPUC January 24 Answer**
13. The CPUC asserts that while SDG&E’s filing contains work papers and a wholesale true-up adjustment report, neither adequately explains the reasons why SDG&E had such a large adjustment resulting in a difference of $85 million between wholesale and retail rates.[[39]](#footnote-40) Additionally, the CPUC states that while SDG&E may have held technical conferences and responded to discovery, the CPUC argues that none of this information is part of the record and SDG&E has failed to meet its burden of proof.[[40]](#footnote-41)
14. According to the CPUC, the Commission recently affirmed in the PJM Show Cause Order that Order No. 890 requires transmission owners, like SDG&E, to conduct all of their transmission planning in accordance with certain principles, including transparency, access to data, and stakeholder involvement.[[41]](#footnote-42) The CPUC contends that while the CAISO TPP serves as an Order No. 890-compliant process for some of SDG&E’s projects, CAISO does not review all of SDG&E’s projects.[[42]](#footnote-43) The   
    CPUC asserts that the PJM Show Cause Order is clear that in regard to “supplemental” transmission planning, the PTO is responsible for ensuring that an Order No. 890-compliant process exists.[[43]](#footnote-44) Absent an Order No. 890-compliant process for the proposed $300 million in projects, the CPUC requests that the Commission require SDG&E to demonstrate that these projects and related costs are needed prior to including them in its 2017 rate base.[[44]](#footnote-45)
15. **SDG&E January 30 Answer**
16. With respect to the $300 million in projects for which no CAISO review has been undertaken, SDG&E asserts that the CPUC completely disregards that it has siting jurisdiction as embodied in CPUC General Order 131-D (General Order),[[45]](#footnote-46) and implementing decisions for the projects reflected in rate base.[[46]](#footnote-47) According to SDG&E, the General Order sets forth the levels of review, authorization and permitting requirements applicable to various types of projects which includes requiring a utility to file a certificate of public convenience and necessity, an application for permit to construct and an advice letter, contingent on the type of project.[[47]](#footnote-48) SDG&E notes that the CPUC determined in the General Order that certain types of projects or activities, including maintenance or compliance activities do not require pre-authorization and are exempt from such filing requirements.[[48]](#footnote-49) According to SDG&E, the CPUC’s complaint regarding the level of review or need determination for projects or activities established under the CPUC’s own siting authority is nothing more than a collateral attack on the CPUC’s General Order and implementing decisions.[[49]](#footnote-50)
17. **CPUC February 14 Answer**
18. The CPUC argues that SDG&E’s reliance on the General Order for its citing authority misrepresents the CPUC’s regulations.[[50]](#footnote-51) As an initial matter, the CPUC explains that its authority under the General Order does not, in any manner, either represent or supplant the need for an Order No. 890 transmission planning process. The CPUC states that the General Order process does not involve a need determination for transmission facilities except when the obligation to obtain a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity is initiated, which the CPUC alleges is not the case for the projects in question.[[51]](#footnote-52) Hence, the CPUC asserts that a CPUC process could not replace the need for SDG&E to have an Order No. 890-compliant process.[[52]](#footnote-53)
19. Finally, the CPUC states that it joined a consortium of California wholesale transmission customers to file a complaint against PG&E for violations of Order No. 890 resulting in PG&E’s self-approval of more than $2 billion in projects.[[53]](#footnote-54) The CPUC suggests it is possible that the SDG&E projects that have not undergone stakeholder review are similar to the types of projects addressed in the PG&E Complaint. Therefore, the CPUC requests that if the Commission declines to set the instant filing for hearing, that the Commission defer rendering any legal determinations regarding SDG&E’s compliance with Order No. 890 until it has considered and made a determination on the same issues raised in the PG&E Complaint.[[54]](#footnote-55)
20. **SDG&E February 28 Answer**
21. In response to the CPUC’s request to hold the proceeding in abeyance pending action on the PG&E Complaint, SDG&E argues that the TO4 Formula is its filed rate and expressly sets forth the showing a participant must demonstrate to challenge cost recovery in an annual rate filing, i.e., imprudence, incorrect calculation, or inconsistency with the TO4 Formula. SDG&E asserts that the CPUC’s request for deferral, pending Commission action in an unrelated proceeding, is not one of the enumerated bases for protesting this filing. Therefore, SDG&E contends that setting the matter for hearing or deferring this proceeding would violate the filed-rate doctrine.[[55]](#footnote-56) Moreover, SDG&E argues that deferring resolution of this rate proceeding indefinitely will undermine the formula rate goals of administrative efficiency and rate certainty. According to SDG&E, anticipating the timing and disposition of a Commission ruling on the PG&E Complaint is entirely speculative, and it is entirely unclear whether the ruling in or resolution of the PG&E Complaint proceeding would have any applicability to SDG&E.

**III.** **Discussion**

**A.** **Procedural Matters**

1. Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure,   
   18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2017), the notice of intervention and timely, unopposed motions to intervene serve to make the entities that filed them parties to this proceeding.
2. Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2017), prohibits an answer to a protest or an answer unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. We will accept SDG&E’s and the CPUC’s answers because they have provided information that assisted us in our decision-making process.

**B.** **Commission Determination**

1. We accept SDG&E’s TO4 Cycle 4 Filing, effective January 1, 2017, as requested. We find that SDG&E’s informational filing sets forth the information it is required to file under the terms of the TO4 Settlement, and shows the base transmission revenue requirement in effect for the next calendar year.
2. We find that the CPUC has not demonstrated that a hearing is needed to resolve any disputed issues of material fact related to SDG&E’s TO4 Cycle 4 Filing or SDG&E’s implementation of the formula rate. Indeed, the CPUC fails to challenge any specific cost input or argue that any costs sets forth in the TO4 Cycle 4 Filing were imprudently incurred, as is specified in SDG&E’s TO4 Formula Rate Protocols. We find that SDG&E has adequately justified and explained the basis for the approximate $85 million cost differential between its proposed retail and wholesale rates. Volume 3, Section 2.1, at Bates pages 52-53 of SDG&E’s filing sets forth the calculation of the retail true-up. The amount of retail revenues received by SDG&E is provided by month versus that month’s retail cost-of-service resulting in either an over or under-collection for the month, with the total 2015 retail under-collection of $37,049,009 appearing on line 30 of Bates page 53. Similarly, Volume 3, Section 3.1.1, Bates pages 75-76 of SDG&E’s filing sets forth the wholesale true-up and resulting over-collection of $47,247,099. Accordingly, in light of the record before us in this case, we find a trial-type evidentiary hearing is not necessary to make a determination.
3. In response to the CPUC’s assertion that based on the engineering audit and the reviewing engineer’s recommendations certain SDG&E capital additions may not be needed at this time, we find, as SDG&E notes, four of the six projects that the reviewing engineer objects to are outside the scope of the TO4 Cycle 4 Filing. As set forth in SDG&E’s January 6 Answer at 6-7 and undisputed by the CPUC, SDG&E has not included these four projects in its forecasted capital additions for purposes of recovering costs in the current Rate Effective Period; therefore, we find that these four projects are immaterial to this proceeding. If and when expenditures related to these projects are included in a SDG&E rate filing before the Commission, the CPUC may submit a protest or comments on such expenditures at that time.[[56]](#footnote-57) We also encourage the CPUC to address concerns regarding whether certain of SDG&E’s projects should be selected in CAISO’s TPP in the relevant CAISO transmission planning process cycle.[[57]](#footnote-58)
4. With regard to the two projects that are within the current Rate Effective Period, (1) the Camp Pendleton and the Basilone voltage support project (Project 26); and   
   (2) San Luis Rey Synchronous Condensers project (Project 43), we find SDG&E’s answer to be sufficient. SDG&E explained that the projects were reviewed by CAISO and approved through the CAISO TPP, which determined that the projects were necessary to meet the needs of the entire Southern California bulk power system, enhance grid reliability, and meet mandatory reliability criteria.[[58]](#footnote-59) We will not in this case, which is focused on the inputs into SDG&E’s formula rate, disturb the results of CAISO’s TPP.
5. Finally, in regard to the PJM Show Cause Order and the CPUC’s contention that SDG&E is seeking to recover approximately $300 million in its 2017 rate base for projects for which no Order No. 890 stakeholder review was provided, we find that the CPUC’s arguments are beyond the scope of this proceeding, which addresses the inputs into SDG&E's formula rate, and not any broader issue about SDG&E transmission planning activities.

The Commission orders:

SDG&E’s TO4 Cycle 4 Filing is hereby accepted for filing, to become effective January 1, 2017, as requested, as discussed in the body of this order.

By the Commission.

( S E A L )

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

1. The term “Cycle” refers to the number of annual filings made under the formula rate in effect. *See* SDG&E Transmittal at n.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. SDG&E, Offer of Settlement, Docket No. ER13-941-000 (filed Feb. 4, 2014) (TO4 Settlement). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. *San Diego Gas & Electric Co.,* 147 FERC ¶ 61,150 (2014). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. TO4 Settlement at Article 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. *Id.* (citing SDG&E OATT, Appendix VIII, Formula Rate Protocols,   
   Sections C.4.d and C.4.g). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. SDG&E Transmittal at 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. *Id.* at 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. *Id.* at 2-3. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. *Id.* at 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. *Id.* at 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. The Six Cities are the cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton, Pasadena and Riverside, California. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. CPUC Protest at 2, 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. *Id.* at 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. *Id.* [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. *Id.* at 2, 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. The TO4 Settlement provides that, for the TO4 Formula, SDG&E will   
    (a) jointly select with the CPUC a reviewing engineer to review transmission facilities added to the SDG&E transmission system at voltage levels of at least 69 kV and   
    below 200 kV items, and projects whose costs are equal to or greater than $3,000,000;   
    (b) support the CPUC and the reviewing engineer’s ability to participate in the CAISO’s review of SDG&E’s projects; and (c) make available $200,000 to be spent on the engineering review in each cycle, subject to an annual inflation adjustment.   
    TO4 Settlement, Article II (Engineering Audit and Quarterly Reports). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. In this instance, the engineering audit refers to the reviewing engineer’s analysis of 22 of SDG&E’s proposed projects and the findings were set forth as part of a report titled “TO4, Cycle Audit of SDG&E’s Forecast Projects.” CPUC Protest at 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. *Id.* at 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. *Id.* [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. *Id.* at 4-5. The CPUC identifies the following proposed projects: (1) Poway Substation Rebuild; (2) 138 kV and 69 kV Breaker Upgrades; (3) TL 13815 Transmission Bridge Structure Reconfiguration, (4) Imperial Valley Substation Operational Reliability & Security; and (5) CBM Gas Circuit Breakers. *Id.* n.8. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. *Id.* at 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. *Id.* at 4, n.7 (citing *Monongahela Power Company, et al.*, 156 FERC ¶ 61,134 (2016) (PJM Show Cause Order)). [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. *Preventing Undue Discrimination and Preference in Transmission Service*, Order No. 890, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,241, *order on reh’g*, Order No. 890-A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,261 (2007), *order on reh’g*, Order No. 890-B, 123 FERC ¶ 61,299 (2008), *order on reh’g*, Order No. 890-C, 126 FERC ¶ 61,228, *order on clarification*, Order No. 890-D, 129 FERC ¶ 61,126 (2009). [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. CPUC Protest at 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. SDG&E January 6 Answer at 5. SDG&E states that the retail true-up adjustment appears at Volume 3, section 2.1 at 51-52 and the wholesale true-up adjustment appears at Volume 3, section 3.1.1 at 74-76 of the instant filing. *Id.* n.14. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. *Id.* at 3, 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. *Id.* at 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. *Id.* at 3-4. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. *Id.* at 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. *Id.* at 8 (citing *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 154 FERC ¶ 61,213, at P 22 (2016)). [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. The four projects that SDG&E states are outside of the scope of the TO4 Cycle 4 Filing are: (1) Bernardo-Rancho Carmel 69 kV Reconductor Project (Project 13);   
    (2) Kearny-Mission Reconductor Project (Project 16); Mesa-Heights-Mission 69 kV Reconductor Project (Project 18); and (4) San Onofre Nuclear Generation Station Project (Project 46). *Id.* at 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. The two projects that SDG&E states are within the scope of the TO4 Cycle 4 filing are: (1) Camp Pendleton and the Basilone voltage support project (Project 26); and (2) San Luis Rey Synchronous Condensers project (Project 43). *Id.* at 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. *Id.* at 8. SDG&E states that CAISO’s approval for the projects that are within the scope of this proceeding were contemplated pursuant to CAISO’s Commission-approved tariff. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. *Id.* at 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. *Id.* n.22 (citing http://www.caiso.com/rules/Pages/BusinessPracticemanuals/Default.aspx). [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. *Id.* at 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. *Id.* at 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. *Id.* at 3-4 (citing *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.,* 151 FERC ¶ 61,011, at PP 10, 30 (2015)). [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. CPUC January 24 Answer at 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. *Id.* [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. *Id.* at 2 (citing Order No. 890, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,241 at PP 2-7). [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. *Id.* at 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
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44. *Id.* at 2-3. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
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50. CPUC February 14 Answer at 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
51. *Id.* at 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
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    The CPUC states that SDG&E has “self-approved” approximately $162 million in transmission projects to be capitalized in rate base between 2014 and 2016 that have not gone through any review process before the CAISO. *Id.* at 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
53. The PG&E Complaint was filed in Docket No. EL17-45-000 on February 2, 2017, and is currently pending before the Commission. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
54. CPUC February 14 Answer at 5. The CPUC states that it raised the same issues as part of the PG&E Complaint, which the CPUC notes are better developed. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
55. SDG&E’s February 28 Answer at 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
56. *See San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 154 FERC ¶ 61,213, at P 22 (2016) (same). [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
57. *See* CAISO Tariff sections 24.3.3 (Stakeholder – Unified Planning Assumptions and Study Plan) and 24.4.9 (Phase 2 Stakeholder Process). [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
58. SDG&E January 6 Answer at 4 (citing *San Diego Gas & Electric Co.*,   
    151 FERC ¶ 61,011, at PP 10, 30 (2015) (referring to CAISO 2012-2013 Transmission Plan)). [↑](#footnote-ref-59)