Date of Hearing: April 8, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON UTILITIES AND ENERGY
Cottie Petrie-Norris, Chair
AB 2493 (Petrie-Norris) – As Amended March 26, 2026

SUBJECT: Electrical corporations: interconnection: transmission: permitting: auditor

SUMMARY: Requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to require each large electrical corporation to retain an independent third-party auditor to review certain transmission- and interconnection-related submissions made by a large electrical corporation.

Specifically, **this bill**:

1) Requires, beginning January 1, 2027, the CPUC to require each large electrical corporation to retain an independent third-party auditor to review the large electrical corporation's submissions pursuant to commission Resolution E-5252 and subdivision (g) of Section 913.4, the large electrical corporation's progress on completing network upgrades following approval in a generator interconnection agreement or transmission plan approved by the Independent System Operator, and the large electrical corporation's compliance with any remedial actions ordered by the CPUC.

2) Requires the CPUC to consult with the Public Advocates Office of the CPUC in selecting the auditor and to ensure that the auditor does not have a conflict of interest due to other work, contracts, or business relationships with the large electrical corporation.

3) Requires the auditor to report to the CPUC on an annual basis and requires the CPUC to post the auditor's reports on its internet website and incorporate those reports into the CPUC's annual reporting requirements.

4) Provides that within 90 days of receiving the auditor's report, the CPUC shall issue a resolution directing a large electrical corporation to take remedial actions to address any and all deficiencies identified by the auditor. Remedial actions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

    a) Reallocating staff or capital resources to complete high-priority upgrades.

    b) Facilitating advanced procurement of equipment or equipment sharing with other electrical corporations to address delays caused by supply chain constraints.

    c) Implementing interim deliverability or temporary generator interconnection solutions

    d) Enabling generators to procure equipment on behalf of the large electrical corporation.

    e) Enabling self-build options by generators or transmission solutions developed by another electrical corporation.

    f) Expediting engineering, design, permitting, and other preconstruction work for high-priority upgrades following approval in a generator interconnection agreement or a transmission plan approved by the CAISO.

5) Defines:

    a) "Self-build options" to include, but not limited to, the permitting, design, procurement, construction, or commissioning of transmission, distribution, or interconnection facilities by an entity other than the large electrical corporation.

    b) "High-priority upgrades" as transmission, distribution, or interconnection facilities affecting the interconnection or deliverability of at least 100 megawatts of generating or storage capacity.

6) Requires within one year following the adoption of each transmission plan produced by the CAISO through the transmission planning process, or a successor process, each large electrical corporation that is assigned to construct a project that requires approval by the CPUC shall initiate permitting for the project by filing an application or other notice, as applicable, pursuant to General Order 131-E.

7) Requires within one year following the execution of a generator interconnection agreement, each large electrical corporation that is obligated to construct a project that requires approval by the CPUC shall initiate permitting for the project by filing an application or other notice, as applicable, pursuant to General Order 131-E.

8) Authorizes a large electrical corporation to request an extension of the filing deadlines by demonstrating good cause in a written notice to the CPUC. The notice shall be served at least 30 days before the filing deadline and specify the actions the large electrical corporation is undertaking to resolve the principal causes of delay identified in the notice.

9) Provides that if a large electrical corporation fails to adhere to the timelines or to make a timely extension request, the CPUC is required to take appropriate enforcement action pursuant to Section 701 of the Public Utilities Code.

10) Requires the CPUC to consider a large electrical corporation's record of compliance with remedial actions ordered as admissible evidence in any proceeding to approve rates or cost of capital under Section 451 of the Public Utilities Code.

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. This bill is keyed fiscal and will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BACKGROUND:

Megawatts in Waiting – California has made significant progress in developing clean energy resources over the past several years. Since January 2020, nearly 400 clean generation and storage projects have been added or interconnected within the CAISO footprint, totaling approximately 27 GW of new nameplate capacity.[1] In 2024 alone, the state added nearly 7 GW of clean energy capacity, predominantly solar paired with battery storage, representing the

[1]CPUC, *Resource Tracking Data* (Energy Division), December 2025 release, "Part 1: New MW Online – SB 100 Resources (In-CAISO)," tracking clean generation and storage resources added or interconnected since January 1, 2020; https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/electrical-energy/summer-2021-reliability/tracking-energy-development

largest single-year increase in clean capacity in California's history.[2] Looking ahead, the CPUC has identified a need for more than 14.8 GW of additional clean resources to come online by 2026 to meet projected load growth and maintain system reliability. However, a significant and growing number of projects remain in the interconnection queue and are dependent on transmission and distribution upgrades that must be designed, permitted, and constructed before they can come online. Interconnection study timelines, the extent of required upgrades, and construction lead times can delay projects from reaching commercial operation even after they have secured permits and contracts.

The CAISO Interconnection Process – To secure financing, developers also need to clearly understand when they can interconnect and whether the electricity they generate can reliably reach customers. Interconnection projects are divided into two main queues: the Distribution Interconnection Queue, managed by individual utilities, and the Transmission Interconnection Queue, overseen by the CAISO. The queue a project enters is determined by its voltage level; specifically, projects exceeding a threshold of 20 MW set by the local utility are directed to the transmission queue, where CAISO manages the interconnection process. The interconnection process begins when a developer submits an interconnection request to the relevant utility or the CAISO. This request includes several elements, such as the selection of a specific point of interconnection and an initial determination of whether sufficient transmission capacity exists to reliably deliver power from that location. Once deemed complete, the interconnection request is entered into the interconnection queue for studies conducted under the CAISO tariff, which governs the requirements for interconnection, operation, and metering.

As part of this process, interconnection studies are coordinated with CAISO's Transmission Planning Process (TPP),[3] which identifies network upgrades needed to integrate new generation and ensure long-term system reliability. Where upgrades are required, the interconnection process specifies the necessary facilities and estimates associated costs in accordance with the CAISO tariff, while coordinating construction schedules with the project**.** After a resource completes the required study phases, an interconnection agreement is signed. The resource must then be modeled in CAISO's market systems and install and test the required metering before it may participate in the wholesale electricity market.

The Interconnection Challenge – In recent years, the volume of projects entering this process has increased significantly, exceeding the pace at which studies and required upgrades can be completed. Between 2012 and 2020, CAISO received an average of 113 interconnection requests per year.[4] That pattern significantly changed, beginning in 2021, as state procurement directives, resource adequacy requirements, and clean-energy targets spurred a sharp increase in interconnection demand. This surge also coincided with the passage of the IRA in August 2022, which significantly expanded and extended federal tax incentives for clean energy generation

---

[2] Gavin Newsom, "New Data Shows California Is Adding More Clean Energy Capacity to the Grid Faster Than Ever Before," Office of Governor Gavin Newsom, June 4, 2025, https://www.gov.ca.gov/2025/06/04/new-data-shows-california-is-adding-more-clean-energy-capacity-to-the-grid-faster-than-ever-before/

[3]CAISO; "CAISO Interconnection Study";
http://www.caiso.com/planning/Pages/GeneratorInterconnection/InterconnectionStudy/Default.aspx

[4] California Independent System Operator, Decision on Cluster 14 Interconnection Procedures, presentation; July 15, 2021;slide 2, stating that "in the last decade, the ISO has received an annual average of 113 queue cluster interconnection requests," https://www.caiso.com/documents/decision-cluster-14-interconnection-procedures-presentation-july-2021.pdf

and energy storage. In the 2022 interconnection application window alone, CAISO received approximately 373 requests, more than triple historical averages.[5]

As a result, CAISO was required to evaluate an unusually large number of interconnection requests simultaneously, which includes a substantial volume of energy storage and hybrid storage-plus-generation projects.[6] As study results developed, the scope and cost of required network upgrades were refined over time rather than resolved within a single study cycle.[7] As a result, developers faced longer study timelines, changes in preliminary cost estimates, and uncertainty regarding the scope, cost, and timing of required transmission upgrades, contributing in some cases to withdrawal from the interconnection queue or deferral to later study clusters.[8]

Following completion of Cluster 14, CAISO implemented more reforms through its Interconnection Process Enhancements (IPE), approved by FERC in September 2024. These reforms modified how projects enter and advance through the queue by introducing screening and prioritization criteria based on commercial readiness, project viability, and system need, and by limiting the number of projects that proceed into study. In June 2025, CAISO reported that 145 projects advanced out of 541 submitted in Cluster 15, reflecting a more selective intake process intended to reduce backlog and improve study timelines.[9] While these reforms are intended to improve study timelines, they do not address delays that occur after studies are completed, including the time required for utilities to initiate permitting and construct required network upgrades, which can extend project timelines even after interconnection is complete.

Transmission Development Process – The CAISO leads statewide transmission planning through its annual Transmission Planning Process **(**TPP), which identifies needed transmission projects to maintain system reliability and support state policy goals. According to the CEC, projects approved through the TPP currently account for approximately 22% of California's transmission projects, with the remainder consisting primarily of utility self-initiated repair and replacement work that is not reviewed through the TPP. Utilities proposing the construction of new transmission facilities are generally required to obtain approval from the CPUC pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1001. The CPUC reviews applications through established permitting processes, including environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

For projects approved through the TPP, transmission facilities are typically financed, constructed, and owned by the incumbent utility within its service territory. Projects above 200

---

[5]Marissa Evans, "As California Grid Interconnection Requests Triple, Analysts Assess CAISO's Response," Utility Dive, March 30, 2023, https://www.utilitydive.com/news/as-california-grid-interconnection-requests-triple-analysts-assess-caisos/642591/

[6]California Independent System Operator, Memorandum; Decision on Cluster 14 Interconnection Procedures; July 7, 2021, https://www.caiso.com/Documents/Decision-Cluster-14-Interconnection-Procedures_Memo-July-2021.pdf

[7] California Independent System Operator, Decision on Cluster 14 Interconnection Procedures, presentation; July 15, 2021; slides 3–4, explaining that Phase I cost estimates are "advisory" and Phase II establishes cost caps for network upgrades; https://www.caiso.com/documents/decision-cluster-14-interconnection-procedures-presentation-july-2021.pdf

[8]California Independent System Operator, comments on Improvements to Generator Interconnection Procedures and Agreements, October 13, 2022, 23–24, stating that most interconnection customer withdrawals occur immediately prior to financial security posting deadlines, https://www.caiso.com/documents/oct-13-2022-comments-notice-proposedrulemaking-improvements-generatorinterconnectionprocedures-agreements-rm14-22.pdf

[9]

kilovolts, as well as those that cross multiple service territories, may be subject to competitive solicitation, allowing independent developers to build and own transmission facilities. Both utilities and third-party developers recover capital and ongoing maintenance costs through the Transmission Access Charge.

As discussed in this committee and reflected in multiple records, transmission capacity will need to at least double by 2045 to interconnect new renewable generation and meet California's clean energy goals. However, the transmission development process is lengthy and complex, and major projects can take more than a decade to move from initial planning, permitting and to construction and completion.

GO-131 Reforms. General Order 131 was originally adopted by the CPUC in 1970 and last substantially updated in 1995 as GO 131-D, establishing the rules for permitting and constructing electric transmission facilities. Since then, California's electricity system has changed significantly, with increases in renewable generation, electrification, and the need for transmission to connect new resources. In January 2025, the CPUC adopted GO 131-E to update these requirements and implement SB 529 Hertzberg, Chapter 357, Statutes of 2022. The order revises procedures for obtaining a Permit to Construct (PTC) or claiming an exemption, while continuing to require environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It allows applicants to submit applicant-prepared draft CEQA documents with their applications, requires pre-filing consultation with CPUC staff prior to submitting an application, and establishes a pilot program to evaluate CEQA review timelines for certain transmission projects. For projects identified in the CAISO transmission planning process, the CPUC may rely on CAISO's determination of need as part of its review process.

Recent CPUC findings indicate that transmission development timelines remain extended despite these process updates. For transmission projects approved through the CAISO transmission planning process, utilities take, on average, approximately three years between project approval and initiation of a permitting application at the CPUC, with the pre-application phase often exceeding the duration of the CPUC's permitting review. CPUC reporting also shows that some approved projects have not yet entered the permitting process several years after approval.[10] While GO 131-E updates the permitting process and may improve coordination and review timelines, it does not establish a requirement for when utilities must initiate permitting following project approval.

COMMENTS:

1) *Author's Statement*. According to the author, "Federal clean energy tax credits worth billions of dollars to California ratepayers are on the verge of expiring, and the single greatest obstacle to capturing those savings is the failure of our largest utilities to complete the grid upgrades needed to connect new clean energy projects. The CPUC's own data shows that nearly two-thirds of these transmission upgrades are delayed, with some languishing for over a decade. AB 2493 creates the independent oversight and

[10] California Public Utilities Commission, *2025 Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) Annual Report* (including SB 1174 systemwide transmission assessment), at pp7, pp13–15 (documenting average pre-application timelines of approximately three years for transmission planning projects and identifying projects approved in earlier transmission planning cycles that have not yet filed CPCN or PTC applications)

enforceable accountability mechanisms needed to break through these delays before it is too late."

2) *Delays. Delays. Delays.* AB 2493 addresses delays in the transmission and interconnection -related upgrades needed to bring new clean energy resources online. California's large investor-owned utilities, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), Southern California Edison (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E), are responsible for constructing these upgrades, which must be completed before new generation and storage projects can connect to the grid. When these upgrades are delayed, dependent generation and storage resources are unable to interconnect and supply electricity to the grid.

   Recent findings from the CPUC[11] indicate that transmission project delays remain prevalent. In 2025, 328 of 513 in-development projects (64%) were delayed beyond their original in-service dates, including 277 of 440 projects (63%) at PG&E and 51 of 73 projects (70%) at SCE. Delay reasons across PG&E and SCE include: a) bundling dependencies (117 projects) where work on one project cannot proceed until related transmission upgrades are completed; b) project design (98), including redesigns and additional engineering work beyond the original scope; c) financing (48); and d) permitting (45).[12] Notably, SDG&E's data were not included in the CPUC's assessment for the second consecutive year due to data limitations, including challenges distinguishing between original and current in-service dates and inconsistencies in how the reporting scope was interpreted.[13]

   However, these data have limitations. SB 1174 (Hertzberg, Chapter 367, Statutes of 2022) requires the CPUC to collect information on transmission projects needed to support RPS procurement and assess their status. The CPUC uses this information to identify delayed projects and evaluate systemwide trends. But the reporting relies on utility-submitted data and does not include independent verification of those submissions. AB 2493 addresses this directly by requiring large electrical corporations to retain independent third-party auditors to review interconnection and transmission-related submissions, providing the verification that current reporting lacks.

3) *Federal Changes*. Federal policy is shortening project development timelines. The One Big Beautiful Bill Act, signed on July 4, 2025, phases out federal clean energy tax credits for new solar and wind projects. These projects now face a shorter timeline to qualify for these incentives. Projects that do not meet the eligibility deadlines could forgo more than $10 billion in federal investment tax credits that would otherwise help lower project costs. Given the multi-year timelines required to plan, permit, and construct transmission and interconnection upgrades, delays at early stages may affect whether projects are able to come online in time to qualify. Therefore, AB 2493 requires permitting to begin on a defined timeline and requires independent verification of project status to help address early delays and reduce the risk of higher project costs.

---

[11] CPUC, 2025 California Renewables Portfolio Standard Annual Report; SB 1174 Assessment; pp. 84–112; November 2025; https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/office-of-governmental-affairs-division/reports/2025/2025-california-renewables-portfolio-standard-rps-annual-report.pdf

[12] *Ibid.*, at pp. 89–91 (Table 40: Transmission Project Delay Reasons by PTO).

[13] *Ibid.*, at pp. 86-87

4) *Setting the Clock*. There is currently no timeline requirement for large electrical corporations to begin transmission upgrades following approval. Therefore, utilities may take several years to initiate permitting, with averages of roughly three years between approval and filing an application with the CPUC. In some cases, projects approved more than a decade ago have not yet been filed, and the pre-application phase can exceed the duration of the CPUC permitting process itself. AB 2493 addresses this gap by requiring utilities to initiate permitting within one year of project approval or execution of an interconnection agreement. The bill additionally allows utilities to request additional time for good cause, including delays outside their control. Recent updates to General Order 131-E, which allow utilities to submit draft CEQA documents in place of a complete environmental assessment, may further support compliance with this timeline.

5) *It's Been Done. Now Do it Again.* SB 254 (Becker, Chapter 119, Statutes of 2025) established independent oversight of large electrical corporations by requiring third-party auditors to evaluate utility practices related to energizing new customers, including energization performance, workforce capacity, and planning for demand growth. Auditors report to the CPUC on a biannual basis, and the CPUC may require corrective actions to address identified deficiencies. These efforts build on earlier legislative actions to address delays in energizing new customers. AB 50 (Wood, Chapter 217, Statutes of 2023) and SB 410 (Becker, Chapter 394, Statutes of 2023) required the CPUC to establish timelines for connecting new customers and increasing service capacity. In response, the CPUC adopted a decision in September 2024 requiring large electrical corporations to plan and prioritize energization work to meet those timelines, report when timelines are exceeded, and take corrective actions.

   AB 2493 extends this approach to interconnection and transmission, where CPUC assessments show delays in completing network upgrades needed to bring new generation online. Beginning January 1, 2027, the bill would require large electrical corporations to retain independent third-party auditors to review interconnection related submissions, assess progress on completing network upgrades approved through interconnection agreements or transmission plans, and evaluate compliance with CPUC ordered remedial actions. Auditors would report annually, and the CPUC would be required to issue a resolution within 90 days directing actions to address any deficiencies identified. As such, the measure builds on existing oversight tools from distribution level energization to transmission and interconnection, where project delays have also been persistent.

6) *Delays Catch Up*. Under existing law, utilities face limited financial consequences for chronic interconnection delays, and existing oversight does not consistently carry those delays into ratemaking outcomes. Utilities provide status updates on interconnection and transmission projects, but those updates are not always directly considered in proceedings that determine authorized returns and cost recovery. As a result, repeated delays may be identified, but do not necessarily affect those determinations. Section 769.4(c) provides that a utility's interconnection compliance record may be considered by the CPUC in rate cases and cost of capital proceedings. This allows the CPUC to consider a utility's record on these delays when evaluating the reasonableness of costs and setting authorized returns. While AB 2493 does not impose automatic penalties, it ensures that repeated delays are not evaluated in isolation but can be considered in the same proceedings that determine authorized returns and cost recovery.

7) *Independent Verification*. Resolution E-5252 requires utilities to report on the status of transmission projects approved through the CAISO's TPP assigned to the utilities for development. These reports include schedule updates and explanations for delays, allowing the CPUC to track project status and delays over time. However, this reporting is primarily focused on transmission planning projects and does not include independent verification. AB 2493 expands oversight by requiring independent third-party audits of transmission and interconnection projects, providing an external assessment of project status and delays.

8) *Opposition.* This bill is opposed by PG&E and SCE, who raise some of the following concerns:

   Duplicative Reporting
   PG&E and SCE report that CPUC's Resolution E-5252 (Transmission Project Review Process) already provides oversight, including the ability for the CPUC to request additional information and review utility submissions. Resolution E-5252 requires utilities to report on the status of transmission projects approved through the CAISO Transmission Planning Process and assigned for development, including schedule updates and explanations for delays. These reports allow the CPUC to track project status over time. However, the reporting is based on utility-submitted information and does not provide for ongoing independent verification.

   The utilities also note that they provide regular updates through established CAISO and CPUC coordination forums, including monthly interconnection reporting and periodic transmission updates. However, these processes support coordination and information sharing across agencies and stakeholders.

   In addition, the period between project approval and the start of permitting can extend for multiple years and is not subject to a defined timeline. While utilities provide explanations for delays, those explanations are not always presented in a standardized manner across projects, making it difficult to assess patterns of delay.

   AB 2493 takes a more targeted approach by requiring an independent third-party review to supplement, rather than replace existing reporting. This allows for independent review of project status and reported delays, particularly for projects expected to move forward.

   Increases Ratepayer Costs
   PG&E and SCE argue that this bill would impose a new recurring cost for an auditor, create additional administrative requirements, and raise affordability concerns, particularly if costs are not recoverable. They suggest that, if independent auditing is needed, it should be funded through existing public resources or other means. However, the cost concern should be considered alongside the cost of delay. When projects are delayed, costs increase as timelines extend, and those impacts ultimately fall on ratepayers. This bill does not add construction costs. Instead, it is intended to identify delays earlier, when they can still be addressed and ultimately reduce project costs.

Federal-State Conflict.
AB 2493 requires utilities to initiate permitting within one year of both CAISO transmission plan approval and execution of a generator interconnection agreement. It remains unclear whether these requirements create a conflict with federal jurisdiction, particularly where interconnection timelines are governed by FERC-approved processes.

Bill targets utilities and ignores other major sources of delay.
PG&E and SCE argue that AB 2493 focuses exclusively on utility actions, while interconnection timelines are also affected by customer-driven redesigns, multijurisdictional permitting, procurement lead times, and right-of-way acquisition. They contend that a more balanced approach should address delays across all responsible parties, rather than focusing on utilities alone.

Interconnection timelines can be affected by factors beyond the utility's control, including permitting, supply chain constraints, and customer-driven changes. These issues are the subject of ongoing legislative and regulatory efforts. This committee has held informational hearings and conducted oversight on permitting timelines, CAISO transmission planning and interconnection processes, and coordination gaps among the CPUC, CEC, and CAISO.

AB 2493 does not attribute delays only to utilities; it focuses on utility-managed steps in the development process, including how projects move after delays. Addressing these steps does not exclude other sources of delay. Rather, it complements broader efforts to improve project timelines in general.

9) *Audit Scope.* This bill requires an independent third-party audit of utility transmission and interconnection projects, including reporting under Resolution E-5252 and Section 913.4(g), which requires utilities to report on the status and timelines of interconnection-related network upgrades, as well as tracking progress on network upgrades following approval. However**,** these provisions are primarily focused on project status and do not verify compliance with the defined timeframe for initiating permitting in subdivision (a). *As such, the committee recommends including a provision that ensures the audit evaluates whether utilities meet the one year to initiate permitting requirement as provided in subdivision (a) of this measure.*

10) Clarifying Amendments. This legislation contains some provisions that may benefit from additional clarity. *As such, the committee recommends other technical amendments that are clarifying in nature*.

11) *Related legislation.*

AB 2111 (Papan) would require the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to incorporate specified requirements into its integrated resource planning and transmission planning processes, including evaluating resource portfolios across a range of plausible future conditions and assessing system needs under uncertainty. Status: Assembly Committee on Utilities and Energy

AB 2369 (Rogers) would require the CPUC and the CEC, as part of their transmission planning projections, to identify cost-effective opportunities to increase the reliability

contribution or mitigate congestion of planned or existing energy-only resources through transmission capacity expansions. Status: Assembly Committee on Utilities and Energy

12) *Prior Legislation.*

SB 254 (Becker) Establishes the Transmission Infrastructure Financing and Development Program to support the financing and development of transmission projects. Status**:** Chapter 636, Statutes of 2025

SB 836 (Rubio) would have required state entities to take actions to improve coordination of transmission planning and permitting processes among the CPUC, the CEC, and the CAISO. Status: Senate Appropriations

AB 3238 (Garcia) directed the CPUC, in coordination with the CAISO and other relevant agencies, to evaluate and identify opportunities to accelerate the development of transmission infrastructure needed to support the state's clean energy goals, including by assessing planning, permitting, and cost allocation barriers and recommending strategies to streamline project development and deployment. Status: Chapter 378, Statutes of 2024

AB 551 (Bennett, 2023) authorizes the CPUC to adopt guidelines at a publicly noticed meeting to carry out its review of applications for the construction of electrical transmission facilities and makes other changes to help reduce delays in processing these requests. Status: Chapter 299, Statutes of 2024.

SB 420 (Becker, 2023) removes the requirement on new electrical transmission facility projects less than 138 kilovolts (kV) proposed by the state's six largest investor-owned utilities (IOUs)1 from a determination of need from the CPUC before construction. These new projects must either be located on previously disturbed land, located in an urbanized area or be part of a project that has undergone a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. Excludes from eligibility projects that are located in wetlands, any un-remediated hazardous waste site, or critical habitat, as specified. Status: Vetoed by the Governor

SB 319 (Dodd) requires the California Energy Commission (CEC), in coordination with the CPUC and the CAISO, to develop a transmission planning and permitting guidebook describing applicable processes and requirements. Status: Chapter 365, Statutes of 2023

AB 1373 (Garcia), among other things, requires the CPUC, in a proceeding when evaluating the issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a proposed transmission project, to establish a rebuttable presumption with regard to the need for the proposed transmission project in favor of an Independent System Operator governing board-approved need evaluation if specified requirements are met. Status: Chapter 367, Statutes of 2023.

SB 619 (Padilla, 2023) Authorizes an electrical corporation, at the time it files an application with the CPUC for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity AB 941 Page 13 (CPCN) or Permit to Construct (PTC) for new construction of any electrical transmission facility 138 kilovolts (kV) or greater to, at the same time, submit an application for that facility to the CEC. Prohibits the CEC from considering the necessity for the electrical transmission facility. Status: Vetoed by the Governor

SB 529 (Hertzberg) directed the CPUC to revise General Order 131-D to authorize investor-owned utilities to use a streamlined Permit to Construct process for modifications to existing transmission facilities regardless of voltage level, with the intent of reducing permitting timelines for grid upgrades. Status: Chapter 357, Statutes of 2022

SB 887 (Becker, 2022) required the CPUC, on or before January 15, 2023, to request the CAISO to identify the highest priority transmission facilities anticipated to be needed to support the delivery of electricity from renewable energy resources or zero-carbon resources. Status: Chapter 358, Statutes of 2022

SB 1174 (Hertzberg) required large electrical corporations that are participating transmission owners to submit annual data on transmission project delays and their impact on RPS-eligible renewable generation and storage resources, incorporated into the CPUC's annual RPS Report. Did not include an independent third-party review or an enforcement mechanism. Chapter 758, Status of 2022.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Advanced Energy United
American Clean Power- California
California Energy Storage Alliance
California Environmental Voters
California Wind Energy Association
City of Pico Rivera
Edf Power Solutions
Engie North America
Environmental Defense Action Fund
Fluence
Independent Energy Producers Association
Large-scale Solar Association
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
Ormat
San Diego Community Power
Sierra Club California
Solar Energy Industries Association
Union of Concerned Scientists

Support If Amended

The Utility Reform Network (TURN)

Opposition

Pacific Gas and Electric Company and its Affiliated Entities
San Diego Gas and Electric Company
Southern California Edison

Analysis Prepared by: Lina V. Malova / U. & E. / (916) 319-2083