



Legislation Text

File #: 22-797, Version: 1

Memorandum

Date: July 26, 2022

To: The Honorable Lake County Board of Supervisors

From: Bruno Sabatier, District 2 Supervisor
Eddie "EJ" Crandell, District 3 Supervisor

Subject: Consider Letter to CPUC Re: CPUC Fast Trip Regulations

Executive Summary:

On July 14th, RCRC reached out to all member counties requesting action be taken regarding the lack of regulation over Investor Owned Utilities such as PG&E when it comes to Fast Trip electrical outages.

As utilities use fewer and fewer pre-planned Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) events, there has been a tremendous increase in unplanned Fast Trip-related outages. While these outages generally impact fewer customers and may not last as long as PSPS events, their frequency and unplanned nature have had a debilitating impact on thousands of customers at a time. Last summer, PG&E's EPSS program was used on a limited number of circuits and resulted in over 600 outages (with some circuits experiencing as many as 19 discrete outages over a period of just a few months). This year, PG&E has doubled the number of line-miles in the EPSS program from 11,500 miles to 25,500 miles, with 44 counties now being impacted by the EPSS program.

As with PSPS events, IOUs' Fast Trip Programs impose significant potential risks to public health, safety, and welfare. Despite these risks, the Fast Trip Programs are generally not overseen or regulated by the Commission. RCRC believes this proposal will significantly increase CPUC oversight of Fast Trip electrical outages and improve utility accountability.

The deadline for submitting a letter in support of the request from Pioneer Community Energy, Sonoma Clean Power Authority, East Bay Community, and Marin Clean Energy is July 27th. The request is for CPUC to develop rules governing the conduct, reporting, and oversight of utility Fast Trip electrical outages, including PG&E's Enhanced Powerline Safety Settings (EPSS) outages.

If not budgeted, fill in the blanks below only:

Estimated Cost: _____ Amount Budgeted: _____ Additional Requested: _____ Future Annual Cost: _____

Consistency with Vision 2028 (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Well-being of Residents | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Safety | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure | <input type="checkbox"/> Disaster Prevention, Preparedness, Recovery |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> County Workforce |

☐ Community Collaboration ☐ Business Process Efficiency ☐ Clear Lake

Which exemption is being requested? Code section 38.2 (2) & (3)

How long has Agreement been in place? N/A This is a new agreement between the two cities and consultant

When was purchase last rebid? N/A this is a new agreement for a new contract agreement

Reason for request to waive bid? As this project is funded by a cost-share agreement between County and two cities, the RFP and bid process would not result in an economic benefit to any party and it's not determined who would bear the financial and staff burden of conducting that RFP and bid exercise.

Recommended Action:

Approve letter to CPUC and have Board Chair sign and submit to CPUC prior to July 27 deadline.