

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
1325 G STREET, N.W., SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005**

**ORDER**

**January 31, 2025**

**FORMAL CASE NO. 1182, IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM PLANNING FOR  
ELECTRIC UTILITIES, Order No. 22359**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. By this Order, the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia (“Commission”) grants the Department of Energy and Environment’s (“DOEE”) Unopposed Motion for an Enlargement of Time to File Comments<sup>1</sup> on the Notice of Inquiry (“NOI”) issued on November 27, 2024, requesting comment on various matters related to electric utility distribution system planning, including the Commission-created strawman proposal on Integrated Distribution System Planning (“IDSP”).<sup>2</sup> Initial comments and reply comments shall now be due on March 17, 2025, and April 14, 2025, respectively.

**II. BACKGROUND**

2. The Commission has emphasized the need for transparency and quality reporting in the distribution system of the utilities it regulates.<sup>3</sup> IDSP focuses on optimizing and modernizing the distribution system to meet evolving demands from ratepayers. In addition to the traditional distribution planning that the District of Columbia’s utilities undertake, IDSP incorporates advanced technologies, data analytics, and distributed energy resources, such as solar panels, energy storage, electric vehicles, demand response, energy efficiency, and federal and local policy. In Order No. 20286, the Commission determined that an interactive and stakeholder-informed process is necessary for distribution system planning.<sup>4</sup>

3. On October 10, 2024, the Commission issued Order No. 22313 directing the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Formal Case No. 1182, In the Matter of the Investigation into the Implementation of Integrated Distribution System Planning for Electric Utilities* (“*Formal Case No. 1182*”), Unopposed Motion of the Department of Energy and Environment for Enlargement of Time to File Comments, filed January 23, 2025 (“DOEE Motion”).

<sup>2</sup> *Formal Case No. 1182*, Notice of Inquiry, rel. November 27, 2024.

<sup>3</sup> *Formal Case No. 1130, In the Matter of the Investigation into Modernizing the Energy Delivery System for Increased Sustainability* (“*Formal Case No. 1130*”), Order No. 20286, ¶ 37, issued January 24, 2020 (“We agree with [ ] stakeholders that the DSP/NWA process must be an iterative one. . . [and] additional information, including the outcomes of the studies, must be continually factored into the DSP/NWA process to improve it and ensure that Pepco is considering all appropriate NWAs and DER integrations into its planned infrastructure improvements.”).

<sup>4</sup> *Formal Case No. 1130*, Order No. 20286, ¶ 37.

Potomac Electric Power Company and the Washington Gas Light Company to submit revised Climate Solution Plans,<sup>5</sup> dismissing the pending proposals without prejudice,<sup>6</sup> and declining to adopt integrated planning frameworks.<sup>7</sup> On November 12, 2024, the Office of the People’s Counsel for the District of Columbia (“OPC”) and the District of Columbia Government (“DCG”) filed motions for reconsideration of Order No. 22313 (issued October 10, 2024) in *Formal Case No. 1167*.<sup>8</sup> OPC’s Motion proposed restructuring *Formal Case No. 1167* to facilitate integrated, coordinated utility planning.<sup>9</sup> DGC requested that the Commission create a separate docket for IDSP.<sup>10</sup>

4. The Commission issued the NOI on November 27, 2024, creating a new case for IDSP, *Formal Case No. 1182*. The NOI invited interested persons to comment on various matters related to electric utility distribution system planning, IDSP, and the appended Commission-created strawman proposal. The NOI established a 60-day comment and 30-day reply comment period, making initial comments due on January 31, 2025, and reply comments due by February 28, 2025. On January 23, 2025, DOEE filed its unopposed Motion requesting an enlargement of time to file initial and reply comments.<sup>11</sup>

### III. DISCUSSION

5. In its Motion, DOEE requests an enlargement of time to file comments on the NOI stating that good causes exists to grant its motion to provide sufficient time to onboard its consultant.<sup>12</sup> DOEE asserts that, “[a]s demonstrated by the lack of opposition to this Motion, the 45-day enlargement of time will not prejudice any parties or interested members of the public. Nor will [it] create undue delay since there are currently no scheduled deadlines in this proceeding beyond the comment dates in the [ ] NOI.”<sup>13</sup> DOEE cautions that denying its request may result

---

<sup>5</sup> Order No. 22313, ¶¶ 1, 19.

<sup>6</sup> Order No. 22313, ¶ 23.

<sup>7</sup> *Formal Case No. 1167*, Dissent of Commissioner Beverly to Order No. 22313, ¶ 4 (“While I agree with the majority that the CBP and CSP should be dismissed without prejudice, I believe that does not go far enough to ensure this case is comprehensive, nor does it achieve the required integrated planning that we urgently need to comply with the District’s decarbonization mandates and policies.”).

<sup>8</sup> *Formal Case No. 1167, In the Matter of the Implementation of the Business Climate Plan* (“*Formal Case No. 1167*”), Order No. 22313, rel. Oct. 10, 2024 (“Order No. 22313”).

<sup>9</sup> *Formal Case No. 1167*, Office of the People’s Counsel for the District of Columbia, Motion for Reconsideration of Public Service Commission Order No. 22313, at 9, filed November 12, 2024.

<sup>10</sup> *Formal Case No. 1167*, District of Columbia Government, Motion for Reconsideration of Public Service Commission Order No. 22313, at 18, filed November 12, 2024.

<sup>11</sup> DOEE Motion.

<sup>12</sup> DOEE Motion at 2.

<sup>13</sup> DOEE Motion at 2.

in “DOEE’s filed comments [ ] being incomplete, speculative, and insufficient for [the] Commission to best formulate a path forward for the District’s IDSP.”<sup>14</sup>

6. The Commission has broad authority in managing its docket.<sup>15</sup> Generally, the Commission will grant a request of this nature if good cause is shown.<sup>16</sup> In this instance, DOEE has presented good cause, indicating that it needs additional time to procure a third-party energy consultant with specialized expertise to assist DOEE in “crafting comprehensive comments for the benefit of the Commission and public.”<sup>17</sup> Since DOEE’s Motion is unopposed, requests a commensurate extension of time to file reply comments, and will facilitate broad stakeholder participation in this proceeding, the Commission believes no party or stakeholder will be prejudiced by the granting of the Motion. Therefore, the Commission grants the Motion. Accordingly, initial comments and reply comments on the NOI shall now be due on March 17, 2025, and April 14, 2025, respectively.

**THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

7. The Department of Energy and Environment’s Motion for an Enlargement of Time to File Comments regarding the November 27, 2024, Notice of Inquiry is **GRANTED**; and

8. Interested persons **SHALL** file comments no later than March 17, 2025, and reply comments no later than April 14, 2025.

**A TRUE COPY:**

**BY DIRECTION OF THE COMMISSION:**



**CHIEF CLERK:**

**BRINDA WESTBROOK-SEDGWICK  
COMMISSION SECRETARY**

---

<sup>14</sup> DOEE Motion at 2.

<sup>15</sup> 15 DCMR § 105.8. “Written motions may be filed at any time in accordance with this chapter. Responses to a written motion shall be filed no later than 10 calendar days after a motion has been served.” *See also*, 15 DCMR § 105.10. “The Commission may act without awaiting responses when considered necessary.”

<sup>16</sup> *See, e.g., Formal Case No. 1175, In the Matter of Washington Gas Light Company’s Application for Approval of PROJECTpipes 3 Plan*, Order No. 21573, ¶ 10 n.16, rel. February 17, 2023.

<sup>17</sup> DOEE Motion at 2.