

AYK/jv1 2/28/2013



**FILED**

02-28-13  
01:41 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking Pursuant to  
Assembly Bill 2514 to Consider the  
Adoption of Procurement Targets for Viable  
and Cost-Effective Energy Storage Systems.

Rulemaking 10-12-007  
(Filed December 16, 2010)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING DENYING  
REQUEST FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS**

This Administrative Law Judge's Ruling (Ruling) denies the request of Southern California Edison Company (Edison) for evidentiary hearings. The disputed facts identified in Edison's request are outside the scope of this rulemaking.

On January 18, 2013, I issued a ruling entering Energy Division Staff's (Staff) interim report on energy storage (Interim Staff Report) in Phase 2 of this proceeding into the record and seeking comments from parties. As part of reply comments, parties were provided an opportunity to identify specific material disputed facts and request evidentiary hearings. In its reply comments filed on February 21, 2013, Edison requested evidentiary hearings to address:

- a. The costs of storage in both the near term (2015) and the longer term (2020) using updated cost estimates from the latest available information, given the many claims that storage is cost-effective or should be deemed cost-effective;
- b. The extent to which the benefits of storage are or are not valued in competitive markets and solicitations; and

- c. The rate impacts of energy storage procurement on utility customers.<sup>1</sup>

The issues identified by Edison are outside the scope of Phase 2. Although Phase 2 is developing a methodology for evaluating cost effectiveness, the focus is on identifying the applicable costs and benefits categories that should be utilized in determining cost-effectiveness in each use case. Edison's request, on the other hand, seeks to litigate cost and benefit amounts. It is beyond the scope of this proceeding to determine specific amounts to be used in the cost-effectiveness models. In fact, as has been explained by Staff in workshops, the costs used in the models under review are for illustration only. Thus, while the cost-effective methodology may inform the Commission whether to pursue certain use cases, application of the model to specific energy storage projects is beyond the scope of this proceeding. As such, any impact of these projects on rates is premature.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reply Comments of Southern California Edison Company to Opening Comments on the Energy Storage Phase 2 Interim Staff Report and Energy Storage Workshops and Request for Evidentiary Hearings, filed February 21, 2013 at 12.

The disputed factual issues raised by Edison are outside the scope of this proceeding. Moreover, the disputed facts identified by Edison are not material for the Commission to make its policy determinations for energy storage in this proceeding.

**IT IS RULED** that Southern California Edison Company's request for evidentiary hearings is denied.

Dated February 28, 2013, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ AMY C. YIP-KIKUGAWA

Amy C. Yip-Kikugawa  
Administrative Law Judge