

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) For Authority to, Among Other Things, Increase Its Authorized Revenues For Electric Service in 2003, And to Reflect That Increase in Rates.

Application 02-05-004
(Filed May 3, 2002)

Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Rates, Operations, Practices, Service and Facilities of Southern California Edison Company.

Investigation 02-06-002
(Filed June 6, 2002)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING ON
EXHIBITS AND TRANSCRIPT CORRECTIONS**

Exhibits

The Joint Comparison Exhibit served by Southern California Edison Company (SCE) on March 24, 2003 is identified as Exhibit 403 and will be received in evidence.

On March 28, 2003 the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) served an exhibit consisting of errata to Exhibit 114, Chapter 16. The errata exhibit is hereby identified as Exhibit 404 and by this ruling will be received in evidence; provided, however, that parties may raise objections to the receipt of Exhibit 404 by so notifying the undersigned within seven days of the date of this ruling. In the event of an objection to the receipt of Exhibit 404, this ruling may be rescinded or modified by further ruling.

Transcript Corrections

SCE, The Utility Reform Network (TURN), San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Aglet Consumer Alliance, and County of Los Angeles have proposed transcript corrections. TURN has timely served objections to certain of the corrections proposed by SCE. TURN objects to proposed corrections that materially alter the testimony concerning disputed issues or clean up testimony properly transcribed without a change in meaning.

SCE submitted a letter in response to TURN's objections.¹ In some cases SCE withdraws its proposed corrections, while in other cases it continues to believe that the corrections it proposes are warranted. SCE included with its response affidavits of several of its witnesses and attorneys stating the belief of the witness or attorney that the proposed corrections accurately reflect what was said on the record.

Attachment A to this ruling sets forth the transcript corrections that I am adopting. The purpose of transcript corrections is neither to materially alter nor to dress up the appearance of what a witness or attorney actually said. Where TURN objects, proposals to make such changes are generally rejected unless I determine the correction is supported by SCE's affidavits or is otherwise warranted. For example, at page 1414, line 11 of Volume 18, the transcript shows that SCE witness Kelly stated that "shareholders" receive the benefits of certain expenditures. SCE proposes that the transcript be corrected to read "ratepayers." No one can know with certainty whether the witness misspoke and stated

¹ The March 11, 2003 ruling establishing post-hearing procedures did not provide for such responses. In view of the informality of the procedure for proposing transcript corrections and objections by letter, I hereby accept SCE's response.

“shareholders” when he meant “ratepayers,” or whether the transcript incorrectly shows “shareholders” when he actually stated “ratepayers.” Taking into account the entire context of the testimony, including the question by ORA’s attorney and the entire answer; Kelly’s supporting affidavit; as well as the possibility of mistranscription, I am persuaded that TURN’s objection should be overruled and that the proposed correction is justified. On the other hand, I have rejected proposed corrections, even where supported by an affidavit, if the case is less compelling.

SCE proposed two corrections for Volume 12, page 502. I selected the correction that appears more complete and rejected the other. SCE’s proposal to change “Silomar” to “Sylmar” at page 1039, line 6 of Volume 16 is appropriate but its proposal to make the same change “Throughout” is rejected because it lacks specific page and line references. In some cases I have taken the liberty of correcting SCE’s statement of the current transcript. For example, SCE proposes to change what it cites as “disconnected” to “disconnected” at page 1138, line 2 of Volume 16. What actually appears at line 2, and what clearly requires correction, is “disconnecteded.” Similarly, SCE proposes to change what it cites as “customers as” to “customers. As” at page 1216, line 11 of Volume 17. What actually appears at line 11 is “consumers, as.” Still another apparent error has found its way into SCE’s proposed corrections. At page 1219, line 17 of Volume 17, SCE proposes to change “transmission for the program charges” to “transmission, for the public purpose program changes.” I believe that SCE meant to leave “charges” unchanged, and I have done so. Where incorrect page references were given and I was able to find the correct reference, I made the appropriate correction. For example, SCE proposed a correction at page 110 of Volume 21. I was able to determine that the location of the requested change

actually appears at page 1787, and accepted that change. As another example, SCE seeks to change “based in” to “based on” at page 2099, line 8 of Volume 24, and I determined that the change should be made at page 2096, line 8.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The Joint Comparison Exhibit served on March 24, 2003 is identified as Exhibit 403 and received into evidence.
2. The Office of Ratepayer Advocates’ errata exhibit served on March 28, 2003 is identified as Exhibit 404 and received into evidence, subject to the provision for objections set forth in the foregoing discussion.
3. The transcript corrections set forth in the attachment (Attachment A) are hereby adopted; the proposed corrections not included in Attachment A are rejected.

Dated April 16, 2003, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MARK S. WETZELL

Mark S. Wetzell

Administrative Law Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have by mail, and electronic mail, to the parties to which an electronic mail address has been provided, this day served a true copy of the original attached Administrative Law Judge's Ruling On Exhibits and Transcript Corrections on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record.

Dated April 16, 2003, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ CLAIRE JOHNSON
Claire Johnson

N O T I C E

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

The Commission's policy is to schedule hearings (meetings, workshops, etc.) in locations that are accessible to people with disabilities. To verify that a particular location is accessible, call: Calendar Clerk (415) 703-1203.

If specialized accommodations for the disabled are needed, e.g., sign language interpreters, those making the arrangements must call the Public Advisor at

A.02-05-004, I.02-06-002 MSW/cgj

(415) 703-2074, TTY 1-866-836-7825 or (415) 703-5282 at least three working days in advance of the event.