



COM/GSH/mef 6/25/2021

**FILED**  
06/25/21  
02:46 PM

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking  
Concerning Energy Efficiency Rolling  
Portfolios, Policies, Programs,  
Evaluation, and Related Issues.

Rulemaking 13-11-005

**ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S AMENDED SCOPING MEMO  
AND RULING FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE REGARDING  
ALLEGED VIOLATION OF DECISION 18-05-041 AND RULE 1 OF  
THE COMMISSION'S RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE**

This Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling (Amended Scoping Memo) revises the scope of the Order to Show Cause (OSC) initiated by ruling dated October 3, 2019.

On October 3, 2019, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), in the instant proceeding, issued a ruling granting a motion filed by the Public Advocate's Office (Cal Advocates) of the Public Utilities Commission, wherein Cal Advocates alleged that Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas, or Respondent) violated Decision (D.) 18-05-041 by continuing to engage in codes and standards advocacy, and Rule 1.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure by providing misleading and inaccurate information regarding its codes and standards activities, and requested the Commission to initiate an OSC.

A prehearing conference (PHC) was held on October 22, 2019 to address the issues of law and fact, determine the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and address other matters as necessary. On

December 2, 2019, the assigned Commissioner issued a Scoping Memo determining the issues as follows:

Cal Advocates' motion makes two allegations to support its request for an OSC:

1. Respondent continued to charge ratepayers for energy efficiency codes and standards advocacy for nearly a month after the Commission ordered Respondent to cease such advocacy; and
2. Respondent submitted misleading and inaccurate information that minimized the full extent of its codes and standards advocacy after the Commission ordered Respondent to cease its ratepayer-funded advocacy.

If Cal Advocates' allegations are true, the issues to be determined are:

1. If Respondent failed to comply with D.18-05-041, should Respondent be fined, penalized, or have other sanctions imposed for such failure; and
2. Whether Respondent failed to comply with Rule 1.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, and if so, whether Respondent should be fined, penalized or have other sanctions imposed for such failure.

The assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo specified: "[t]he scope of this OSC shall not include any costs other than those referenced in Cal Advocates' motion (namely, the alleged codes and standards advocacy costs and associated allocated overhead costs)."

On August 24, 2020 and October 23, 2020, SoCalGas requested leave to serve supplemental testimony, which described certain activities that SoCalGas undertook after the timeframe covered by Cal Advocates' motion. The presiding officer granted both of Respondent's requests to serve supplemental testimony. The presiding officer held evidentiary hearings on November 2 and 3, 2020, and admitted exhibits including SoCalGas's supplemental testimony into evidence.

It is necessary to amend the scope of this OSC in order to consider the activities addressed in testimony, but that were not included in Cal Advocates' motion. Therefore, this Amended Scoping Memo amends the scope of this OSC to include the activities addressed in SoCalGas's August 24, 2020 and October 23, 2020 supplemental testimony.

**IT IS RULED** that:

1. The scope of this proceeding is amended as described above and is adopted.
2. All other determinations reached in the December 2, 2019 scoping ruling remain in effect.

This order is effective today.

Dated June 25, 2021, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ GENEVIEVE SHIROMA  
Genevieve Shiroma  
Assigned Commissioner