



COM/MBL/mef 10/1/2021

**FILED**  
10/01/21  
02:27 PM

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

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2023. (U39M.)

Application 21-06-021

**ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S SCOPING MEMO AND RULING**

This Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo) sets forth the issues, need for hearing, schedule, category, and other matters necessary to scope this proceeding pursuant to Public Utilities Code (Pub. Util. Code) § 1701.1 and Article 7 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules).

**1. Procedural Background**

On June 30, 2021, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed Application (A.) 21-06-021, requesting authority to approve its Test Year (TY) 2023 general rate case (GRC).<sup>1</sup> PG&E requests a 2023 TY revenue requirement of \$15.46 billion for its gas and electric distribution, gas transmission and storage, and electric generation programs. This is a 9.6 percent increase over its 2022 adopted revenue requirement of \$11.9 billion.<sup>2</sup> PG&E's request is based on its proposal for expense and capital forecasts for the 2023 TY.

---

<sup>1</sup> The PG&E Application and other documents filed in this proceeding are available on the Commission's website at the *Docket Card*.

<sup>2</sup> PG&E Application at 2. The \$11.6 billion amount is derived from subtracting the TY 2023 revenue requirement from the incremental rate increase over PG&E's 2022 revenue requirement, which is \$15.46 billion minus \$3.56 billion.

According to the Commission's recent GRC rate case plan,<sup>3</sup> PG&E's GRC cycle is four years. Therefore, PG&E also seeks approval for its attrition mechanism, which will identify its forecasted program expenditures for 2024, 2025, and 2026. In addition, PG&E requests the Commission to approve recovery of costs recorded in certain memorandum and balancing accounts for 2019, 2020, 2021, and 2022.

On July 16, 2021, PG&E filed a motion requesting that the Commission order the rates in the instant Application to become effective on January 1, 2023.

On July 23, 2021, The Utility Reform Network (TURN) filed a motion for party status, which was subsequently granted by the then-assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ).

On July 26, 2021, TURN filed a motion for reassignment of the then-assigned ALJ on peremptory challenge. In response, the Commission's Chief ALJ issued a ruling granting TURN's motion and reassigning the proceeding.

Seven parties filed responses to the Application.<sup>4</sup> Twelve parties filed protests.<sup>5</sup> PG&E filed a reply to the protests and responses.

---

<sup>3</sup> Decision (D.) 20-01-002, *Decision Modifying the Commission's Rate Case Plan for Energy Utilities* (January 6, 2020) at Appendix A, Table 1 Adopted Revised GRC Application Filing Schedule Effective June 30, 2020.

<sup>4</sup> Coalition of California Utility Employees (CUE); Gill Ranch Storage, LLC (Gill Ranch); National Diversity Coalition (Diversity Coalition); Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain); Small Business Utility Associates (SBUA); Southern California Edison Company (SCE); and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) (collectively, SoCalGas/SDG&E).

<sup>5</sup> City of Palo Alto, California and Southern California Generation Coalition (together, SCGC/City of Palo Alto); California Farm Bureau Federation; California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA); Energy Producers and Users Coalition (EPUC); Citadel Energy Market LLC and Tourmaline Oil Marketing Corp. (Citadel Energy/Tourmaline); Lodi Gas Storage, L.L.C., Wild Goose Storage, LLC, Central Valley Gas Storage, LLC (together,

*Footnote continued on next page.*

FEITA Bureau of Excellence LLC, American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), Engineers and Scientist of California, Local 20 filed motions for party status, which the assigned ALJs granted.

On August 5, 2021, TURN filed a motion requesting the Commission to direct PG&E to supplement its testimony with an inflation constrained alternative spending plan. PG&E filed a response.

A prehearing conference was held on August 30, 2021 to address issues of law and fact, determine the need for evidentiary hearings, set the schedule for the proceeding, and address other matters, as necessary. During the prehearing conference, parties were invited to discuss pending motions, which I address below. At the prehearing conference, the ALJs granted motions for party status by Center for Accessible Technology, Calpine Corporation, and California Community Choice Association.

After considering the protests and responses, PG&E's responses and replies, the motions, and the discussion at the prehearing conference, I have determined the issues and schedule of the proceeding to be set forth in this Scoping Memo.

## **2. Issues**

The issues in the scope of this proceeding to be determined or otherwise considered are as follows:

1. Whether PG&E's proposed revenue requirements, proposed costs, and proposed recovery mechanisms

---

Independent Storage Providers or ISPs); Indicated Shippers; Public Advocates Office of the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates); Mussey Grade Road Alliance (Mussey Grade); Northern California Generation Coalition (NCGC); Pioneer Community Energy, Marin Clean Energy, City and County of San Francisco, East Bay Community Energy, Peninsula Clean Energy Authority, San Jose Clean Energy, Sonoma Clean Power Authority, and Silicon Valley Clean Energy Authority (collectively, Joint Community Choice Aggregators); and TURN.

- for TY 2023 are just and reasonable, and should be adopted by the Commission.
2. Whether PG&E's proposed post-test year forecast adjustment mechanisms, and regulatory filings for 2024, 2025, and 2026 are just and reasonable, and should be adopted by the Commission.
  3. Whether PG&E's recorded costs in balancing and memorandum accounts for 2019 through 2021 are just and reasonable, consistent with legislative and Commission requirements, and should be adopted by the Commission and whether this proceeding should be extended to consider recorded costs in balancing and memorandum accounts for 2022.
  4. How to mitigate any identified impacts of PG&E's Application on environmental and social justice communities, including the extent to which any of PG&E's proposals impact the achievement of any of the nine goals of the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan.<sup>6</sup>
  5. How to mitigate any identified safety considerations, including wildfire-related matters, associated with PG&E's request.

Because parties sought clarification on whether certain specific matters fall within the above scope of issues, I clarify that the below matters, among other matters, are included within the scope of issues:

- a. the impact of the proposed rate increase on affordability and disconnections for non-payment;
- b. whether the identified risks in PG&E's June 2020 Risk Assessment and Mitigation Phase (RAMP) report have been adequately integrated into this GRC proceeding, and whether mitigation programs and projects that address

---

<sup>6</sup> Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan is available on the Commission's website at: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/news-and-updates/newsroom/environmental-and-social-justice-action-plan>.

- safety risks are reasonably balanced with the costs associated with such programs and projects; and
- c. whether the forecasted wildfire mitigation-related costs, inclusive of forecasted capital, operation, and maintenance expenses, are just and reasonable, and whether they are consistent with Assembly Bill 1054.

### **3. Certain Matters Raised in Protests, Motions, and Requests**

During the prehearing conference, the ALJs discussed certain protests, motions, and requests with PG&E and the other parties. I make the following determinations on these protests, motions, and requests:

1. In TURN's August 5, 2021 protest, it requests the Commission to clarify whether the scope of this proceeding includes affirmative, rather than solely responsive, proposals from parties, provided that the affirmative proposals address issues properly within the scope of this proceeding. Alternatively, TURN requests the Commission to open a companion investigation proceeding, similar to the proceeding the Commission opened for PG&E's 2007 GRC.<sup>7</sup> I find it reasonable to allow parties to present proposals that are both relevant to this proceeding and not already raised by PG&E. GRC proceedings occur once every few years and typically involve numerous key stakeholders, making it an optimal proceeding for evaluating proposals that may impact PG&E's revenue requirement.

2. TURN requests the Commission to direct PG&E to submit 2021 recorded expenditures in this proceeding by March 15, 2022.<sup>8</sup> During the prehearing conference, PG&E stated it would provide its 2021 recorded expenditures by

---

<sup>7</sup> TURN August 5, 2021 Protest at 24, *citing* A.05-12-002.

<sup>8</sup> TURN August 5, 2021 Protest at 32.

March 31, 2022. TURN did not oppose. I find PG&E's timeline reasonable. PG&E is directed to provide this data in PDF and Excel to promote efficient access by parties.

3. TURN requests that the Commission find that PG&E's testimony in Exhibit PG&E-3 at 7-53 falls outside the scope of this proceeding because it concerns PG&E's cost allocation position, which TURN states is an issue that the Commission will decide in the upcoming proceeding on the PG&E's gas transmission and storage (GT&S) cost allocation and rate design.<sup>9</sup> During the prehearing conference, PG&E explained that this testimony asserts its position on how much withdrawal capacity is needed at Los Medanos storage field, an issue PG&E claims falls within the scope of this proceeding. In making that assertion, PG&E states that a review of firm services provided to core customers must be evaluated. In response, TURN stated that its position is to ensure that the parties understand that cost allocation for PG&E's revenue requirement will be decided in the GT&S cost allocation and rate design proceeding, not the GRC. TURN also offered to confer with PG&E and the other parties to determine an approach for addressing TURN's concerns. I agree with TURN's approach and encourage the other parties to meet and confer with TURN and PG&E to resolve this issue.

4. TURN and Mussey Grade request the Commission direct PG&E to update its testimony to reflect the announcement by company executives stating that PG&E will initiate a multi-year effort to underground approximately 10,000 miles of distribution lines in high fire threat districts.<sup>10</sup> During the prehearing conference, PG&E explained that it is not requesting to modify the

---

<sup>9</sup> TURN August 5, 2021 Protest at 21-23.

<sup>10</sup> TURN August 5, 2021 Protest at 7-11; Mussey Grade August 5, 2021 Protest at 2-3 and 5-6.

forecasts for the undergrounding program at this time because the project is in the planning phase and PG&E lacks sufficient details. PG&E stated it will provide additional information concerning the project in its next Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which is due in February 2022. PG&E further stated it does not anticipate it will start the revised pace of work at that time. TURN raised concerns that PG&E's 10,000 mile undergrounding proposal was not vetted in the Commission's most recent Risk Assessment and Mitigation Phase, referred to as the RAMP proceeding. Similarly, Mussey Grade argued that PG&E should be required to demonstrate it examined alternative solutions because undergrounding is the most expensive wildfire mitigation measure.<sup>11</sup> Otherwise, Mussey Grade claims that allowing PG&E to move forward using a declaration would encourage other utilities to do the same and have a chilling effect on other wildfire mitigation strategies. I find that the undergrounding work proposed in PG&E's announcement could have a substantial impact on the forecasts in this proceeding for PG&E's wildfire-related mitigation programs, especially during the attrition years of this rate case cycle. The GRC is the most appropriate proceeding to authorize forecasted expenditures for the programs that support PG&E's utility services, including wildfire and risk mitigation activities. Accordingly, as set forth, below, in the proceeding's schedule, I direct PG&E to serve testimony to seek approval for any revisions to the forecasted expenditures for undergrounding programs that fall within the timeframe covered by this proceeding, including the extent to which the expenditure forecasts for its other wildfire mitigation programs should be revised, along with an explanation of

---

<sup>11</sup> In addition, in Protest filed on August 5, 2021, Cal Advocates, CLECA, and EPUC raised concerns regarding the need to review revised testimony if the pace of work for the undergrounding work is increased.

how those forecasted expenditures are consistent with PG&E's 2022 Wildfire Mitigation Plan.

5. TURN argues the Commission should consider bill affordability as it reviews PG&E's GRC Application because, by the end of the rate case cycle, the bills for CARE and non-CARE customers will increase by 44 and 45 percent, respectively, over PG&E's 2022 rates.<sup>12</sup> To that end, TURN requests the Commission to direct PG&E to prepare supplemental testimony that applies the Commission's affordability metrics set forth in D.20-07-032 to PG&E's currently authorized revenue requirement and PG&E's requested TY 2023 revenue requirement. During the prehearing conference, TURN argued that the Commission's affordability metrics have been approved for use in GRCs and for purposes of evaluating a utility's TY revenue requirement. PG&E disagreed and argued that the Commission has yet to determine how the affordability metrics set forth in D.20-07-032 will be used in proceedings. I find the affordability metrics in D.20-07-032 may be useful in providing a broader perspective on the impact of the potential rate changes resulting from a utility's proposed revenue requirement as part of a GRC proceeding. However, certain aspects of the affordability metrics remain in development. In addition, the Commission in D.20-07-032 did not mandate the analysis. Instead, under D.20-07-032, any stakeholder, and even the Commission's staff, is permitted to conduct the analysis themselves. For this proceeding, in an effort to further explore the available affordability metrics, I direct PG&E to work with Energy Division to prepare an analysis. I further direct PG&E to serve a report with this analysis on the service list of this proceeding. In preparing this report, PG&E is expected to

---

<sup>12</sup> TURN August 5, 2021 Protest at 4.



incorporate feedback from Energy Division. PG&E should serve this report at least one month before the due date for intervenor opening testimony to provide parties an opportunity to respond to PG&E's report.

6. I also address TURN's August 5, 2021 motion for PG&E to supplement its testimony with an inflation-constrained alternative spending plan. During the prehearing conference, CUE opposed TURN's proposal, arguing that it will preclude PG&E from implementing needed wildfire mitigation measures. CLECA and EPUC supported TURN's proposal. While I appreciate that TURN's proposal would offer an informative view of PG&E's GRC Application, a more comprehensive analysis of TURN's suggested approach to inflation-constrained alternative spending and, in addition, other approaches should first be analyzed by the Commission and stakeholders to better understand and determine whether such approaches would serve the intended purpose. In addition, any selected approach should ideally uniformly apply to all the large investor-owned utilities. Accordingly, I find TURN's motion is beyond the scope of this proceeding and the motion is denied.

7. In the SCGC/City of Palo Alto protest, it requests that the following two issues be considered in the GT&S cost allocation and rate design proceeding: validity of PG&E's reserve capacity service and whether PG&E can improve its curtailment process.<sup>13</sup> During the prehearing conference, PG&E explained that the Commission's 2019 GT&S decision, D.19-09-025, directed PG&E to propose improvements to its curtailment process so that it could reduce or eliminate its reserve capacity service and, in this Application, PG&E complied with that directive. However, PG&E concluded that using an hourly curtailment process

---

<sup>13</sup> SCGC/City of Palo Alto August 5, 2021 Protest at 2-5.

or performing other improvements are not feasible and are uneconomic. SCGC/City of Palo Alto stated that it previously suggested that PG&E consider implementing the hourly curtailment process that SoCalGas uses, and it reiterated its request that the Commission direct PG&E to serve a proposal in the GT&S cost allocation and rate design proceeding since it failed to include one in this proceeding. Indicated Shippers supported SCGC/City of Palo Alto's request. I agree with PG&E that the issue of whether its curtailment process could be improved is within the scope of the current proceeding. I encourage SCGC/City of Palo Alto to serve testimony if it disagrees with PG&E's position.

8. In addition, PG&E's Application proposes that the Commission authorize it to rely on a Tier 2 advice letter for cost recovery of the Caltrain Project addressed in D.20-05-008 if this proceeding is concluded before PG&E has the information required to serve testimony. In response, Caltrain states it supports PG&E's proposal to rely on the Tier 2 advice letter process and further states "[I]f the Commission is disinclined to authorize rate recovery through the proposed Tier 2 advice letter, Caltrain would request that the Commission direct PG&E as to the procedural manner in which it should proceed if the audit results are not available in time to be presented during Phase 1 of PG&E's 2023 GRC."<sup>14</sup> Caltrain further clarified at the prehearing conference that it seeks guidance on this procedural matter soon, if possible. I find that the Tier 2 advice letter process does not accommodate the Commission's directive in D.20-05-008 for PG&E to serve testimony to support its request for cost recovery for this matter. Testimony is not part of the advice letter process. As the Commission stated at Ordering Paragraph 6 of D.20-05-008, testimony pertaining to this

---

<sup>14</sup> Caltrain August 5, 2021 Response at 6.

matter is required, "Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall submit testimony specific to the Caltrain Project when it seeks recovery of the Caltrain Project costs explaining in detail why the costs that Pacific Gas and Electric Company proposes to recover from ratepayers are prudent and do not result in unjust and unreasonable rates. Any such testimony shall include the completed independent third-party audit of costs incurred to complete the Caltrain Project." PG&E and Caltrain do not explain why deviation from this relatively recent Commission directive is warranted now. However, in an effort to keep apprised of the progress on the underlying audit and any potential additional proposals or information by PG&E and Caltrain pertaining to prompt cost recovery, I direct PG&E and Caltrain to jointly file a report in this proceeding, every four months until this issue is resolved, with the first report due four months from today. These reports must provide, at a minimum, a brief status update on the expected timeline for completion of the audit. Motions or other procedural approaches may also be appropriate should parties seek to present specific proposals.

9. Lastly, on July 16, 2021, PG&E filed a motion requesting that the Commission order the rates in this Application to become effective on January 1, 2023. PG&E also requests authority to track its existing and final revenue requirements in certain memorandum accounts, as were approved in the 2020 GRC, and to earn interest on any differences in the revenue requirement at a rate that is equivalent to the Federal Reserve three-month commercial paper rate. To address this request, I have designed time in the schedule in 2022 for the Commission to vote on a proposed decision resolving this request before January 1, 2023.

#### **4. Need for Evidentiary Hearing**

Parties state that evidentiary hearings are needed due to various contested issues of material fact. I agree. Accordingly, I find that evidentiary hearings are needed on contested issues of material fact. The dates for evidentiary hearings are included in the schedule herein. Further details regarding the evidentiary hearings will be provided by ALJ Ruling as the date for these hearings approaches.

#### **5. Schedule**

The schedule for this proceeding will include two tracks. Track 1 will address the majority of matters presented in this proceeding, including PG&E's requested revenue requirement (Issues 1 and 2) together with safety and environmental and social justice issues (Issues 4 and 5). Track 2 will address the narrower matters of the reasonableness of the 2019-2021 actual costs recorded in the named memorandum accounts and balancing accounts (Issue 3) and, to the extent relevant, also address safety and environmental and social justice (Issues 4 and 5). Regarding PG&E's request in its Application that the Commission in 2023 address the reasonableness of 2022 actual recorded costs in memorandum accounts and balancing accounts in this proceeding, I plan to address the process for reviewing these 2022 actual recorded costs (which pertain to the so-called track 3 in PG&E's Application) in an Amended Scoping Memo, if needed.<sup>15</sup>

In setting the schedule for this proceeding, I recognize the schedule does not conform with the Commission's rate case plan schedule adopted in

---

<sup>15</sup> PG&E June 30, 2021 Application at 28-29.

D.20-01-002.<sup>16</sup> Multiple reasons exist for deviating from D.20-01-002. Efficient resolution of this proceeding weighs in favor of a schedule with multiple tracks. The schedule also needs to accommodate potential revisions to PG&E's forecasts in February 2022 due to the recent 10,000 mile undergrounding announcement by PG&E's executives and, in addition, the extent of these potential revisions are unknown at this time. The schedule also accommodates PG&E's request to serve testimony in July 2022 for the Commission to review significant recorded costs. None of these scheduling matters, which are specific to this proceeding, were contemplated by the Commission when recommending a rate case plan schedule in D.20-01-002.

Also, due to the vast amount of information presented in this proceeding, I have incorporated additional and mandatory *meet & confers*, which must all be noticed to the service list in accordance with Rule 13.9(b).

For all these reasons, I also find that this proceeding may not be resolved within 18 months set forth in Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5. Accordingly, as permitted by Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5, I set the statutory deadline of this proceeding at a later date to encompass 24 months, June 30, 2023.

The following schedule, which includes two tracks, is adopted and may be modified by the ALJ as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the Application.

---

<sup>16</sup> D.20-01-002, *Decision Modifying the Commission's Rate Case Plan for Energy Utilities* (January 6, 2020) at Appendix A, Table 1 Adopted Revised GRC Application Filing Schedule Effective June 30, 2020.

### Schedule for A.21-06-021 PG&E TY 2023 GRC - Track 1 & Track 2

A21-06-021 - Event	Track 1 - Review of 2023 TY Revenue Requirement and Attrition Years 2024, 2025, 2026	Track 2 - Reasonableness Review of Recorded Costs for 2019, 2020, and 2021 for Memorandum & Balancing Accounts
PG&E Testimony	June 30, 2021	July 22, 2022
Scoping Memo of Assigned Commissioner	October 1, 2021	TBD - Amended Scoping Memo issued, if needed
Public Participation Hearings (virtual)	January/February 2022	November 2022
PG&E Status Report on Changes to Cost Forecast for Wildfire Programs and, if needed, PG&E Seeks Permission for Supplemental Testimony	February 2022	N/A
PG&E serves Affordability Metrics Report	At least one month prior to Intervenor Opening Testimony	TBD
PG&E Testimony on 2021 Recorded Expenditures	Before March 22, 2022	N/A
Intervenors - Opening Testimony	March 30, 2022	November 14, 2022
PG&E and Intervenors - Concurrent Rebuttal Testimony	April 29, 2022	December 14, 2022
Duty to Meet & Confer - Rule 13.9 and Additional Meet and Confer Requirements (mandatory)	Between May 1, 2022 and May 31, 2022, at a minimum 4 times	Between December 15, 2022 and January 20, 2023, at a minimum 2 times
Status Conference (virtual) on Procedural Matters and Report on Meet & Confer	TBD by ALJ Ruling - Held on Date Prior to Evidentiary Hearings	TBD by ALJ Ruling - Held on Date Prior to Evidentiary Hearings
Evidentiary Hearings begin (virtual)	May 16, 2022	January 23, 2023
Evidentiary hearings end (virtual)	May 31, 2022	January 27, 2023
Meet & Confer (mandatory)	TBD by ALJ Ruling - Held on Date Prior to Briefing and Updated Testimony, if any	TBD by ALJ Ruling - Held on Date Prior to Briefing, and Updated Testimony, if any.
Status Conference (virtual)	TBD - by ALJ Ruling - Held on Date Prior to Briefing and Updated Testimony, if permitted	TBD - by ALJ Ruling - Held on Date Prior to Briefing and Updated Testimony, if permitted
Parties Request Permission for Updated Testimony, if any	June 13, 2022	N/A
Updated Testimony, to the extent requested and permitted.	June 17, 2022	N/A
Motions for Additional Evidentiary Hearing on Updated Testimony	June 24, 2022	N/A
Additional Evidentiary Hearing, if permitted, on Updated Testimony (virtual)	July 11-13, 2022	N/A
Joint Comparison Exhibit (file in proceeding)	July 20, 2022	February 3, 2023

Opening Briefs	August 31, 2022	February 24, 2023
Reply Briefs	September 30, 2022	March 24, 2023
Proceeding Submitted, unless otherwise designated - Rule 13.15(a)	March 24, 2023	March 24, 2023
Proposed Decision published on the July 16, 2021 PG&E Motion for Interim Rates	4th Quarter 2022	N/A
Decision on PG&E's Motion for Interim Rates placed on Commission Agenda	4th Quarter 2022	N/A
Proposed Decision published on A.21-06-021 and PUC Sec. 311 Comments within 20 and 25 days	2nd Quarter 2023	2nd Quarter 2023
Decision on A.21-06-021 placed on Commission Agenda	2nd Quarter 2023	3rd Quarter 2023

## **6. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Program and Settlements**

The Commission's ADR program offers mediation, early neutral evaluation, and facilitation services, and uses ALJs who have been trained as neutrals. At the parties' request, the assigned ALJs can refer this proceeding to the Commission's ADR Coordinator. Additional ADR information is available on the Commission's website.

I encourage parties to take advantage of these ADR resources or other resources available so that parties are able to present a consensus on matters.

Any settlement between parties, whether regarding all or some of the issues, shall comply with Article 12 of the Commission's Rules and shall be served in writing. Such settlements shall include a complete explanation of the settlement and a complete explanation of why it is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with the law and in the public interest. The proposing parties bear the burden of proof as to whether the settlement should be adopted by the Commission.

## **7. Category of Proceeding and Ex Parte Restrictions**

This ruling confirms the Commission's preliminary determination to categorize this proceeding as ratesetting.<sup>17</sup> Accordingly, *ex parte* communications are restricted and must be reported pursuant to Article 8 of the Commission's Rules. Pursuant to Rule 7.6 and § 1701.1(a), anyone who disagrees with this categorization must file an appeal of the categorization no later than 10 days after the date of this ruling.

## **8. Oral Argument**

Unless comment is waived pursuant to Rule 14.6(c)(2) for granting the uncontested relief requested in this proceeding, motion for oral argument shall be by no later than the time for filing comments on the proposed decision.

## **9. Public Outreach**

Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1711(a), I hereby report that the Commission sought the participation of those likely to be affected by this matter by noticing it in the Commission's monthly newsletter that is served on communities and business that subscribe to it and posted on the Commission's website. In addition, the assigned ALJ and I will host several remote public participation hearings, with some of these public participation hearings tailored to the interests of specific areas of PG&E's service territory, such as the San Joaquin Valley and areas that have been particularly impacted by Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) events. These remote hearings will be held both in the afternoon and evening hours.

---

<sup>17</sup> Resolution ALJ 176-3489 at 2.



## **10. Intervenor Compensation**

Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a)(1), a customer who intends to seek an award of compensation must file and serve a notice of intent to claim compensation by September 29, 2021, 30 days after the prehearing conference.

## **11. Public Comments**

Parties may, but are not required to, respond to written comments received from the public. (Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(g).) Parties may do so by posting such response using the *Add Public Comment* button on the *Public Comment* tab of the online docket card for the proceeding.

## **12. Public Advisor**

Any person interested in participating in this proceeding who is unfamiliar with the Commission's procedures or has questions about the electronic filing procedures is encouraged to obtain more information at the following link: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/about-cpuc/divisions/news-and-public-information-office/public-advisors-office> or contact the Commission's Public Advisor at 866-849-8390 or 866-836-7825 (TTY), or send an e-mail to [public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov).

## **13. Filing, Service, and Service List**

The official service list has been created and is on the Commission's website. Parties should confirm that their information on the service list is correct and serve notice of any errors on the Commission's Process office, the service list, and the ALJ. Persons or entities may become a party pursuant to Rule 1.4 of the Commission's Rules.

When serving any document, each party must ensure that it is using the most current official service list on the Commission's website.

This proceeding will follow the electronic service protocol set forth in Rule 1.10. All parties to this proceeding shall serve documents and pleadings

using electronic mail, transmitted no later than 5:00 p.m., on the date scheduled for service to occur. Rule 1.10 requires service on the ALJ of both an electronic and a paper copy of filed or served documents but, for this proceeding, the ALJ requests that the parties refrain from serving them paper copies.

When serving documents on Commissioners or their advisors, whether or not they are on the official service list, parties must only provide electronic service. Parties must not send paper copies of documents to Commissioners or their advisors unless specifically instructed to do so.

Persons who are not parties but wish to receive electronic service of documents filed in the proceeding may contact the Process Office at [process\\_office@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:process_office@cpuc.ca.gov) to request addition to the "Information-Only" category of the official service list pursuant to Rule 1.9(f).

#### **14. Receiving Electronic Service from the Commission**

Parties and other persons on the service list are advised that it is the responsibility of each person or entity on the service list for Commission proceedings to ensure their ability to receive e-mails from the Commission. Please add [@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:@cpuc.ca.gov) to your e-mail safe sender list and update your e-mail screening practices, settings and filters to ensure receipt of e-mails from the Commission.

#### **15. Assignment of Proceeding**

President Marybel Batjer is the assigned Commissioner. Regina DeAngelis is the assigned ALJ and the Presiding Officer for the proceeding.

**IT IS RULED** that:

1. The scope of this proceeding is described above and is adopted.

2. The schedule of this proceeding is set forth above and is adopted. The assigned Commissioner or the assigned Administrative Law Judge may revise the procedural schedule, as necessary.

3. Evidentiary hearing is needed and scheduled as set forth above.

4. The Presiding Officer is the assigned Administrative Law Judge.

5. The category of the proceeding is ratesetting.

This order is effective today.

Dated October 1, 2021, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MARYBEL BATJER

Marybel Batjer  
Assigned Commissioner