

ALJ/SW9/cmf 10/24/2022



FILED

10/24/22

11:57 AM

A2203006

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric
Company for Approval of 2023-2026
Clean Energy Optimization Pilot
U39E.

Application 22-03-006

**E-MAIL RULING CANCELLING EVIDENTIARY HEARING AND DIRECTING
PARTIES TO ANSWER QUESTIONS**

Dated October 24, 2022, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ STEPHANIE WANG
Stephanie Wang
Administrative Law Judge

From: Wang, Stephanie <Stephanie.Wang@cpuc.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 10:41 AM
To: 'Douglass@EnergyAttorney.com' <douglass@energyattorney.com>;
James.Whooley@sce.com; Shek, Selina <selina.shek@cpuc.ca.gov>;
Jennifer.ReyesLagunero@pge.com; RegRelCPUCCases@pge.com; Wynn, Cheryl
<Cheryl.Wynn@cpuc.ca.gov>; Alberto.Gonzalez@sce.com; Case Admin
<Case.Admin@sce.com>; ElizabethB.Gomez@sce.com; Buchholz, Adam
<Adam.Buchholz@cpuc.ca.gov>; aeo@cpuc.ca.gov; Donovan, James
<James.Donovan@cpuc.ca.gov>; Perez-Green, Joanna <Joanna.Perez-Green@cpuc.ca.gov>;
Lyser, Shelly <Shelly.Lyser@cpuc.ca.gov>; Wang, Stephanie <Stephanie.Wang@cpuc.ca.gov>;
js8@cpuc.ca.gov; Rehman, Uzma <Uzma.Rehman@cpuc.ca.gov>; Ana.Gonzalez@pge.com;
Eric.Sezgen@pge.com; ryan.chan@pge.com; scott.fable@pge.com; v1ak@pge.com;
meghan.dewey@pge.com; MeganMMyers@yahoo.com; Andrew@arc-alternatives.com;
Eric.Eberhardt@ucop.edu; Policy@CEDMC.org; elsi@caliberstrat.com
Cc: ALJ_Hearing Requests <ALJ_HearingRequests@cpuc.ca.gov>; Gutierrez, Thomas
<Thomas.Gutierrez@cpuc.ca.gov>; ALJ_Support ID <alj_supportid@cpuc.ca.gov>; ALJ Docket
Office <ALJ_Docket_Office@cpuc.ca.gov>; Cox, Rory <rory.cox@cpuc.ca.gov>
Subject: A.22-03-006 (PG&E Clean Energy Optimization Pilot): Ruling cancelling evidentiary
hearing and directing parties to answer questions

Service list of A.22-03-006:

This ruling cancels the evidentiary hearing previously scheduled for November 7, 2022 and directs parties to answer the questions in this ruling.

On October 13, 2022, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) notified this service list that the parties to this proceeding agreed that there is no need for hearings and that parties are in the process of scheduling discussions regarding a potential settlement. Accordingly, this ruling cancels the evidentiary hearing previously scheduled for November 7, 2022.

This ruling directs parties to include in any settlement agreement explicit and thorough answers to the following questions in the order presented below. If the parties do not explicitly address any or all of these questions in a settlement agreement, the parties shall address the remaining questions in opening briefs in the order presented below.

1. Answer each of the questions listed in Section 2 of the scoping memo (Issues) in the order presented in the scoping memo.
2. Answer each of the questions listed in Section 3 of the scoping memo (Supplemental Testimony) in the order presented in the scoping memo.
3. What is the estimated impact of the proposed budget on the residential Climate Credit (in the aggregate and for each residential customer) during each year of the program? Is this estimated impact on the residential Climate Credit reasonable?

4. Why is it reasonable to use Public Purpose Program funds for costs of this pilot program to the extent that cap-and-trade allowance revenues are not sufficient in a given year? What is the basis for use of these funds from legal and policy perspectives?
5. Why is it reasonable to approve a pilot size and budget based on the needs of the campuses in PG&E territory rather than based on data needs or the size of the Southern California Edison Company (SCE) pilot?
 - a. How many campuses need to participate (and what associated budget is necessary) for the pilot program to gather sufficient data and experience to learn from the pilot and determine whether the pilot should be expanded with modifications in the future?
 - b. What does initial SCE pilot data and lessons learned indicate about the appropriate number of campuses and associated budget needed to conduct an informative pilot?
7. How should the pilot and evaluation be designed to provide insight into whether the approach of the pilot could be applied to different types of customers (e.g. multi-family residential, small business, agricultural, single family residential, other types of large commercial or industrial customers)?

Note that if the parties do not explicitly and sufficiently answer the questions in this ruling in a settlement agreement and/or opening briefs, I may schedule a hearing to address my remaining questions.

The Commission's docket office shall file this ruling.

Stephanie Wang (she)
Administrative Law Judge
California Public Utilities Commission
stephanie.wang@cpuc.ca.gov

(Pronunciation: Wang rhymes with song)

Notice: This communication may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.