



COM/DH7/hma 6/12/2025

FILED

06/12/25

03:45 PM

A2209006

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Gas Company (U904G), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902G), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U39G), and Southwest Gas Corporation (U905G) to Establish Hydrogen Blending Demonstration Projects.

Application 22-09-006

ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S SCOPING MEMO AND RULING

This scoping memo and ruling sets forth the issues, need for hearing, schedule, category, and other matters necessary to scope this proceeding pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1701.1 and Article 7 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules).

1. Background

On November 20, 2020, Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), Pacific Gas And Electric Company (PGE), and Southwest Gas Corporation (SW Gas) filed Application (A.) 20-11-004 and sought guidance and rate protection for any pilot projects they might launch to test the capacity of California's gas infrastructure to handle infusions of hydrogen gas above a *de minimis* level of 0.1 percent by volume.

On July 16, 2021, the Commission issued Decision (D.) 21-07-005, dismissing A.20-11-004 without prejudice,¹ and provided the utility applicants

¹ D.21-07-005 at pp. 23 - 26.

general guidance for hydrogen pilot projects in the event they should choose to develop one or more pilot(s).²

In September 2022, SoCalGas, SDG&E, and SW Gas filed the instant proceeding, A.22-09-006, and sought authorization to establish hydrogen blending demonstration projects. Specifically, the instant application proposed four pilot projects to test the gas infrastructure's capacity to handle transportation and storage of hydrogen above the 0.1 percent volume level.³

In December 2022, the Commission issued D.22-12-057 in Rulemaking (R.) 13-02-008, and directed SoCalGas, SDG&E, SW Gas and PG&E, to propose pilot projects that would help fill the gaps in research and understanding from the 2022 UC Riverside study on hydrogen blending in natural gas pipelines (Hydrogen Blending Impact Study).⁴

The Hydrogen Blending Impact Study, commissioned by the Commission, involved bench testing distribution-size pipe materials and associated attachments as are generally found in the distribution portion of the California gas infrastructure. This study evaluated the feasibility and risks of injecting hydrogen into the state's natural gas infrastructure, and highlighted key concerns such as hydrogen embrittlement in pipeline materials, increased leakage rates, and potential safety hazards due to hydrogen's unique molecular properties. The study found that while blends up to 5 percent may require minimal modifications, higher percentages could pose significant

² *Id.* at 22-23 (design guidance provided to utilities should they choose to proceed with development of a pilot project or projects).

³ Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) was not an initial applicant in proceeding A.22-09-006.

⁴ D.22-12-057, at OP 7, pp. 68 -69.

challenges for pipeline durability, end-use appliances, and gas metering accuracy. The extensive modeling and experimental work reviewed in the study indicated that steel pipelines may become more brittle when exposed to hydrogen and that polymeric materials may degrade faster in hydrogen-rich environments. The study recommended a phased approach to blending, starting with controlled field demonstrations in isolated sections of the gas network.

Lastly, upon release of the Hydrogen Blending Impact Study, Ordering Paragraphs (OPs) 7 and 10 of D.22-12-057 directed the utilities, within two years of that decision:

1. Either to amend the existing joint application in the instant proceeding, A.22-09-006, or file an entirely new joint application seeking authority to conduct pilot projects within two years of that decision. Any amended application or new application being filed pursuant to that directive must meet the specific design requirements detailed in OP 7, subsections a-l. Relevant OP 7 excerpt is attached as Appendix A for ease of reference; and
2. “[J]ointly file a Hydrogen Blending Compendium Report, with cost recovery to be determined pursuant to the utility budgeting requests for the pilot projects ordered by th[at] decision ... to identify existing studies and regulatory proceedings that are complete and underway and include findings related but not limited to” the issues identified in OP 10 of that decision at subsection a-h.

Pursuant to OP 7 of D.22-12-057, on March 1, 2024, the four utilities SoCalGas, SDG&E, SW Gas, and PG&E (collectively, Joint Applicants), filed an Amended Joint Application in this proceeding. The Amended Joint Application seeks authorization for individual Joint Applicants to undertake a total of five coordinated pilot projects that together would, according to the Joint Amended Application, test the ability of the existing statewide gas infrastructure to store

and transport safely natural gas blended with hydrogen above the currently allowable level of 0.1 percent.

The Hydrogen Blending Compendium Report (Compendium Report), which was ordered in OP 10 of D.22-12-057, was sponsored by SoCalGas, SDG&E, SW Gas and PG&E and recently completed. The Compendium Report was written by faculty from the Riverside campus of the University of California, the same university where the Commission-commissioned impact study described in the preceding paragraph was performed.

On February 14, 2025, the Compendium Report was filed by SoCalGas, SDG&E, SW Gas and PG&E (the Joint Applicants) in the docket of this proceeding. The Compendium Report identifies relevant, current information from sources around the world regarding the effect of hydrogen, by itself or blended, on pipelines and other equipment used to transport hydrogen to end users. The information contained in the Compendium Report will be used by the Joint Applicants when completing the design phases of their pilot projects so that the pilot projects will fill-in knowledge gaps that still exist regarding the effects of hydrogen when transported as a part of a blended gas. The Joint Applicants will carefully review the Compendium Report and conduct all pilot planning and efforts to avoid duplicative efforts while focusing each proposed project on known gaps in the existing body of scientific knowledge concerning the transportation of hydrogen blends as found in the Compendium Report.

A prehearing conference was held on June 28, 2024. On July 15, 2024, the Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club, Climate Action Campaign, and Utility Consumers' Action, Network (Moving Parties) filed a Motion to Dismiss (MTD) the entire Joint Amended Application filed on March 1, 2024. In their MTD, the Moving Parties asserted: (1) each of the five pilot projects proposed by the Joint

Applicants, if constructed as proposed, would violate Commission directives; (2) it would be an unacceptable waste of ratepayer money to build any one of the five proposed projects, much more so if all five were constructed⁵; and (3) to build and operate the five pilot projects would be an imprudent use of hydrogen.⁶

On July 30, 2024, the Joint Applicants filed a Joint Opposition Brief (Opposition) to oppose the MTD. The Moving Parties requested and were granted an opportunity to respond to the arguments made by the Joint Applicants in the Opposition. On August 9, 2024, the Moving Parties filed their Joint Reply Brief (Reply) in support of their MTD.

Other parties to the proceeding split their support, with some supporting the MTD (the Public Advocates Office, Wild Tree Foundation, Southern California Generation Coalition, Orange Cove United, and Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability) and others opposing (California Hydrogen Business Council, Green Hydrogen Coalition) the MTD.

On October 28, 2024, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Charles Ferguson denied the MTD in its entirety as premature and ordered the proceeding to continue.

Based on the record of this proceeding to date, including (1) the Amended Joint Application filed by the Joint Applicants, (2) the Hydrogen Blending Impact Study and the Compendium Report, both of which were prepared by faculty at UC Riverside, (3) the extensive briefing associated with the MTD, and (4) the

⁵ The aggregated cost of constructing the five proposed projects has been estimated by the four Joint Applicants as more than \$200 million. *See* MTD, at p. 6, Figure 1 (citing tendered but not admitted testimony of the Joint Applicants).

⁶ MTD at p. 1.

briefing for and discussions at the prehearing conference, I have determined the issues and remaining schedule of the proceeding to be as set forth below.

2. Project Descriptions

The Joint Applicants have proposed the following five pilot projects for Commission approval:

2.1 SoCalGas's Orange Cove Distribution Project

This project, one of two proposed by SoCalGas, is described in the Joint Amended Application as a test to “show what happens when hydrogen is blended into the distribution system and served to many customers with varied end uses.”⁷ SoCalGas proposes to develop a parcel of land (several contiguous acres) in an agricultural area on the outskirts of the City of Orange Cove, California. The parcel will contain both a 1.1 megawatt (MW) solar farm to produce electricity to power an appropriately sized electrolyzer that separates hydrogen from water and a blending apparatus that will both blend and then direct the hydrogen/natural gas mixture to approximately 10,000 Orange Cove residents through a total of 2,000 residential gas meters, and to 100 commercial enterprises in Orange Cove, while simultaneously preventing the hydrogen blend from entering the gas distribution and transmission lines outside the City of Orange Cove.⁸ SoCalGas intends to test the delivery of a blended natural gas and hydrogen mixture at volumetric levels between one and five percent hydrogen.

2.2 PG&E's Gas Transmission Project

PG&E's pilot project is proposed as a possible solution for the lack of operational data on the effects of hydrogen blending at transmission pressures

⁷ Amended Joint Application at p. 13.

⁸ *Ibid.* Orange Cove is located at the terminus of a SoCalGas distribution line.

on California's existing natural gas transmission infrastructure. PG&E states that it has designed its pilot to avoid duplication of all aspects of the four other pilots proposed in this proceeding as well as avoiding repetition of any aspects of field experiments in the world at large with blends of hydrogen and natural gas (methane). This project will be constructed on a 130-acre parcel of unimproved land leased from the City of Lodi and located away from the residential portions of Lodi. The project will be a full-scale, offline, testing facility to enable testing of full-scale transmission equipment compatibility with hydrogen, leak testing, and full-scale testing of the integrity of the transmission equipment. It is possible the facility will fill knowledge gaps associated with scaling-up from laboratory research to full-size transmission of hydrogen blends.

PG&E's proposed project will operate for a period of ten years, much longer than any of the four other proposed pilot projects in this proceeding. Furthermore, unlike SoCalGas's Orange Cove project, PG&E will begin with a blend of five percent hydrogen by volume and gradually work up to a blend containing 20 percent hydrogen. PG&E intends to accomplish all this by building a completely isolated, one mile or more, loop composed of high-pressure, transmission-size pipe which will be filled with a hydrogen/natural gas mixture whose volumetric ratio of hydrogen to natural gas will range up to 20 percent. The test loop is proposed to operate over multiple years to allow monitoring of the pipeline and transmission equipment's performance, integrity, operations and maintenance changes due to extended use of hydrogen blends. The transmission pipes used in the project will be representative of the high-pressure pipelines used by PG&E, which are mostly steel. However, provisions will be made to add other high pressure pipeline samples into the loop for testing for a short or long term, as appropriate. A control center facility will be

built on the premises to control and monitor the test loop. There will also be a laboratory building, an observation and data compilation building, a maintenance and storage facility and a small classroom building for, among other things, providing lectures to and interacting with the public on the work PG&E will be doing during the ten-year test period. PG&E states that it expects to load the project's pipeline loop with just natural gas first, up to a 100 percent saturation level. Then, over the course of the next two years, PG&E will inject hydrogen in five percent increments by pipeline volume up to 20 percent. PG&E further represents that each five percent increment will require as much as six months to accomplish. PG&E states that if it is possible it will increase the amount of hydrogen to a percentage higher than 20 percent but only if NCPA⁹ is willing to take the blend with higher than 20 percent of hydrogen to burn in its nearby electric generation station.

2.3 SW Gas's Cold Climate Distribution Project

The SW Gas project in Truckee, California, if successful, will reveal the behavior of hydrogen in a distribution and end-use setting at high altitude and in a very cold climate for part of each calendar year. SW Gas represents that its project will establish critical knowledge complementary to the other Joint Applicants' demonstration projects because it alone will target hydrogen blending in extremely cold weather conditions in Northern California.¹⁰ The other Joint Applicants will be building their test projects in milder, warmer climates. On the other hand, SW Gas points out that its demonstration project is much like the others in that it will need to assess the same safety measures

⁹ Northern California Power Agency, a power generation agency owned by several California municipalities.

¹⁰ Proffered Testimony of SW Gas witness Lang at p. 1.

required for all five projects, namely, leak detection, emergency shutdown procedures, and risk mitigation strategies.

The SW Gas project is like the SoCalGas Orange Cove project in an important way – Truckee’s resident population and visitors will be continually exposed participants in the pilot project. SW Gas intends to construct a project that will inject hydrogen into a distribution line that serves three comparatively large buildings located in Truckee’s business district. The three proposed buildings are: (i) its own office building in Truckee; (ii) the California Highway Patrol’s Office building in Truckee; and (iii) a newly constructed multi-use commercial/residential building in Truckee.

2.4 SDG&E’s Isolated Distribution Project

This project, according to SDG&E, will contribute information useful for developing a statewide hydrogen blending standard for polyethylene pipes in the California gas infrastructure that could then deliver blends of hydrogen gas from 5 – 20 percent by volume at moderate (50 – 70 psi) pressures.

SDG&E initially proposed to locate its pilot project on the campus of the University of California at San Diego (UCSD). However, UCSD has recently informed SDG&E that the school is no longer willing to act as the host location for SDG&E’s pilot project. Accordingly, on May 28, 2025, SDG&E served newly prepared testimony describing a somewhat different project design.

SDG&E still proposes it will test polyethylene pipe that is representative of the polyethylene pipe currently in use in the statewide gas distribution system. Though often referred to by SDG&E as a “loop,” the project’s distribution pipe will simply deliver hydrogen from its start point, a storage tank, to a fuel cell 200 feet away. The scale of this project is still the smallest of the five pilot projects proposed by the Joint Applicants. This project will be entirely

disconnected from SDG&E's existing natural gas system. It will be entirely located on a 47-acre site owned by SDG&E and used by SDG&E for more than 60 years as a site for storing its construction equipment and supplies. SDG&E's recently filed testimony further explains that SDG&E will manufacture its own hydrogen for the pilot project, on another site that it owns, using solar power.

2.5 SoCalGas's Gas UC Irvine Distribution Project

SoCal Gas has applied for authority to conduct a second hydrogen pilot project in conjunction with the University of California at Irvine. This proposal is to conduct a much smaller test than SoCalGas's Orange Cove proposal. SoCal Gas proposes to isolate the gas supplied to buildings at the student center area of the university campus. This area of the campus includes the university's gymnasium and recreation complex. Only the buildings in this portion of the campus will receive a blend of hydrogen and natural gas. The hydrogen in the mixture will range between 5 - 20 percent by volume. The mixture will travel through both steel and plastic distribution pipes and be delivered to heating and cooking equipment (furnaces, water heaters, and stove tops) within the center's buildings. The buildings involved in the project will continue to operate as they do now, with students and members of the public entering and exiting for sporting and recreational activities. An existing parking lot for approximately 200 cars would be devoted to the project. The electrolyzer and blending equipment would cover a small portion of the lot and the remainder of the lot, as we understand it, would be covered with a solar array to supply the electricity to run the electrolyzer(s) and blender. The natural gas delivered to the parking lot and the blended gas delivered to the end use equipment would be at distribution levels of pressure (60 -70 psi)

3. Issues

The issues to be determined in the proceeding are set forth below:

1. Do the pilots conform to regulatory requirements?
 - a. How does each pilot comply with specific requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code and D.22-12-057?
 - b. If there are any exemptions or waivers being requested for any pilot project, are there sufficient justification?
 - c. Does each pilot project align with broader state energy and climate goals? If so, how?
2. Are the pilots useful and well designed?
 - a. What specific knowledge gap does each pilot project address that isn't covered in the Hydrogen Blending Impact Report and Hydrogen Blending Compendium Report? How would the findings of each pilot project complement the research summarized in those reports?
 - b. How will the additional knowledge, contributed by each project, be useful to utility operators and state policy makers?
 - c. How is success defined and measured for each pilot project? How will pilot project's progress toward project success and desired outcome be reported to the Commission?
 - d. What alternative approaches or experimental sites were considered for studying the specific problem being addressed by each pilot project? Why was the specific site and experimental design chosen among the alternatives considered?
 - e. How will the ultimate findings from these pilot projects be documented, validated, and shared with stakeholders and the Commission?
 - f. What would be needed to move from a pilot project to full implementation if the pilot project was successful?
3. Are the pilots prudent?

- a. What is the detailed cost breakdown for each pilot project, including equipment, monitoring, safety system, and administration?
 - b. What specific benefits will gas ratepayers receive from investment in these pilot projects?
 - c. What cost-sharing arrangements have been made or pursued with potential non-ratepayer beneficiaries of this research?
 - d. How will cost overruns be handled?
4. Are the pilot projects safe?
- a. What comprehensive risk assessment has been conducted (i) for each pilot project; (ii) for the specific hydrogen blend percentages attempted in each project; and (iii) for each segment of the California gas infrastructure for which the pilot project was designed?
 - b. Beyond monitoring, what automated safety systems and shutdown protocols are in place for each pilot project?
 - c. What baseline testing of infrastructure integrity has been and will be completed prior to pilot project implementation?
 - d. How have emergency response plans been updated specifically for hydrogen incidents at each pilot project?
 - e. What specific outreach has been conducted with communities potentially affected by each pilot project and how has informed consent been documented?
 - f. How does each utility plan to monitor and assess hydrogen embrittlement of the gas components within its pilot project(s)?
5. Are the pilots equitable and do the pilots create any positive or negative community impacts?
- a. How were pilot project locations selected?
 - b. What measures ensure equitable distribution of risks and benefits for each project?

- c. How were community stakeholders in each pilot project included in the planning process?
- d. What ongoing community engagement is planned during implementation of each pilot project?
- e. What, if any are the impacts on environmental and social justice communities, including the extent to which these pilots impact achievement of any of the nine goals of the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan.

4. Need for Evidentiary Hearing

Parties have indicated that they believe there are contested, material issues of fact. Therefore, I find that evidentiary hearings are needed.

5. Schedule

The following schedule is adopted, but it may be modified by the Assigned Commissioner or assigned Administrative Law Judge as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the Amended Joint Application.

Event	Date
Service of all Intervenor's prepared testimony not yet served	July 14, 2025
Service of all Rebuttal testimony	July 31, 2025
Party responses to the questions set forth in Appendix B to this Scoping Memo, filed and served.	Within 45 days from issuance of this Scoping Memo
Reply comments to responses to the questions in Appendix B, filed and served.	Within 15 days after the responses to the questions in Appendix B are filed
Last day for Rule 13.9 meeting to commence; joint report to be filed within 7 days of the meeting(s) conclusion	August 29, 2025

PPHs	As specified in ALJ's May 23, 2025 PPH ruling
Status Conference	Week of September 15, 2025
Evidentiary hearing	October 29 – November 10, 2025
Opening Briefs	TBD
Reply Briefs (Submission Date)	TBD
Proposed Decision	Not later than 90 days after Submission
Commission Decision	No sooner than 30 days after Proposed Decision

In-person Public Participation Hearings (PPHs) are scheduled in this proceeding and must be attended by a representative of the Applicant whose project site is the focus of the PPH. Each Applicant shall be allowed five minutes at the start of a PPH to describe their proposed project. One representative of all parties who are opposed to the specific project which is the focus of a PPH will be allowed five minutes to present a composite of the views of the opposing parties. Both the assigned ALJ and/or I will preside at each PPH and may direct the Applicant's representative to respond to one or more comments from the public, as appropriate. A court reporter will be present at each PPH to make a complete record of each PPH. The allotted time for each member of the public to speak will be announced at each PPH.¹¹

The purpose of the status conference is to ascertain whether, pursuant to Rule 13.8(c), the parties stipulate to the receipt of prepared testimony into

¹¹ No comments on the Compendium Report shall be filed. Intervenor's prepared Direct Testimony may contain comments by competent witnesses on the Compendium. Likewise, Applicants' prepared Rebuttal Testimony may contain responses to such testimony as may be offered by Intervenor's.

evidence without direct or cross examination or other need to convene an evidentiary hearing or, in the alternative, the parties' resources, readiness and needs for the effective conduct of the evidentiary hearing, including estimates of time requested for cross-examination and identification of anticipated exhibits.

The organization of prepared testimony, not yet served, and briefs must correlate to the identified issues set out above.

In addition to the requirements of Rule 1.9, Rule 1.10, and Rule 13.7(f), parties shall serve two hard copies of the prepared testimony on the assigned ALJ and Assigned Commissioner.

The proceeding will stand submitted upon the filing of Reply Briefs, unless the Assigned Commissioner or ALJ requires further evidence or argument.

Due to the various developments and complexity of the issues presented in this proceeding, pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 1701.5(b), the time to resolve this ratesetting proceeding will be set as June 20, 2026.

6. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Program

The Commission's Alternative Dispute Resolution (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 ALJ can refer this proceeding to the Commission's ADR Coordinator. Additional ADR information is available on the Commission's website.¹²

The schedule set forth in this Scoping Memo includes a date, June 2, 2025, for the completion of settlement talks. No later than this date, the parties will file a status report of their efforts, identifying agreements reached and unresolved issues requiring hearing. Any settlements between parties, whether regarding all

¹² <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/adr/>

or some of the issues, shall comply with Article 12 of the 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 that this is a ratesetting proceeding. Accordingly, ex parte communications are restricted and must be reported pursuant to Article 8 of the Rules.

8. Public Outreach

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1711(a), where feasible and appropriate, before determining the scope of the proceeding, the Commission sought the participation of those likely to be affected, including those likely to derive benefit from, and those potentially subject to, a decision in this proceeding. This matter was noticed on the Commission's daily calendar. Where feasible and appropriate, this matter was incorporated into engagements conducted by the Commission's External Affairs Division with local governments and other interested parties.

9. Intervenor Compensation

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1804(a)(1), those intervenors who intend to seek an award of compensation must file and serve a notice of intent to claim compensation within 30 days after the prehearing conference.

10. Response to Public Comments

Parties may, but are not required to, respond to written comments received from the public. 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.

11. 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 <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.

12. 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 may become a party pursuant to Rule 1.4.¹³

When serving any document, each party must ensure that it is using the 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, whenever possible, 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. In this proceeding the ALJ only requires that two paper copies of prepared testimony be provided to him.

¹³ The form to request additions and changes to the Service list may be found at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/additiontoservicelisttranscriptordercompliant.pdf>

When serving documents on Commissioners or their personal advisors, whether or not they are on the official service list, parties must only provide electronic service. Parties must not send hard copies of documents to Commissioners or their personal 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 to request addition to the “Information Only” category of the official service list pursuant to Rule 1.9(f).

The Commission encourages those who seek information-only status on the service list to consider the Commission’s subscription service as an alternative. The subscription service sends individual notifications to each subscriber of formal e-filings tendered and accepted by the Commission. Notices sent through subscription service are less likely to be flagged by spam or other filters. Notifications can be for a specific proceeding, a range of documents and daily or weekly digests.

13. 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 emails from the Commission. Please add “@cpuc.ca.gov” to your email safe sender list and update your email screening practices, settings and filters to ensure receipt of emails from the Commission.

14. Assignment of Proceeding

Darcie L. Houck is the assigned commissioner and Charles Ferguson is the assigned ALJ and 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.
3. Evidentiary hearing is needed.
4. The presiding officer is Administrative Law Judge Charles Ferguson.
5. The category of the proceeding is ratesetting.
6. Party responses to the questions set forth in Appendix B to this Scoping Memo shall be filed and served no later than 30 days from issuance of this Scoping Memo. Reply comments to responses to the questions in Appendix B shall be filed and served within 15 days after the responses to the questions in Appendix B are filed.

Dated June 12, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ DARCIE L. HOUCK

Darcie L. Houck
Assigned Commissioner