



COM/MBK/jds 6/30/2025

FILED

06/30/25

03:52 PM

A2412001

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U-338E) to Require a Customer-Financed Added Facilities Agreement for Replacement Added Facilities to Serve the THUMS Islands Consistent with Decision No. 70659 and Tariff Rule 2.

Application 24-12-001

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. Procedural Background

On December 4, 2024, Southern California Edison Company (SCE or Applicant) filed Application (A.)24-12-01 (Application) to *Require a Customer-Financed Added Facilities Agreement for Replacement Added Facilities to Serve the Thums Islands Consistent with Decision No.70659 and Tariff Rule 2*. On January 8, 2025, protests to A.24-12-001 were filed by THUMS Long Beach Company (THUMS), the City of Long Beach (Long Beach), and the Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) (all jointly as Intervenors). THUMS's protest asserts that SCE sought a Commission order for THUMS to enter into a customer-financed added facilities agreement for the replacement of added facilities and to further order THUMS to pay all costs

associated with the replacement; THUMS, however, states it has not requested replacement of the added facilities and should not be ordered to pay for a replacement.

Long Beach states it is a third-party beneficiary of the current Added Facilities Agreement (AFA) and its protest mirrors that of THUMS. Cal Advocates contests SCE's Application because it appears to request approval for SCE to recover costs from ratepayers and is vague by asking for approval of a new undefined and unspecified AFA. SCE filed a reply to the protests on January 21, 2025, asserting that SCE's Application simply seeks an order from the Commission that confirms THUMS is responsible for all replacement costs, including planning and permitting costs, and further requests that THUMS pay those costs up-front pursuant to a new customer-financed AFA and Tariff Rule 2.

On February 18, 2025, an ALJ ruling directed the parties to A.24-12-001 to submit a Joint Prehearing Conference (PHC) statement, and to include responses to posed questions related to the Application about cost responsibility, jurisdiction, and ripeness.

On April 15, 2025, a prehearing conference was held in person at Commission headquarters in San Francisco, CA where the parties expressed a potentially agreeable solution and their joint desire and willingness to mediate.

The PHC addressed the issues of law and fact, determined the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and addressed other matters as necessary.

On April 11, 2025, THUMS and Long Beach jointly filed a Motion to Dismiss Application of Southern California Edison Company to Require a Customer-Financed Added Facilities Agreement for Replacement Added Facilities to Serve the Thums Islands Consistent With Decision No.70659 And

Tariff Rule 2 (Joint Party Motion to Dismiss). On April 28, 2025, SCE filed its response to the Joint Party Motion to Dismiss. On April 28, 2025, Cal Advocates also filed a response to Joint Party Motion to Dismiss SCE's Application. On May 8, 2025, THUMS filed a reply to SCE's response to the Joint Party Motion to Dismiss, and on May 8, 2025 also filed a reply to Cal Advocates' response to the Joint Party Motion to Dismiss.

On April 24, 2025, SCE filed a Motion for Ruling Staying the Proceedings Pending Mediation (SCE Motion to Stay). Intervenors oppose a stay. On May 9, 2025, Joint Parties, THUMS and City of Long Beach, filed a response to SCE's Motion to Stay. On May 12, 2025, Cal Advocates filed a response to SCE's Motion to Stay. On May 19, 2025, SCE filed a reply in Support of its Motion for a Ruling to Stay the Proceeding Pending Mediation.

On April 28, 2025, Cal Advocates filed a Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice SCE's Request to Recover Costs and Returns from Ratepayers (Cal Advocates Motion to Dismiss). On May 13, 2025, SCE filed its response to Cal Advocates Motion to Dismiss. On May 13, 2025, Joint Parties THUMS and City of Long Beach filed a response to Cal Advocates Motion to Dismiss.

This ruling will resolve the Joint Party Motion to Dismiss, the Cal Advocates Motion to Dismiss, and the SCE Motion for a Ruling to Stay Pending Mediation.

Additionally, after considering the Application, Protests, Joint Prehearing Conference Statement and discussion at the prehearing conference, and all motion filings, I have determined the issues and initial schedule of the proceedings to be set forth in this scoping memo. I have also determined that no environmental and social justice issues have been raised at this time.

2. Joint Party Motion to Dismiss, Cal Advocates Motion to Dismiss, and SCE Motion to Stay

Let's first turn to the threshold questions raised in the three pending motions before the Commission.

2.1 Background Facts that Apply to All Three Motions

In 1964, Texaco, Humble, Union, Mobil, and Shell formed THUMS Long Beach Company (THUMS) and built four artificial islands in the harbor of Long Beach (Islands) for oil drilling and production in the Long Beach Unit area of the Wilmington Oil Field.

Added facilities are special facilities to accommodate specific electrical service needs of a particular customer. The facilities are installed at the customer's request and serve only them. At the request of THUMS, SCE built, owns, and operates the added facilities that deliver electricity to the islands. In 1966, the Commission approved the SCE and THUMS Added Facilities Agreement (AFA) to install specialized facilities, including two undersea cables (the THUMS Added Facilities), to power THUMS's oil drilling and production operations on the THUMS Islands.¹ The AFA incorporates the filed rates set forth in SCE's Tariff Rule 2.

After 60 years the added undersea facilities have far outlived their expected lifespan.² Although it has been determined the facilities are currently safe, they are showing signs of aging, particularly in one area. Aging infrastructure is more prone to failure and more likely to require disconnection because it is no longer safe to operate.³ THUMS requested and SCE agreed that it

¹ Decision (D.)70659.

² Application at 3.

³ Ibid.

is prudent considering the age of the THUMS Added Facilities, that the parties should begin the planning and permitting process for repair and replacement facilities as continued electric service to the THUMS Islands is needed.⁴ The process takes many years to complete and must be started well in advance. The planning and permitting alone is estimated at 2-3 years⁵ and the completion of the project could take up to a decade.⁶ THUMS claims it is not liable for the costs because as the customer it has not yet specifically requested repair and replacement, only planning and permitting for repair and replacement.⁷ SCE claims THUMS is responsible for the costs as a customer who built the four artificial islands and requested the added facilities for its use in drilling for California oil off the coast of Long Beach, CA, and that planning and permitting is part and parcel of repair and replacement.⁸

2.2 Joint Party Motions to Dismiss

On April 11, 2025, THUMS Long Beach Company and City of Long Beach jointly filed a Motion to Dismiss the Application (Joint Party Motion).

The Joint Party Motion asserts that the Application is not properly before the Commission. The Joint Parties allege this dispute over cost recovery for repair and replacement of the undersea cables, which is a subject of the AFA authorized by the Commission, is not a basis to assert jurisdiction; and that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate contractual disputes. The Joint Parties further assert the cost issue is not ripe since THUMS, as the customer, has

⁴ Prehearing Conf. Tr. at 15:20-23

⁵ Prehearing Conf. Tr. at 21:9-10.

⁶ Application at 4.

⁷ THUMS Protest at 6.; Joint Party Motion to Dismiss at 13-14.

⁸ Application at 10.

not requested repair or replacement. THUMS has only requested to begin the planning and permitting process to replace or repair the Added Facilities, and thus SCE seeks an inappropriate advisory opinion.

2.2.1 Jurisdiction

When reviewing a motion to dismiss an application, the Commission assumes that the facts, but not legal conclusions, as alleged in the application, are true. After accepting the facts, the Commission then determines “whether the Commission and the parties would be squandering their resources by proceeding to an evidentiary hearing when the outcome is a foregone conclusion under the current law and policy of the Commission.”⁹ In making a determination whether to “dismiss the application without hearing any evidence,” the Commission also must consider an “applicant’s due process rights.”¹⁰

The threshold issue is whether the Commission has jurisdiction to go forward in this matter. The Commission does have jurisdiction. As required to become effective, in 1966 the Commission approved the THUMS AFA in D.70659. The THUMS AFA specifically retains Commission jurisdiction, and states that the AFA “shall at all times be subject to such changes or modifications by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California as said Commission may, from time to time, direct in the exercise of its jurisdiction.”¹¹

The Commission is a state agency of constitutional origin with far-reaching duties, functions and powers. The Commission is constitutionally empowered to regulate utilities and to fix rates, establish rules, hold hearings, award reparation,

⁹ D.99-11-023 at 7.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 6.

¹¹ Exhibit SCE-04, Appendix A (AFA, Section 10), at A-3.

and establish its own procedures, Cal. Const., Art. XII, section 1-6. It is legislatively empowered to do “all things ... necessary and convenient in the exercise of such power and jurisdiction.” Pub. Util. Code section 701. The Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over the regulation and control of utilities including the regulation of their rates, while taking into consideration the protection of ratepayers, as noted in D.70659, the decision authorizing this AFA. The Application raises core rate issues within the Commission’s exclusive jurisdiction. The THUMS AFA expressly provides that the Added Facilities were installed in accordance with the applicable rates and rules of SCE, including Commission approved Tariff Rule 2, which governs SCE’s provision of added facilities. The Application was appropriately filed under Tariff Rule 2 authority under which Commission relief is sought. Section 761 confirms Commission jurisdiction over the terms and conditions of service, including the provision of added facilities, and requires utilities to provide service according to the terms and conditions set forth in their tariff rules.¹²

The application also implicates the obligation to furnish and maintain added facilities as are necessary to promote the safety of patrons, employees and the public. The Commission has jurisdiction under Pub. Util. Code section 701 to find whether this obligation is met in this proceeding.

2.2.2 Contract, Ripeness, Delay, Safety and Other Issues of Merit

Having established jurisdiction, I turn to the remaining merits issues of the Motions to Dismiss. The Joint Parties argue the Commission may not adjudicate contractual disputes. As a general rule, this Commission typically does not adjudicate contract disputes merely because one party is a public utility. Since

¹² Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 761.

the Commission typically does not award damages, complaints alleging breach of contract and damages are better served through the civil courts. *Crystal River Oil and Gas, L.L.C. v Pacific Gas and Electric Company*, 2000 Cal. PUC Lexis 817; D. 00-10-005. Nevertheless, the Commission does adjudicate contract interpretation or disputes in the exercise of its regulatory jurisdiction, particularly where the public may be affected.¹³ The dispute underlying the Application that is currently before us calls for a legal determination of the rights of parties under an existing Commission approved contract affecting rates. Here there is an active dispute over whether THUMS's request to partner with SCE on planning and permitting for the replacement of a portion of the added facilities triggered the provisions of Tariff Rule 2, which is part of the Commission approved AFA and provides guidance on who is responsible for the costs of replacing the Added Facilities. Whether permitting and planning types of costs are part of the replacement process is a pertinent question to be answered in order to move forward. The issues are fit for Commission decision and no hardship exists for any party in moving forward.

After years of discussions among the parties that ended in an impasse over cost responsibility for the replacement added facilities, and with evidence of aging facilities that need attention and with both parties agreeing it is prudent to begin the process for repair or replacement, the issue of cost responsibility is ripe for decision.

This is not the case of an inappropriate advisory opinion as alleged by Joint Parties. Applicant has made it clear that it is requesting that the

¹³ *Crystal River Oil and Gas, L.L.C. v Pacific Gas and Electric Company*, 2000Cal. PUC Lexis 817; D. 00-10-005, citing, *Investigation into transmission system operations* (1992) 43 CPUC 2d 234.

Commission “confirm that customer THUMS is responsible for the costs”¹⁴ of repair and replacement per the AFA, and Applicant has made some requests for relief dependent on the outcome of that determination. Applicant does not seek approval of hypothetical or non-existent cost amounts. Applicant does not request approval to replace the added facilities, nor does it seek to approve a specific new project or added facilities agreement. It seeks confirmation of cost responsibility per the AFA, so that any potential work may begin in a timely fashion, without further delay.

To begin the process, it is important to know who the responsible party is for the costs of planning, permitting, repair and replacement. If the case were dismissed it would cause further delay and duplication of efforts if it were refiled after a failed mediation. Recently the Commission defined safety as “the prevention of harm to people, the environment, and assets that also encompasses safety of workers, members of the public, and operational safety.”¹⁵ That necessarily includes the need to take actions to protect public safety, especially in situations where, as here, the process to guard against a potential failure is a multi-year prospect.

As I have learned in this matter the public is affected, both the local community and the broader State of California population. For instance, the entire Long Beach community is affected by its need for power delivered to the islands now and after oil and gas production operations cease for post-production injections for subsidence mitigation, protection against the sinking of the City of Long Beach.¹⁶ As another example, the Long Beach Unit of the

¹⁴ See, e.g. SCE Reply to Protests at p. 2 ,10.

¹⁵ D.25-01-031 at 55.

¹⁶ THUMS Protest at 1-2

Wilmington Oil Field, which includes the Islands, is held in trust for the State of California by the City of Long Beach.¹⁷ The State of California receives a majority of the profits generated and is significantly affected as the production of oil ceases and the land and undersea cables are put to other uses, including carbon sequestration, energy storage, and desalination.¹⁸ At the prehearing conference (PHC), in discussing ramifications of a failure where power would not be delivered to the Islands, the parties noted that if power were lost the State of California would be primarily responsible for the minimum \$1 billion in costs for the decommissioning of the Long Beach Unit. And the City of Long Beach would need to find a source of power for injections to avoid subsidence, the sinking of the City of Long Beach.¹⁹ That the area be properly maintained and cared for, and that power safely exists at the time it is needed is crucial. Multi-year discussions regarding who is responsible for paying the costs of planning, permitting, repair or replacement of the undersea cables have reached an impasse, leading to inaction and delay.

2.2.3 Conclusion of Joint Party Motion to Dismiss

The issues are reasonable and properly before the Commission to resolve the long-standing cost issue in the public interest and in the interest of safety and justice. The Commission has made clear that a “motion to dismiss before hearing is a drastic remedy, and all doubts must be resolved against the moving party.”²⁰ Dismissal of the Application would only serve to leave the cost responsibilities

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Prehearing Conf. Tr. at 22:24-23:35.

²⁰ D.97-09-113 (MCI Telecomm. Corp. v. Pac. Bell), 1997 Cal. PUC LEXIS 894, at *23 (Cal. P.U.C. Sept. 24, 1997).

unresolved and hinder the timely work needed on the aging Added Facilities. If the Added Facilities do not receive work in a timely fashion, this also raises a question about whether an obligation is met to furnish and maintain added facilities as are necessary to promote the safety of patrons, employees and the public.

As such, the Joint Party Motion to Dismiss is denied.

2.3 Cal Advocates Motion to Dismiss

The Cal Advocates motion requests dismissal with prejudice and asserts that Applicant inappropriately requests authorization to recover costs and returns from ratepayers by requesting abandoned plant protection if certain events occur.²¹ D.70659 specifically prohibits recovery from ratepayers for costs and liabilities associated with the THUMS added facilities. Cal Advocates requests a summary adjudication now to establish irrevocably that ratepayers bear no burden, either now or in a future proceeding, for costs, risks, or other liabilities associated with the THUMS Added Facilities, including any proposals to repair, replace, sell or transfer, decommission, or undertake any other activities. Cal Advocates argues that certain accounting practices used in the future could mask an outcome where ratepayers pay replacement costs.

D.70659 provides that Applicant's ratepayers should not be responsible for the costs associated with the THUMS Added Facilities Agreement. Applicant agreed with this assertion and with Cal Advocates' position, and Applicant

²¹ See Cal Advocates Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice at 4, fn. 18, "SCE asks the Commission to 'Grant SCE abandoned plant protections if the Commission were to order SCE to finance replacement Added Facilities for THUMS and the facilities were abandoned prior to their in-service date and authorize SCE to recover fully the return of, return on, and cost of removal associated with any capital investments made to replace the Added Facilities through the filing of a Tier 2 Advice Letter.' "

states it filed this Application to protect its ratepayer customers and confirm THUMS' cost responsibility. Cal Advocates' motion refers to an alternate request by Applicant regarding abandoned plant protections which are contingent on a series of events, rulings and proceedings unfolding in a particular order. The contingencies expressed in the request have not yet and may never occur. The ratepayer concern is not presently at issue in this proceeding. By requesting a summary dismissal with prejudice Cal Advocates appears to be requesting that I affirm D.70659 and seek to have the effect of a Declaratory Judgement, which I am unable to grant at this time without the pertinent evidentiary facts necessary for review. Accordingly, Cal Advocates Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice is not ripe for consideration at this time, however I will hold the motion in indefinite abeyance and may readress at a later point in this proceeding.

2.4 SCE Motion to Stay the Proceeding

On April 24, 2025, SCE moved for a Ruling Staying the Proceeding Pending Mediation. For purposes of efficiency, SCE requests that the Commission issue a ruling to stay the proceeding while the parties participate in mediation that, if successful, would resolve the issues presented in the Application. Intervenors oppose a stay asserting it is more efficient and preserves resources to dismiss the Application.

2.5 Discussion

In the PHC on April 15, 2025, THUMS and SCE stated they are amenable to participating in a mediation to explore a potential sale from SCE to THUMS of the Added Facilities at issue in the Application. THUMS offered to pay for planning and permitting costs conditioned upon an agreement among THUMS, SCE, and Long Beach as to appropriate roles and responsibilities. If successful, a sale would render the Application moot, as it would no longer be necessary for

the Commission to resolve the dispute over who bears responsibility for the costs of replacing the Added Facilities.

The recent activity of the pending proceeding appears to have been a counterproductive distraction to the progress achieved by the parties at the PHC. It is not efficient for the Commission or the parties to continue to spend these resources at this time when the parties already agreed to and could be working together to solve the issues at hand. However, if the matter needed to be refiled after an unsuccessful mediation it would cause undue delay in the proceeding and is at this stage an inefficient manner to proceed. I encourage parties to focus their resources on the upcoming requested mediation, and to redouble their efforts toward reaching a settlement that they can propose to the Commission in a timely fashion.

2.6 Conclusion

The Commission has discretion to stay proceedings in the interest of judicial economy and efficiency. With good cause appearing such a stay is warranted here. A stay will allow the parties to focus and explore the reality of coming to an agreement. The mediating parties shall file and serve a Joint Status Report on the dates noted in the schedule below. Status reports shall include the description and status of the mediation and efforts to settle, and what activities or events have taken place to schedule and participate in mediation.

In the interest of judicial economy and efficiency this proceeding is stayed until September 15, 2025.

3. Issues

The issues to be determined or otherwise considered are:

1. Should the Commission order that replacement of the Added Facilities that serve the THUMS Islands be undertaken pursuant to a new customer-financed AFA,

- which requires the customer to provide the upfront funding for all replacement work, or other form of agreement that may be financed from an alternative source?
2. Should the Commission make any determination related to the responsibility of the costs for any removal work associated with the replacement added facilities on or pertaining to THUMS islands?
 3. Should the Commission make any determination related to the responsibility of the costs, and the responsibility of safety, pursuant to statutory and Commission requirements, pertaining to the repair or replacement of the added facilities on or pertaining to THUMS Islands?
 4. Pursuant to Section 10 of the December 20, 1965 Added Facilities Agreement between SCE and THUMS, should the Commission change or modify any element of the agreement?
 5. Should the Commission assert or order any relief regarding protections for consumers or ratepayers?
 6. Should there be any additional Commission review and oversight of the agreements and projects to replace or repair the THUMS Islands added facilities?

In the joint prehearing conference statement, SCE requested the following issue to be scoped into the proceeding.

Grant SCE abandoned plant protections if the Commission were to order SCE to finance construction of replacement facilities and authorize SCE to fully recover the return of, return on, and cost of removal associated with any capital investments made to replace these facilities through the filing of a Tier 2 Advice Letter.

As discussed in section 2.3 in response to Cal Advocates' Motion to Dismiss, this issue is not ripe for consideration. However, I may modify the scope of this proceeding at a later point in time to consider abandoned plant protections if the issue is necessary to be resolved.

4. Need for Evidentiary Hearing

The above issues are potentially contested, material issues of fact. During the PHC the Parties stated that evidentiary hearings are not indicated at this time, but there may be material issues of fact not all of which are currently known, so a potential need for an evidentiary hearing exists. Because it is unclear whether a hearing will be needed, I have determined that there is not a need for an evidentiary hearing at this time. Accordingly, no hearings will be scheduled at this point.

However, to allow for reconsideration of the hearing need after the parties have had a chance to conduct discovery, meet and confer, and review the testimony that will be served in this proceeding, I will permit parties to file a motion for evidentiary hearing after the testimony service. Such a motion must clearly identify specific & material disputed issues of fact, including party positions, within the scope of this proceeding that require an evidentiary hearing. The need for evidentiary hearing will be determined by the assigned ALJ. A status conference will take place prior to the hearing. 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 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 remote conduct of the evidentiary hearing, including estimates of time requested for cross-examination and identification of anticipated exhibits.

5. Schedule

The following schedule is adopted here and may be modified by the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the application:

EVENT	DEADLINE (Hearing)	DEADLINE (No Hearing)
Joint Mediation Status Statement	July 31, 2025 and September 15, 2025	July 31, 2025 and September 15, 2025
Mediation Status Conference	September 17, 2025	September 17, 2025
Intervenors-Prepared Direct Testimony Served	October 17, 2025	October 17, 2025
Prepared Rebuttal Testimony Served	December 17, 2025	December 17, 2025
Meet and Confer (Rule 13.9)	December 30, 2025	December 30, 2025
Motion for Evidentiary Hearing Filed	January 5, 2025	
Joint Status Conference Statement filed Parties identify the specific disputed issues of material fact, witness lists and cross-examination estimates.	January 15, 2025	
Status Conference	January 16, 2026	
Evidentiary Hearing In-person, San Francisco	February 16, 2026	
Concurrent Opening Briefs	March 16, 2026	January 27, 2026

Concurrent Reply Briefs <i>[matter submitted]</i>	April 16, 2026	February 17, 2026
Proposed Decision	July 2026 <i>[no later than 90 days after submission]</i>	May 2026

The proceeding will stand submitted for decision by the Commission as of the due date for reply briefs, unless the ALJ requires further evidence or argument or if an oral argument is scheduled; in such case, the proceeding will stand submitted upon occurrence of the latest such proceeding event.

To reduce the risk of confusion, the opening briefs must conform to the order of issues as scoped in Section 3 of this Scoping Memo and Ruling.

Based on this schedule, the Applicant's request for private mediation and the stay is granted herein, the proceeding may not be resolved within 18 months as required by Public Utilities Code Section 1701.5.

6. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Program and Settlements

The Commission's Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) program also offers mediation, early neutral evaluation, and facilitation services, and uses ALJs who have been trained as neutrals. Although the parties at this time have chosen to proceed on their own in private mediation, 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.²²

The schedule set forth in this Scoping Memo includes a date for the completion of settlement talks. No later than this date, the parties will submit to the assigned ALJ a status report of their efforts, identifying agreements reached

²² <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/adr/>.

and unresolved issues requiring hearing. Any settlements between parties, whether regarding all 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 the Commission's preliminary determination²³ 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), a customer who intends to seek an award of compensation must file and serve a notice of intent to claim compensation within 30 days after the prehearing conference.

²³ Resolution ALJ 176-3556.

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 1.4.²⁴

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

²⁴ 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>.

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.

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).

I encourage 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

Commissioner Matthew Baker is the assigned commissioner and Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Theresa Moore is the assigned ALJ.

Having considered the motions, the procedural posture of the case, and good cause appearing,

IT IS RULED that:

1. The scope of this proceeding is described above and is adopted.
2. The April 11, 2025, Joint Party Motion to Dismiss is Denied.
3. The April 28, 2025, Cal Advocates Motion to Dismiss is not ripe and will be held in abeyance.
4. The April 24, 2025, Southern California Edison Company Motion to Stay is Granted.
5. The schedule of this proceeding is set forth above and is adopted.
6. Evidentiary hearing is not needed.
7. The presiding officer is Administrative Law Judge Theresa Moore.
8. The category of the proceeding is ratesetting.
9. The deadline for resolving the proceeding is extended to July 31, 2026.

Dated June 30, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MATTHEW BAKER

Matthew Baker
Assigned Commissioner