



ALJ/CR2/cg7 10/01/2025

FILED

10/01/25

09:22 AM

R2312008

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking
Regarding Transportation
Electrification Policy and
Infrastructure.

Rulemaking 23-12-008

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUESTING COMMENT ON
TRANSPORTATION ELECTRIFICATION PROACTIVE PLANNING MODELING
INPUTS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

Summary

This ruling seeks comment from interested parties on the attached staff work products titled, "Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning: Corridor Disaggregation Methodology" (Corridor Disaggregation Method), "Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning: Modeling Inputs and Assumptions Report" (Modeling Inputs & Assumptions), "Inputs and Assumptions Library" (Library Worksheet), "Tract Level Domicile Data Addendum" (Domicile Worksheet), and "Corridor Disaggregation Methodology Visualizations" (Visualizations)

Parties who wish to provide formal comments in response to this ruling must file and serve them on October 31, 2025. Opening Comments are limited to 15 pages. Reply comments must be filed and served by November 14, 2025. Reply comments are limited to 10 pages.

1. Background

The Commission initiated this Order Instituting Rulemaking (Rulemaking) to consider continued development of infrastructure and policy to support the acceleration of transportation electrification.

On April 12, 2024, the assigned Commissioner issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1701.1 and Article 7 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Consistent with the assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling, this ruling seeks comment from interested parties on the Corridor Disaggregation Method, Modeling Inputs & Assumptions, and Inputs and Assumptions Library Worksheet. Parties shall access these materials through the Commission's website by opening this link through a web browser:

[Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning](#) and via the Commission website link below, in Footnote 1.¹

Parties who wish to provide formal comments in response to this ruling must file and serve them on October 31, 2025. Opening Comments are limited to 15 pages. Reply comments must be filed and served by November 14, 2025. Reply comments are limited to 10 pages.

2. Request for Formal Comments

Interested stakeholders shall file comments in response to the Disaggregation Method, Modeling Inputs & Assumptions, and Inputs and Assumptions Library Worksheet.

¹ Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning Ruling Material, available at: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/electrical-energy/infrastructure/transportation-electrification/transportation-electrification-proactive-planning>

When responding to the questions below, parties shall organize and submit their comments in the same order in which the issues and questions are presented in this ruling. Opening Comments are limited to 15 pages. Reply comments are limited to 10 pages.

2.1. Questions

Parties are directed to respond to the specific questions below. If applicable, describe any specific changes to the model, assumptions, and/or worksheet:

2.1.1. TEPP Modeling Inputs and Assumptions (I&A)- Appendix A and B - Current Values

1. For the category of vehicle inputs, including Battery Electric Vehicle (BEV) Forecast, Vehicle Registration Data, Vehicle Domicile Location Data, and Vehicle Use Cases (as described in Appendix B Section 2):
 - a. Are the approaches and values proposed for these inputs reasonable to inform the Corridor Disaggregation Methodology (CDM)? If not, please provide justification for any suggested alternatives.
 - b. Are any additional inputs needed for the vehicle category? If so, please provide justification and any relevant data sets that can be leveraged.
2. For the category of charging infrastructure inputs including Level 2- DC Fast Charging (DCFC) Power Split, Vehicles per Charger, and Charger Power (described in Appendix B Section 3):
 - a. Are the approaches and values proposed for these inputs reasonable to inform the CDM? If not, please provide justification for any suggested alternatives.
 - b. Are any additional inputs needed for the charging infrastructure category? If so, please provide justification and any relevant data sets that can be leveraged.

3. The L2-DCFC power split and vehicles per charger ratio inputs described in Appendix B Section 3.1 are based on interviews with fleets and owner operators (see Appendix A-Fleet Interviews tab for a description of the interviews conducted).
 - a. Does this interview-based approach seem reasonable to inform these inputs? Are there existing fleet survey results that you can share with CPUC that could inform these inputs?
 - b. If another approach would be more appropriate to determine values for these inputs, please describe the approach, and why the CPUC should consider it as an alternative.
4. For the category of grid impacts inputs including Fuel Efficiency, Vehicle Miles Traveled, Driving Range, Trip Data, Public versus Private Charging Allocation, Load Shapes, and State of Charge (described in Appendix B Section 4):
 - a. Are the approaches and values proposed for these inputs reasonable to inform the CDM? If not, please provide justification for any suggested alternatives.
 - b. Are any additional inputs needed for the grid inputs category? If so, please provide justification and any relevant data sets that can be leveraged.
5. Does the approach outlined in Appendix B Section 4.8 to identifying drayage operations seem appropriate? If not, please provide an alternative approach, justification, and/or data sets that can be used to identify where drayage vehicles are most likely to travel and charge.
6. Please provide comments on whether there are accurate and reliable data sources that can be used to identify fleet depot domicile locations (see Appendix B Section 5.10) defined as private, behind-the-fence charging that is only available to serve the needs of specific fleets.

**2.1.2. Corridor Disaggregation
Methodology (CDM)- Appendix C**

7. The CDM proposes to implement charging behavior assumptions on where and when BEVs are likely to charge to accurately model BEV load. These assumptions are outlined in Section 2.4.1 and Section 2.4.2 of the CDM Document (Appendix C). Are there any additional assumptions to include that may inform when and where BEVs are likely to charge? If so, please explain why additional assumptions are needed.
8. In Appendix C, Table 16 of the CDM describes the geospatial data that is proposed to inform this methodology. Is there any other geospatial data needed to inform the CDM, and if so, is this data publicly available?
9. Appendix C proposes to incorporate fleet depot data into the CDM to provide context on where depots are located in relation to corridor segments, as well as provide insights into where charging might occur (public versus depot). As noted in Section 4.2 of Appendix C, a challenge of associating BEV load with depots is identifying which vehicles and vehicle trips belong to a given depot. In lieu of data that explicitly ties trips to fleet depots, what assumptions should be used to associate BEV load with fleet depots?
10. As described in Appendix C Section 2.1, the CDM proposes to identify BEV loads associated with 150 major arterial and collector roads, interstate highways, collector/distributor lanes and controlled access highways in California that meet the following criteria: are at least 50 miles in length, have been identified as one of the 34 priority corridors by the California Transportation Commission (CTC)'s Senate Bill (SB) 671 (Gonzalez, 2021) Clean Freight Corridor Assessment, or are included in the 2024 National Zero-Emission Freight Corridor Strategy. Does this scope seem appropriate to capture high-volume traffic corridors where transportation electrification (TE) public charging is likely to be needed? If not, what alternative scope should the CPUC consider?

2.1.3. Interaction with Existing Planning Processes

11. For the IOUs- In what ways, if any, does developing a CEC load bus allocation product that incorporates the Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning (TEPP) approach for near-corridor locations support the identification of the size, timing, and location of long-term BEV load growth to inform distribution planning, such as the Pending Load or Scenario Planning approaches established in D.24-10-030? Please explain why or why not.
12. For the IOUs- How would the IOUs map the outputs of the CDM (consisting of hourly BEV load for an average day for each corridor segment) to their associated infrastructure?
13. For the IOUs-What value, if any, would a TEPP informed load bus allocation provide for the CAISO and/or IOU Transmission Planning Process? Please explain your response.
14. Are there additional analyses, outputs, or methods necessary to enable a load bus allocation integrating the CDM to be used in distribution and transmission planning?

2.1.4. Regional Considerations

15. Should the I&A seek to account for the fact that Publicly Owned Utilities (POU) may not take comparable steps on proactive TE planning? If so, how should the I&A and forecast account for load associated with corridor segments located in POUs? Should we assume that TE loads in adjacent POU corridor segments may move into IOU corridor segments?
16. Should the CDM attempt to account for potential impacts from Assembly Bill (AB) 98 (Aguiar- Curry, 2024) plans, which will require cities and counties to establish designated truck routes, or other state transportation planning frameworks? If so, how?
17. Does the CDM adequately account for vehicles that might be domiciled in Mexico or in neighboring states, but cross the border and are likely to charge within California, due

to limited charging infrastructure in Baja or outside of California?

- a. How should the CDM account for anticipated grid impacts resulting from changes to traffic flow that could result from the expected new port of entry along the San Diego-Mexico border in Otay Mesa?

2.1.5. Future Refinements

18. How and when should future refinements to the TEPP I&A and CDM be made?
19. The TEPP I&A does not currently include vehicle grid integration (VGI) and load flexibility assumptions. Additionally, the TEPP I&A does not account for installations of behind-the-meter distributed energy resources (DERs) such as solar or battery storage. Given the corridor use case addressed in TEPP, is there a need for iterations to develop I&A to account for VGI/load management or DERs? Please provide specific recommendations for improvements, with justification. If you do not think these assumptions will be important for public charging sites, please provide justification.
20. Section 3.4 of Appendix C describes potential refinements to the CDM for future implementation. Are there any areas of refinement that should be considered for future iterations of the CDM that are not captured in this section?

2.1.6. Miscellaneous

21. Please provide any additional comments on TEPP I&A, CDM, or the proposed implementation approach.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning: Corridor Disaggregation Methodology (Corridor Disaggregation Method), Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning: Modeling Inputs and Assumptions Report (Modeling Inputs & Assumptions), Inputs and Assumptions Worksheet (Library Worksheet), Tract Level Domicile Data Addendum (Domicile Worksheet) and

Corridor Disaggregation Methodology Visualizations (Visualizations) are hereby entered into the record of this proceeding.

2. Parties shall submit opening comments in response to the questions presented in this ruling regarding the draft Corridor Disaggregation Method, Modeling Inputs & Assumptions, and Library Worksheet by October 31, 2025.

3. Parties shall submit reply comments in response to the questions presented in this ruling regarding the Corridor Disaggregation Method, Modeling Inputs & Assumptions, and Library Worksheet by November 14, 2025.

4. Opening Comments are limited to 15 pages. Reply comments must be
Reply comments are limited to 10 pages.

Dated October 1, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ COLIN RIZZO

Colin Rizzo
Administrative Law Judge