



ALJ/CR2/avs 10/14/2025

**FILED**

10/14/25

03:00 PM

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 AMENDED RULING MODIFYING THE  
SCHEDULE ON REQUEST FOR COMMENT TO TRANSPORTATION  
ELECTRIFICATION PROACTIVE PLANNING MODELING INPUTS AND  
ASSUMPTIONS, AND PROVIDING ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE**

**Summary**

This Amended Ruling modifies the schedule for the request for comment on the October 1, 2025 Ruling. The October 1, 2025 Ruling sought comment from interested parties on the 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).

This Amended Ruling also directs parties to use the additional guidance contained within Section 2 of this Ruling when responding to the staff work products referred to in the October 1, 2025 Ruling.

Parties who wish to provide formal comments in response to these rulings must now file and serve them on November 14, 2025. Opening Comments are

limited to 15 pages. Reply comments must now be filed and served by December 5, 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, an October 1, 2025 Administrative Law Judge's Ruling sought comment from interested parties on the Corridor Disaggregation Method, Modeling Inputs & Assumptions, and Inputs and Assumptions Library Worksheet. Parties were directed to access these materials through the Commission's website by opening this link through a web browser: [Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning](#) or via the Commission website link below, in Footnote 1.<sup>1</sup>

Parties who wish to provide formal comments in response to the October 1, 2025 Ruling and staff work products must now file and serve them on November 14, 2025. Opening Comments are limited to 15 pages. Reply comments must now be filed and served by December 5, 2025. Reply comments are limited to 10 pages.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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>

## **2. Additional Guidance**

Interested stakeholders shall file comments in response to the Disaggregation Method, Modeling Inputs & Assumptions, and Inputs and Assumptions Library Worksheet contained with the October 1, 2025 Ruling.

Interested stakeholders are also directed to use the additional guidance in Section 2.1 of this Amended Ruling when responding to the October 1, 2025 Ruling.

### **2.1. Additional Guidance Questions**

As stated above, the October 1, 2025 Ruling requested feedback from parties on several Energy Division staff work products, including:

- “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)

These materials can be found at Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning Ruling Material website, available at:

<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/electrical-energy/infrastructure/transportation-electrification/transportation-electrification-proactive-planning>

In the Ruling Questions, there are several erroneous references to “Appendices,” instead of these work products. Below, please find corrected references for the Ruling Questions to which they apply:

- References to “Appendix A” refer to the Library Worksheet.

- References to “Appendix B” refer to the Modeling Inputs & Assumptions.
- References to “Appendix C” refer to Corridor Disaggregation Method.
- Corrections for Ruling Questions 1-10 and 20 can be found below.

**2.1.1. TEPP Modeling Inputs and Assumptions (I&A)- 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 Modeling Inputs & Assumptions 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 Modeling Inputs & Assumptions 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 Modeling Inputs and Assumptions Section 3.1 are based on interviews with fleets and owner operators (see Library Worksheet- 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 Modeling Inputs & Assumptions 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 Modeling Inputs & Assumptions 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 Modeling Inputs & Assumptions 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)**

1. 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 (Corridor Disaggregation Method). 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.
2. In the Corridor Disaggregation Method, Table 1-3 of the CDM on page 7-8 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?
  3. The Corridor Disaggregation Method 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 the Corridor Disaggregation Method, 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?
  4. As described in the Corridor Disaggregation Method 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. Future Refinements**

1. Section 3.4 of the Corridor Disaggregation Method 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?

### **3. Schedule Modification**

On October 9, 2025, CalSTART, Inc. (CalSTART) requested an extension of time for parties to submit Opening and Reply Comments in response to the October 1, 2025 Ruling. The following parties support CalSTART's request:

- Acterra
- Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE)
- Coalition of California Utility Employees (CUE)
- East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
- Environmental Defense Fund (EDF)
- EV Realty
- The International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT)
- Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
- Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E)
- Powering America's Commercial Transportation (PACT)
- Public Advocates Office
- San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E)
- Sierra Club
- Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA)
- Southern California Edison Company (SCE)
- Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)
- The Utility Reform Network (TURN)

- Vehicle-Grid Integration Council (VGIC)

The Port of Long Beach took no position on CalSTART's request. For good cause shown, the following schedule is hereby modified and adopted:

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Current Date</b>	<b>Proposed Date</b>
Opening Comments on TEPP Ruling	October 31, 2025	November 14, 2025
Reply Comments on TEPP Ruling	November 14, 2025	December 5, 2025

**IT IS RULED** that:

1. Parties who wish to provide formal comments in response to the October 1 Ruling must now file and serve them on November 14, 2025. Opening Comments are limited to 15 pages. Reply comments must now be filed and served by December 5, 2025. Reply comments are limited to 10 pages.

2. In response to the October 1, 2025 Ruling, Parties who provide formal comments shall follow the additional guidance found in Section 2 of this Amended Ruling.

Dated October 14, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ COLIN RIZZO  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Colin Rizzo  
Administrative Law Judge