



COM/ARD/cg7 11/25/2025

FILED

11/25/25

10:06 AM

A2406014

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California
Edison Company (U 338-E) for
Approval of Large Power Dynamic
Pricing Rate.

Application 24-06-014

And Related Matter.

Application 24-12-008

**ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S AMENDED SCOPING MEMO AND RULING
EXTENDING STATUTORY DEADLINE**

The scoping memo and ruling issued on December 11, 2024 (Initial Scoping Memo) sets forth the issues, need for hearing, schedule, category, and other matters necessary to scope this proceeding, pursuant to Public Utilities Code (Pub. Util. Code) Section 1701.1 and Article 7 of the California Public Utilities Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules). This Assigned Commissioner's Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling Extending Statutory Deadline (Amended Scoping Memo) amends the scope of the Initial Scoping Memo and updates the procedural schedule as set forth below. Additionally, this Amended Scoping Memo extends the statutory deadline to October 31, 2026.

1. Procedural Background

On June 26, 2024, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) filed Application (A.) 24-06-014 seeking authority to implement the "Large Power Dynamic Pricing Rate" (Large Power Customer Dynamic Rate). The Large Power Customer Dynamic Rate would serve high-demand, non-residential customers

eligible for service on SCE's TOU-8 rate, served at 50 kilovolts (kV) or above (Large Power Customers), with a program cap of 500 megawatts (MW).

The proposed Large Power Customer Dynamic Rate has three components:

- a subscription component, based on the tariff that otherwise would apply to the customer (Otherwise Applicable Tariff or OAT);
- a dynamic component, based on day-ahead hourly market prices and load forecasts, governed by contracts between SCE and individual customers; and
- a non-bypassable charges (NBC) component.

SCE envisions the Large Power Customer Dynamic Rate will incentivize better alignment between customer demand and usage with supply to promote decarbonization, reliability, and affordability.

Responses and protests to A.24-06-014 were filed on August 2, 2024. California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA) and Pacific Steel Group (PSG) filed responses. The Alliance for Retail Energy Markets (AREM) and the Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) filed protests.

A reply in support of A.24-06-014 was filed on August 12, 2024, by SCE.

A Joint Prehearing Conference Statement and Joint Participant List was filed on September 27, 2024, by AREM, Cal Advocates, CLECA, the Federal Executive Agencies (FEA), PSG, and SCE.

A prehearing conference was held on October 1, 2024, to address the issues of law and fact, determine the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and address other matters as necessary.

On December 11, 2024, the Initial Scoping Memo was issued for A.24-06-014.

On December 20, 2024, SCE filed A.24-12-008 seeking authority to implement the “Marginal Cost-Based Dynamic Pricing Rates” (General Dynamic Rates). The proposed General Dynamic Rates would be available to residential and non-residential customers who are currently enrolled on a TOU rate plan incorporating the current TOU periods.

Similar to the proposed Large Power Customer Dynamic Rate, the proposed General Dynamic Rates have three components:

- a subscription component, based on customers’ OAT;
- a dynamic component, based on day-ahead hourly market prices and load forecasts – applicable only to the portion of the customer’s consumption that is deemed flexible; and
- an other component, including NBCs and Facilities Related Demand charges.

Similar to the Large Power Customer Dynamic Rate, SCE envisions the Standard Rate will incentivize better alignment between customer demand and usage with supply to promote decarbonization, reliability, and affordability.

Responses and protests to A.24-06-014 were filed on January 22 and 23, 2025. CLECA, California Energy Storage Alliance (CESA), and California Choice Energy Authority (Cal Choice) filed responses. AReM and Cal Advocates filed protests.

A reply in support of A.24-12-008 was filed on February 14, 2025, by SCE.

On February 20, 2025, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling consolidating A.24-06-014 and A.24-12-008 and vacating the schedule announced in the Initial Scoping Memo to consider SCE’s proposed Large Power Customer

Dynamic Rate and General Dynamic Rates (collectively Proposed Rates) together.

On April 9, 2025, SCE, PSG, and CLECA filed a joint motion seeking to bifurcate the consolidated proceeding into two tracks.

A Joint Prehearing Conference Statement and Joint Participant List was filed on August 26, 2025, by AReM, Cal Advocates, Cal Choice, CLECA, Electrify America, PSG, SCE, Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA), and the Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA).

A prehearing conference was held on August 29, 2025, to address the issues of law and fact, determine the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and address other matters as necessary in this consolidated proceeding.

On August 29, 2025, the Commission issued Decision (D.) 25-08-049, which provided Investor Owner Utilities with guidance on designing and submitting demand flexibility rate proposals.

On September 4, 2025, the ALJ issued a ruling directing SCE to file supplemental testimony for the Proposed Rates, based on guidance in D.25-08-049 for demand flexibility rate proposals.

On September 5, 2025, post-prehearing conference statements were filed by AREM, PSG, and SCE.

After considering the pleadings and discussion at the prehearing conferences, I have determined the amended and restated issues and initial schedule of the proceeding to be set forth in this Amended Scoping Memo.

2. Issues

The issues to be determined or otherwise considered are:

1. Whether SCE's Proposed Rates are just and reasonable, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Section 451.
2. Whether SCE's Proposed Rates comply with the guidance provided in D.25-08-049 and are reasonable, specifically:
 - a. Whether SCE's proposed rate design components comply with Sections 4 and 5 of D.25-08-049 and are reasonable;
 - b. Whether SCE's customer protection proposals comply with Section 6 of D.25-08-049 and are reasonable;
 - c. Whether SCE's equity and access proposals comply with Section 7 of D.25-08-049 and are reasonable; and
 - d. Whether SCE's load serving entity participation proposals comply with Section 8 of D.25-08-049 and are reasonable.
3. Whether SCE's Proposed Rates comply with the timing requirements established by the California Energy Commission's Load Management Standards, California Code of Regulations 20 §§ 1621-1623; D.22-10-022; and D.23-04-040.
4. Whether SCE's proposals promote the use of dynamic rates in rate design to encourage efficiency, affordability, optimal use of grid supply, and reliability.
5. Whether the Proposed Rates design poses risks of revenue shortfalls and/or shifting costs to non-participating ratepayers.
6. Whether SCE's proposals for customer eligibility are reasonable, including but not limited to whether SCE's proposals for dual participation of the Proposed Rates with demand response programs are reasonable.
7. Whether SCE's proposals for implementation, including timeline, budget, contracts between SCE and customers, marketing, education and outreach, and evaluation are reasonable as well as what follow-up measures should the Commission order, such as advice letters.

3. Need for Evidentiary Hearing

This ruling confirms the determination of the Initial Scoping Memo that an evidentiary hearing should be included in the schedule.

4. 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	Date with Evidentiary Hearings	Date without Evidentiary Hearings
SCE Supplemental testimony	October 28, 2025	
Intervenors' prepared direct testimony served	January 16, 2026	
Prepared rebuttal testimony served	February 17, 2026	
Meet and confer deadline	March 3, 2026	
Joint Case Management Statement	March 10, 2026	
Evidentiary hearing, if needed	April 2026	-
Opening briefs	May 2026	April 2026
Reply briefs	May/ June 2026	April/May 2026
Proposed decision	No later than 90 days after submission	
Commission decision	No sooner than 30 days after proposed decision	

The purpose of the February 21, 2026, joint case management statement 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.

The original statutory deadlines for A.24-06-014 and A.24-12-008 are December 26, 2025, and June 20, 2026, respectively. Additional time is necessary to address the additional issues scoped into this consolidated proceeding, including the requirements of D.25-08-049. Therefore, I extend the statutory deadline of this consolidated proceeding to October 31, 2026. This deadline may also be extended by order of the Commission.

5. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Program and Settlements

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.¹

Any settlement 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.

¹ <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/adr/>

6. Category of Proceeding and Ex Parte Restrictions

This ruling confirms the determination of the Initial Scoping Memo that this is a ratesetting proceeding. Accordingly, ex parte communications are restricted and must be reported pursuant to Article 8 of the Rules.

7. 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 by September 29, 2025, 30 days after the prehearing conference.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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 1.4.²

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, with one exception, such that all parties are excused from the Rule 1.10 requirement to serve on the ALJs both an electronic and a paper copy of filed or serviced documents. Therefore, when serving documents on Commissioners, their personal advisors, and the ALJ, parties must only provide electronic service, unless otherwise instructed by the ALJs. All parties to this proceeding shall serve documents and pleadings using electronic mail, whenever possible, transmitted all documents no later than 5:00 p.m., on the date scheduled for service to occur.

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

² The form to request additions and changes to the Service list may be found at <https://www.cpsc.ca.gov/-/media/cpsc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/additiontoservicelisttranscriptordercompliant.pdf>

filters. Notifications can be for a specific proceeding, a range of documents and daily or weekly digests.

11. 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.

12. Assignment of Proceeding

Alice Reynolds is the assigned commissioner and Brandon Gerstle 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 Brandon Gerstle.
5. The category of the proceeding is ratesetting.
6. The statutory deadline of this proceeding is extended to October 31, 2026.

Dated November 25, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ALICE REYNOLDS

Alice Reynolds
Assigned Commissioner