



**FILED**

12/30/25

08:58 AM

C2506014

ALJ/LGG/smt/jnf 12/30/2025

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Patterson Point LP,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Edison Company  
(U338E),

Defendant.

Case 25-06-014

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING ADMITTING  
EVIDENCE INTO THE EVIDENTIARY RECORD**

**1. Factual and Procedural Background**

On June 11, 2025, Complainant Patterson Point LP (Patterson Point or Complainant) filed a complaint against Southern California Edison Company (SCE) alleging violations of SCE's Electrical Service Requirements (ESR), specifically ESR Section 5 and ESR Rules 16 and 18. Complainant plans to build and operate a housing project that will consist of 23 resident units and one unit for an on-site manager. Only formerly unhoused people and those with special needs meeting certain income requirements will qualify for tenancy. In addition to housing, residents will be provided an array of services that are not provided in market-rate or low-income housing. The Complaint alleges that housing authority projects, such as the one proposed, serving extremely low income residents with special needs, have been allowed to install one master meter

serving all units in the projects under ESR Rules 16 and 18, provided that the rental agreements include electrical usage. Complainant asserts that its project is similar to other projects granted a single meter for multiple residential units.

On July 1, 2025, the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) issued Instructions to Answer Notice to Defendant. On July 24, 2025, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling setting a prehearing conference (PHC) for August 14, 2025, directing the parties to meet and confer, and directing SCE to file a Joint PHC Statement by August 8, 2025.

On July 31, 2025, SCE filed an answer to the Complaint. SCE contends that both SCE Tariffs and the Public Utilities Code (PUC) do not allow for the type of metering proposed by the Complainant. Based on its understanding that the proposed project is new construction, that each unit will have its own kitchen, and that the project will include seven electric vehicle charging ports, SCE asserts the project is a residential multiunit structure that as a matter of law must have a separate electricity usage meter.

On August 6, 2025, Complainant sent an e-mail to the assigned ALJ requesting a late filing of the Statement explaining that Complainant had just retained counsel and its counsel needed additional time. In compliance with the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure 11.6, Complainant sought concurrence from SCE for the late filing of the Statement to August 14, 2025. Complainant also requested that the PHC be rescheduled from August 14, 2025, to a later date. On August 7, 2025, the assigned ALJ issued an email ruling granting the motion and extended the deadline for submitting the Statement to August 14, 2025, and moved the PHC to August 25, 2025.

On August 13, 2025, Complainant sent an email to the assigned ALJ requesting an additional extension of time until August 15, 2025, to file the

Statement. The assigned ALJ granted the motion for an extension, and the parties filed a joint PHC statement on August 15, 2025. A PHC was held on August 25, 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.

Commissioner Douglas issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo) on September 19, 2025, which among other things, established a schedule for the proceeding.

On November 3, 2025, SCE filed and served a Motion to Dismiss. On the same date, SCE served its testimony.

On November 4, 2025, Patterson Point sent an email to the assigned ALJ stating that its testimony was not ready and asking the assigned ALJ to suspend the proceeding schedule pending decision on SCE's Motion to Dismiss. On November 7, 2025, the assigned ALJ issued an email ruling directing the Complainant to explain its failure to serve testimony and directing the Complainant to file a formal motion to amend the proceeding schedule, which Complainant did on November 14, 2025. SCE filed a response to Patterson Point's motion on September 19, 2025.

The assigned ALJ held a virtual status conference on November 21, 2025, during which the assigned ALJ discussed the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan and its impact on this proceeding. The assigned ALJ encouraged the parties to review their positions and consider settlement based on the ESJ Action Plan considerations. SCE was directed to file a case status update by December 2, 2025, updating the Commission on the parties' desire to settle the Complaint.

As directed, SCE filed a case status update on December 2, 2025, stating that it will adjust its definition of properties eligible for a single meter to include

Patterson Point and future projects that are similarly situated. SCE requested that the Commission issue a Presiding Officer's Decision to confirm that SCE's approach is consistent with statutory and tariff rules.

Patterson Point also filed a Status Report on December 2, 2025, stating that the construction deadlines for the Patterson Point project will not allow for a master meter at this point. Instead, Patterson Point is committed to installing individual meters for each unit.

On December 12, 2025, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling amending the proceeding schedule, requesting additional information and denying SCE's motion to dismiss.

On December 19, 2025, Patterson Point filed its prepared testimony. On the same date, the parties also filed motions to admit evidence into the evidentiary record and provided additional information regarding per meter charges that the assigned ALJ requested in the December 12, 2025 ruling. SCE filed an accompanying Motion for Leave to File Under Seal the Confidential Version of Motion to Admit Evidence into the Evidentiary Record and Responses to Request for Additional Information.

## **2. Motions to Enter Evidence into the Evidentiary Record**

I hereby mark and identify the following documents, some of which are subject to SCE's motion to file under seal a confidential version of its motion to admit evidence into the evidentiary record, which will be addressed below:

<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Exhibit Name, Description, Sponsoring Witness</b>
PP-01	Patterson Point	Direct testimony of Milton Johns
PP-02	Patterson Point	Housing Authority of Santa Barbara County's (HASBC) response to SCE Data Request No. 001, Questions 1-3
PP-03	Patterson Point	HASBC's response to SCE Data Request No. 001, question 4
PP-04	Patterson Point	California State Treasurer's Office News Release dated October 7, 2024
PP-05	Patterson Point	Patterson Point's Tenant Eligibility Checklist
PP-06	Patterson Point	Patterson Point's Lease Agreement
PP-07	Patterson Point	Patterson Point's Supportive Services Plan
SCE-01	SCE	Prepared testimony of Darrah Morgan
SCE-02-C	SCE	Patterson Point's preliminary single line drawings, dated 1/24
SCE-03-C	SCE	Emails between SCE and Patterson Point

The following documents are admitted into the evidentiary record: PP-01, PP-02, PP-03, PP-04, PP-05, PP-06, PP-07 and SCE-01.

### **3. SCE's Motion to File Under Seal**

On December 19, 2025, SCE filed a motion to file under seal a confidential version of its motion to admit evidence into the evidentiary record.

#### **3.1. Legal Standard for Confidential Treatment**

The California Constitution broadly articulates the public's right of access in public agencies' conduct of the people's business.<sup>1</sup> "A statute, court rule, or other authority. . . that limits the right of access shall be adopted with findings

---

<sup>1</sup> Cal. Constitution, Article 1, Section 3(b)(1).

demonstrating the interest protected by the limitation and the need for protecting that interest."<sup>2</sup> Furthering the goal of transparency, the California Legislature promulgated the California Public Records Act<sup>3</sup> obligating public agencies to make their records available to the public with limited exceptions.<sup>4</sup>

While the Commission has recognized that confidential treatment is sometimes necessary to enable the Commission to conduct its business, several Commission decisions highlight the benefits of transparency in the Commission's decision-making process.<sup>5</sup> General Order (GO) 66-D requires anyone requesting confidential treatment to demonstrate with granular specificity on the facts of the particular information why the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record.

SCE asserts that SCE-02-C and SCE-03-C contain confidential customer information and personal information that is protected under PUC section 8380, various sections of the California Public Records Act,<sup>6</sup> GO 66-D, Decision (D.) 16-08-024, D.17-09-023, and D.20-08-031.

I find that SCE has shown good cause for granting confidential treatment to the information and data identified. Confidential treatment is granted for a period of three years from the date of this ruling. The confidentiality period may be extended by filing a motion showing good cause 30 days prior to the

---

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* (See, e.g., *Sonoma County Employee's Retirement Assn. v. Superior Court (SCERA)* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 986, 991-992.)

<sup>3</sup> Cal. Gov. Code Sections 7920 *et. seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Cal. Gov. Code Sections 7922.635 and 7922.640.

<sup>5</sup> See Decision 20.08.031, at 1.

<sup>6</sup> Cal. Gov. Code Sections 7920 *et seq.*

expiration of this ruling. Confidential treatment is granted to the following documents: SCE-02-C and SCE-03-C.

**IT IS RULED** that:

1. The following documents are marked, identified, and entered into the evidentiary record in this proceeding: PP-01, PP-02, PP-03, PP-04, PP-05, PP-06, PP-07, SCE-01, SCE-02-C, and SCE-03-C.
2. Confidential treatment is granted to the following documents for a period of three years from the date of this ruling: SCE-02-C and SCE-03-C.
3. Confidential treatment granted in this ruling is for a period of three years from the date of this ruling. During this three-year period, information subject to confidential treatment shall not be publicly disclosed except on further Commission order or ALJ ruling. If any party believes that it is necessary for this information to remain under seal for longer than three years, it may file a new motion showing good cause for extending confidential treatment by no later than 30 days before the expiration of this ruling.

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

/s/ LEAH S. GOLDBERG

Leah S. Goldberg  
Administrative Law Judge