



ALJ/RMD/vhj 12/31/2025

FILED

12/31/25

02:26 PM

C2509011

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

National Community Renaissance, A
California nonprofit public benefit
corporation,

Complainant,

vs.

Case 25-09-011

Southern California Edison Company
(U338E), and San Diego Gas and
Electric Company (U902E),

Defendants.

**EMAIL RULING DIRECTING PARTIES TO FILE
A JOINT STIPULATION**

Dated December 31, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ REGINA M. DEANGELIS

Regina M. DeAngelis
Administrative Law Judge

From: DeAngelis, Regina <regina.deangelis@cpuc.ca.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, December 31, 2025 12:50 PM

To: ainsley.carreno@sce.com; Anna.Valdberg@sce.com; GAnderson@sdge.com; Jason.Caruso@NDLF.com; Pertusati, Amanda <Amanda.Pertusati@cpuc.ca.gov>; Frank, Sam <Sam.Frank@cpuc.ca.gov>; CaseAdminTeamSupportGroupList@sce.com; Case.Admin@sce.com; Tariffs.Manager@sce.com; KdeBoer@sdge.com; SDGETariffs@sdge.com; jessica.stuhlmiller@ndlf.com; mark.himmelstein@ndlf.com; Wang, Melissa <Melissa.Wang@cpuc.ca.gov>; DeAngelis, Regina <regina.deangelis@cpuc.ca.gov>

Cc: ALJ Support ID <alj_supportid@cpuc.ca.gov>; ALJ Docket Office <ALJ_Docket_Office@cpuc.ca.gov>; ALJ Process <alj_process@cpuc.ca.gov>

Subject: C.25-09-011 (National CORE v SCE & SDG&E) Email Ruling Directing Parties to File a Joint Stipulation

To Service List for C.25-09-011:

This ruling directs the Complainant and the Defendants to collaborate and file a Joint Stipulation on or before January 21, 2026. This directive is consistent with statements made by parties at the December 17, 2025 Prehearing Conference. At page 29 of the Transcript of the Prehearing Conference, Counsel for the Complainant suggested that the use of a stipulation might be appropriate in this instance. This suggestion is reasonable.

The Joint Stipulation must address the topics set forth below. Parties may also address other topics. Upon receipt of the Joint Stipulation, the Assigned Commissioner will prepare and issue a Scoping Memo and Ruling pursuant to Public Utilities Code 1701.1.

Status of Rule 21 Interconnection

The December 17, 2025 Prehearing Conference included a discussion regarding the potential scope of issues and procedural steps as related to this adjudicatory proceeding. Parties indicated that the issues framed in the Complaint could potentially be narrowed by updating the status of the named projects. For example, at page 8 of the Transcript, Counsel for the Complainant, stated that “Based on discussions with counsel for [SCE], it’s my understanding that PTO has actually been issued for all of the projects that have been identified in our petition, and so that aspect of the relief sought is moot,...”

Understanding that updated information under Rule 21 is available regarding the status of the named projects, the parties are directed to collaborate and provide an update in the Joint Stipulation.

Rulemaking 25-08-004 (Rule 21 Interconnection)

Similarly, Counsel for the Complainant suggested that the Complainant was amendable to narrowing the issues in the Complaint to exclude issues implicated in the on-going quasi-legislative Rulemaking (R.25-08-004). At pages 19-20, the Transcript of the Prehearing Conference reflects this possibility, with Counsel for the Complainant stating “[A]t the time that we issued this petition, we were actually not aware of that separate quasi-legislative proceeding. And we defer to the to the judge's ruling and scoping. If that request for quasi-legislative relief is outside of the scope of this proceeding, we would defer to that and seek either participation or remedies associated with that separate quasi-legislative proceeding.”

Taking the Rulemaking into consideration, the Complainant is directed to review the allegations and relief sought in the Complaint. The Complainant is directed to consider narrowing the scope of the allegations and relief sought therein based on its review of the Rulemaking.

Clarify Allegations Against Defendants

At page 27 of the Transcript of the Prehearing Conference, Counsel for SDG&E suggests that clarifying which allegations apply to SDG&E and, in contrast, which apply to SCE would be helpful, stating "I think it would be very helpful, in terms of just kind of, you know, identifying what the actual disputes are, limiting what discovery is, to -- with -- within kind of the order of that amended complaint also include clarification with respect to what the allegations are against each defendant, specifically, and what's being alleged as being improper."

Also, to the extent further specificity is appropriate to reflect the Commission's authority to award, for example, damages, the Complainant is directed to make such changes and memorialize any changes in the Joint Stipulation.

The suggestions are reasonable and will promote a more efficient resolution of this proceeding. Therefore, the Complainant is directed to separate the allegations in the complaint to clearly indicate which are directed at SCE and which are directed at SDG&E. Further clarity on remedies sought is requested. This information must be included in the Joint Stipulation.

Need for Hearings

The Scoping Memo and Ruling will likely include a placeholder for hearings with the understanding that parties will, at a future point during this proceeding, meet and confer in an effort to resolve any disputes of material fact.

A placeholder for hearings would be consistent with statements made at page 13 of the Transcript by Counsel for SCE, "We understand if Mr. Caruso intends to have hearings requested or a placeholder for those hearings, but we would also seek the opportunity prior to those hearings to reconvene and meet and confer on the need for hearings after our information has been exchanged. We believe those [hearings] likely will not be necessary."

The Complainant and SDG&E did not disagree.

IT IS SO RULED.

The docket office shall file this ruling.

Regina M. DeAngelis

Administrative Law Judge

California Public Utilities Commission

regina.deangelis@cpuc.ca.gov

Notice: This communication may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.