



ALJ/LGG/hma 2/2/2026

FILED

02/02/26

08:26 AM

A2502013

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Compliance Review of Utility Owned Generation Operations, Portfolio Allocation Balancing Account Entries, Energy Resource Recovery Account Entries, Contract Administration, Economic Dispatch of Electric Resources, Utility Owned Generation Fuel Procurement, and Other Activities for the Record Period January 1 Through December 31, 2024. (U39E.)

Application 25-02-013

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING

This ruling modifies the issues for supplemental testimony, requires Pacific Gas and Electric Company to include its workpapers with the its supplemental testimony, reopens discovery for a limited period of time from Pacific Gas and Electric Company's service of supplemental testimony through the date for reply testimony, and modifies the proceeding schedule.

1. Procedural Background

On February 28, 2025, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed this Application for Compliance Review of Utility Owned Generation Operations, Portfolio Allocation Balancing Account Entries, Energy Resource Recovery Account Entries, Contract Administration, Economic Dispatch of Electric

Resources, Utility Owned Generation Fuel Procurement, and Other Activities for the Record Period January 1 Through December 31, 2024 (Application).

On April 4, 2025, the California Community Choice Association^[1] (CalCCA) and the Public Advocates Offices of the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) filed protests to the Application.

The assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) held a prehearing conference on April 18, 2025. On May 2, 2025, assigned Commissioner John Reynolds issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo) setting forth the issues to be decided and the schedule for this proceeding.

On August 15, 2025, CalCCA moved to amend the procedural schedule to extend the discovery timeline until the beginning of evidentiary hearings. On August 15, 2025, the assigned ALJ denied the motion without prejudice.

On September 15, 2025, CalCCA and Cal Advocates served their opening testimony. PG&E served rebuttal testimony on October 24, 2025.

On November 3, 2025, the parties filed a Joint Status Conference Statement requesting additional time to conduct settlement discussions and requesting to reopen discovery between PG&E and CalCCA.

On November 10, 2025, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling reopening discovery for a limited time, amending the proceeding schedule to remove the timeline for settlement, and directing the parties to file an updated status

^[1] California Community Choice Association represents 24 community choice electricity providers in California: Apple Valley Choice Energy, Ava Community Energy, Central Coast Community Energy, Clean Energy Alliance, Clean Power Alliance of Southern California, CleanPowerSF, Desert Community Energy, Energy For Palmdale's Independent Choice, Lancaster Energy, Marin Clean Energy, Orange County Power Authority, Peninsula Clean Energy, Pico Rivera Innovative Municipal Energy, Pioneer Community Energy, Pomona Choice Energy, Rancho Mirage Energy Authority, Redwood Coast Energy Authority, San Diego Community Power, San Jacinto Power, San José Clean Energy, Santa Barbara Clean Energy, Silicon Valley Clean Energy, Sonoma Clean Power, and Valley Clean Energy.

conference statement. The parties filed an updated joint status conference statement on November 25, 2025.

On December 2, 2025, the assigned ALJ held a virtual status conference, at which the assigned ALJ modified the proceeding schedule to remove evidentiary hearings.

On December 15, 2025, the parties filed a joint motion to enter evidence into the evidentiary record, accompanied by PG&E's motion to seal the evidentiary record.

On December 22, 2025, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling directing the parties to prepare supplemental testimony regarding vintaging of a specific group of community choice aggregator customers. The ruling also amended the proceeding schedule to allow time for the additional testimony.

On December 23, 2025, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling granting the joint motion to enter evidence into the evidentiary record and granting PG&E's motion to seal the evidentiary record.

On January 6, 2026, PG&E sent a procedural email to the assigned ALJ advising that it would likely need more time to prepare the testimony requested and that the other parties to the proceeding would like more time to respond to the additional testimony.

On January 9, 2026, PG&E made a motion to extend the deadline for filing supplemental testimony by roughly six months. On behalf of CalCCA, PG&E requested six additional weeks for reply testimony. Briefing would not occur until September 2026.

On January 26, 2026, the assigned ALJ held a status conference to discuss the extension request.

2. Discussion

2.1. Timing of Supplemental Testimony and Modification of Proceeding Schedule

At the status conference on January 26, 2026, PG&E reported that only 163 customers fit within the group of customers identified in the December 22, 2025 ruling, namely customers that opted out of community choice aggregator service, opted back in and then moved within the community choice aggregator's territory. Of those 163 customers, 155 were allocated correct vintages. PG&E is in the process of reviewing the remaining eight customers. PG&E reported that it could complete that review and prepare supplemental testimony by mid-March. PG&E requested that if the one or more of the eight remaining customers were allocated incorrect vintages, that PG&E not be required to revise all the PABA numbers for what would likely be a de minimus change. Instead, PG&E suggested that it provide a remedy to make those customers whole. PG&E also requested time before briefs are filed to conduct settlement discussions.

CalCCA requested time and permission for additional discovery to occur between the date for supplemental testimony and reply testimony.

California Public Utilities Code section 1701.5 sets a deadline of 18 months to resolve ratesetting proceedings. PG&E filed this current proceeding on February 28, 2025. Under section 1701.5, the proceeding must be concluded by August 28, 2026, unless the Commission makes a written determination that the deadline cannot be met. Because the timeline PG&E proposed in its January 9, 2026 motion would preclude resolving this proceeding within the statutory timeframe, and because the parties do not actually need as much time as was requested to complete the analysis necessary for the supplemental testimony, PG&E's January 9, 2026 motion is denied.

Instead, the proceeding schedule is modified as follows:

Event	Date
Supplemental PG&E opening testimony, served	March 11, 2026
Supplemental reply testimony, served	April 10, 2026
Joint motion to admit supplemental testimony into the evidentiary record, filed and served	April 14, 2026
Settlement discussions	Ongoing, but concluding by May 22, 2026
Concurrent opening briefs, filed and served	May 22, 2026
Concurrent reply briefs, filed and served, at which time the case will be submitted	June 19, 2026
Proposed decision	<i>[no later than 90 days after submission]</i>
Commission decision	<i>[no sooner than 30 days after proposed decision]</i>

2.2. Discovery

CalCCA anticipates that it may need additional discovery following PG&E's service of supplemental testimony. To facilitate efficient discovery, CalCCA suggested discovery response deadlines. Because reply testimony is due within a month after PG&E's supplemental testimony, we agree that it is reasonable to establish discovery response deadlines. Accordingly, we reopen discovery for the period March 11 through April 10, 2026. Responses to discovery requests must be provided within five business days of the date that the discovery was requested. All discovery requests and responses must be made via electronic mail.

2.3. Workpapers

CalCCA requested that PG&E submit its workpapers concurrently with serving its supplemental testimony. PG&E did not object to this request.

Therefore, to reduce the amount of discovery and avoid unnecessary delay, PG&E is directed to serve its workpapers with the supplemental testimony required in this ruling.

2.4. Scope of Supplemental Testimony

The scope of the supplemental testimony is hereby modified as follows:

1. The scope of the vintaging problem, namely the number of customers that opted out of CCA service, then opted into CCA service, and then moved within the incumbent CCA territory. Of that set of customers, how many of these customers have been assigned incorrect vintages? How was this number established and verified?
2. What remedy does PG&E propose to address billing errors associated with incorrect vintaging for the 2024 Record Year? What is the estimated impact to the PABA for the 2024 Record Year?¹
3. Does the programming logic require updating to address vintaging problems? If so, what is the source of the funds for updating the programming logic? And what is the schedule for updating the programming logic?

IT IS RULED that:

1. The proceeding schedule shall be modified as detailed in section 2.1 of this ruling.
2. Discovery shall be reopened for the period March 11 through April 10, 2026, and shall be limited to the subject matter of the supplemental testimony. Responses to discovery requests shall be provided within five business days of the date that the discovery was requested. All discovery requests and responses shall be made via electronic mail.

¹ In answering this question, PG&E need not revise every number in the PABA. Given the small number of customers that may be affected by incorrect vintaging, this question merely seeks to understand the magnitude of a problem, if one is identified.

3. PG&E shall serve its workpapers with its supplemental testimony.
4. The scope of the supplemental testimony shall be as detailed in section 2.4 of this ruling.

Dated February 2, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ LEAH S. GOLDBERG

Leah S. Goldberg
Administrative Law Judge