



**FILED**

06/17/26

12:45 PM

A2409014

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

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Revise Its Electric Marginal Costs, Revenue Allocation, and Rate Design. (U39E.)

Application 24-09-014

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE’S RULING MODIFYING SCHEDULE**

This ruling modifies the schedule for the main track of this proceeding.

**1. Background**

On June 10, 2026, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed a joint motion (Motion) on behalf of itself and the Supporting Parties<sup>1</sup> to modify the current procedural schedule for the primary track of Application (A.) 24-09-014. The Motion included a status report on settlement discussions.

In the Motion, PG&E explains that it developed the proposed schedule in the Motion with input provided during settlement negotiations and after routing a draft of the Motion to the parties in A.24-09-014.<sup>2</sup> PG&E notes that no party expressed opposition to the draft Motion.<sup>3</sup> PG&E adds that California League of Food Processors, California Manufacturers and Technology Association, Calstart, Inc., Electrify America, LLC, NRG EVgo Services LLC, Natural Resources

---

<sup>1</sup> The Supporting Parties are Agricultural Energy Consumers Association, California Community Choice Association, California Public Advocates Office of the Commission, California Farm Bureau Federation, California Large Energy Consumers Association, Energy Producers and Users Coalition, Federal Executive Agencies, Small Business Utility Advocates, and The Utility Reform Network.

<sup>2</sup> Motion at 1.

<sup>3</sup> Motion at 1.

Defense Council, Solar Energy Industries Association, and Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association expressly confirmed they do not oppose.<sup>4</sup>

In the Motion, PG&E and the Supporting Parties request that the procedural schedule be modified so that the active parties have sufficient time to continue settlement discussions and prepare formal agreements. The requested schedule changes are meant to narrow or eliminate contested issues, and improve administrative efficiency, among others.<sup>5</sup>

## 2. Schedule

Upon review, I find the proposed schedule for the main track of this proceeding reasonable with changes to the proposed dates of the status conference and the ruling on the need for evidentiary hearings. Accordingly, the schedule set forth below is adopted and may be modified by the ALJ as needed to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the application.

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date</b>
Second Settlement Status Report filed	July 10, 2026
Third Settlement Status Report filed	August 7, 2026
Fourth Settlement Status Report filed	September 4, 2026
Fifth Settlement Status Report filed	October 2, 2026
Concurrent Rebuttal Testimony served and submitted as Supporting Documents	October 9, 2026
Rule 13.9 Meet and Confer	October 19, 2026

---

<sup>4</sup> Motion at 1-2.

<sup>5</sup> Motion at 2-3.

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date</b>
Rule 13.9 Meet and Confer Report (including List of Stipulated and Disputed Facts) filed and served	October 26, 2026
Status conference (if needed)	November 13, 2026
Ruling on Need for Hearings (if needed)	by November 20, 2026
Evidentiary Hearings (if necessary)	December 8-9, 2026
Opening Briefs	4 weeks after the last day of evidentiary hearings
Reply Briefs <i>[matter submitted]</i>	3 weeks after opening briefs
Proposed Decision	<i>[no later than 90 days after submission]</i>
Commission Decision	<i>[no sooner than 30 days after PD]</i>

**IT IS RULED** that:

The schedule for the main track of this proceeding is modified as set forth above.

Dated June 17, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ NILGUN ATAMTURK

Nilgun Atamturk  
Administrative Law Judge