



FILED

06/19/26

10:54 AM

R2502005

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Update and Reform Energy Resource Recovery Account and Power Charge Indifference Adjustment Policies and Processes.

Rulemaking 25-02-005

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE’S RULING AUTHORIZING PARTY COMMENTS ON TRACK THREE WORKSHOP AND RELATED ISSUES

This ruling authorizes parties to file comments regarding issues addressed at the Track 3 Planning Workshop and respond to questions in this ruling.

A Track 3 Planning Workshop was held on June 8, 9, and 15, 2026. The presentations from the workshop are attached for reference.

Parties may file and serve comments that: 1) address issues raised at the workshop 2) that were raised in earlier Track 3 comments; and/or, 3) respond to the ALJ Workshop Questions in Section 1 of this ruling.

Comments that address 1) above shall organize input on the issues by sections, addressing each day of the workshop separately.

1. ALJ Workshop Questions

1. Issues Discussed on Day 1: Structural Changes

- a. Do the following topics have the potential for sufficient net benefits to warrant their inclusion in the scope of Track 3? If so, please provide a brief (one to two sentences) explanation of the direction you would like to consider with regards to this topic. Likewise, please

identify if consideration of any topic should be considered mutually exclusive with others.

- i. Targeted solutions to recover costs for uneconomic legacy resources;
 - ii. Revisiting allocation, in particular the potential for mandatory allocations;
 - iii. Mechanisms to reduce volatility and stabilize rates; and
 - iv. Other proposals or structural frameworks for achieving indifference that may produce greater net benefits for ratepayers and promote competition among LSEs.
- b. If these issues are included in scope, and parties are permitted to make proposals for structural changes, how much time to develop proposals is necessary?
 - c. If these issues are included in scope, should they be addressed concurrently with, before, or after other issues?

2. Issues Discussed on Day 2: Refinements to PCIA and ERRA

- a. What are your 2-3 highest-priority issues?
- b. What is the level of complexity in record development anticipated to address each of the priority issues? For instance, what analysis is necessary?

3. Issues Discussed on Day 3: Data Access

- a. Part 2 of this ruling contains a template for a list of data access issues that would be filled out and included in the joint case management statement. Do you suggest any changes to this template?
- b. If other parties have made proposals for data access that you oppose, identify an underlying motivation for that proposal that you share and/or support.
- c. How much time is needed between the issuance of the Track 3 Scoping Memo and a deadline for load serving

entities to meet and confer on data access issues and subsequently file a joint case management statement?

2. Part 2: Template for Detailed Data Access Issues List for Joint Case Management Statement

It is anticipated that a ruling directing parties to meet and confer on data access would require a list of data access issues with the following categories to be included in the joint case management statement. Please refer to this example in responding to Question 3b above. The list would reflect all data desired from CCAs as well as the utilities. For each issue, parties would be required to identify option(s) that either partly or entirely address the concern.

Type of data desired	Why this data is necessary and relevant to scope	Providing party's concerns with providing this data	Joint options for addressing the concern
-----------------------------	---	--	---

IT IS RULED that:

1. Parties are authorized to file and serve comments as directed in this ruling by July 9, 2026. Comments shall not exceed 15 pages. The file attachment containing these comments shall follow this naming convention: “[Party name] Workshop Comments.”

2. Parties are authorized to file and serve reply comments by July 16, 2026. Reply comments shall not exceed 7 pages. The file attachment containing these comments shall follow this naming convention: “[Party name] Workshop Reply Comments.”

Dated June 19, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MARIA SOTERO

Maria Sotero
Administrative Law Judge