



ALJ/JF2/nd3 6/23/2026

FILED

06/23/26

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PNAM

R2005003

Order Instituting Rulemaking to
Continue Electric Integrated
Resource Planning and Related
Procurement Processes.

Rulemaking 20-05-003

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING
SEEKING COMMENTS ON ADDITIONAL PROPOSAL FOR
A RELIABLE AND CLEAN POWER PROCUREMENT PROGRAM**

Summary

This ruling invites comments in response to an additional option, described in this ruling, for the potential structure of a Reliable and Clean Power Procurement Program (RCPPP). The option summarized in this ruling aligns with the overall purpose of the RCPMP, as identified in a Staff Proposal issued in 2020. This ruling follows the most recent ruling on RCPMP from April 29, 2025, which attached the "Staff Proposal: Reliable and Clean Power Procurement Program" (RCPMP Staff Proposal), and in response to which numerous parties filed comments in July and August 2025, following a two-day workshop in June 2025. The various options laid out in the April 29, 2025 ruling and its attached Staff Proposal, as well as parties' alternative proposals, are still under consideration in this proceeding. This ruling simply adds another option for consideration by the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) and invites parties to comment on it.

Comments in response to this ruling are invited to be filed and served no later than July 22, 2026 with reply comments filed and served no later than August 7, 2026.

1. Background

Efforts to develop a programmatic approach to electricity procurement in this proceeding have a long history, beginning with the publication of a “Staff Proposal for Resource Procurement Framework in Integrated Resource Planning” attached to an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Ruling on November 18, 2020. Numerous parties commented on that initial staff paper, which then led to the next iteration titled “Reliable and Clean Power Procurement Program: Staff Options Paper” (RCPPP Staff Options Paper), published as an attachment to an ALJ ruling on September 8, 2022.

On April 29, 2025, an ALJ ruling was issued, which attached the “Staff Proposal: Reliable and Clean Power Procurement Program” (RCPPP Staff Proposal). On May 16, 2025, a workshop was held to present and explain the RCPSP Staff Proposal. Then, a two-day stakeholder workshop was held on June 23 and June 24, 2025, with presentations from stakeholders and a great deal of interactive discussion of the RCPSP options.¹

Robust comments on the RCPSP Staff Proposal were filed on or before July 15, 2025, by 44 parties. Nine parties or sets of parties also filed their own alternative proposals for the RCPSP structure. Forty-three sets of reply comments were filed on August 5, 2025.

¹ Slides from these workshops are available on the Commission’s website at: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/electrical-energy/electric-power-procurement/long-term-procurement-planning/the-reliable-and-clean-power-procurement-program>.

The full record described briefly above remains available to the Commission for consideration of potential adoption of an RCPPP framework.

2. Proposal

After extensive consideration of the RCPPP Staff Proposal and parties' comments and reply comments, this ruling puts forward one additional option for consideration by parties and the Commission for the structure of the RCPPP. All of the previous options already on the record of this proceeding are also still under consideration by the Commission, but comments in response to this ruling will help round out the discussion and inform the Commission's decisionmaking on this topic. Ultimately, this ruling and comments in response to it are intended to lead to the preparation of a proposed decision adopting an RCPPP framework in 2026.

2.1. Rationale

After review of comments on the RCPPP Staff Proposal, there is no clear consensus among parties about the best structure for the RCPPP overall. In addition, many parties express concern about the connections between an RCPPP and the resource adequacy (RA) and/or renewables portfolio standard (RPS) program. Numerous parties, especially load-serving entities (LSEs), are focused on creating alignment with resource adequacy requirements, in part because the reliability options presented in the RCPPP Staff Proposal were closely linked with the framework for resource adequacy. In addition, many parties are focused on the method of accreditation for resources, whether it be based on an effective load carrying capability (ELCC) methodology or the slice-of-day (SOD) framework used in the RA program. Most LSEs would likely find it simpler to manage their portfolios if the accreditation methodology under an RCPPP were the same as under the RA program.

While there are similarities between the reliability portions of the RA program and RCPPP, the purpose of the RA program is substantially different from the purpose of the RCPPP. RA is a short-term reliability compliance program designed to ensure that existing resources are made available to the market when needed and that those resources are appropriately compensated for that availability. An RCPPP is conceptually designed to ensure that there is enough procurement of electricity resources to provide for the development of long-term electricity resource needs for both reliability and clean energy purposes. Therefore, it does not necessarily follow that the long-term procurement focus of the RCPPP should flow from the short-term RA reliability procurement requirements. In fact, if the programs were being designed from the ground up, it would be preferable for the short-term requirements to flow from the long-term ones, and not vice versa. This ruling is not, however, proposing any changes to the RA program. It is not necessary for both programs to be identical to be successful in achieving their goals.

Instead, this ruling assumes that LSEs are fully capable of managing their portfolios to ensure compliance with both an RCPPP long-term requirement and an RA short-term requirement, even if the details of the compliance and accounting methods are different. Portfolio optimization with several requirements is one of the many responsibilities of LSEs who serve the California market.

Parties are also divided about whether a clean energy standard, similar to and modeled after an RPS, should drive new resource procurement in RCPPP, or whether new resources should be brought online as part of the reliability portion of the RCPPP Staff Proposal (Reliability Option 2).

This ruling emphasizes the role of the RCPPP as a bridge to connect the Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) required by Senate Bill (SB) 350 (Stats. 2015, Ch. 547), transmission planning, and LSE procurement. In the proposed concept in this ruling, this connection between grid and system-level planning and LSE procurement would be the focus of the RCPPP, leading to development of the new long-term resources that represent the future electricity grid that California needs, consistent with statutory requirements, including SB 100 (Stats. 2018, Ch. 312), SB 2010 (Stats. 2022, Ch. 361), and Assembly Bill 1279 (Stats. 2022, Ch. 337).

Periodically (usually every two or three years), the Commission takes in individual IRP filings from all of the LSEs, representing how LSEs intend to comply with the numerous state requirements for electricity procurement. In particular, the LSE individual IRPs must show that their plans meet both reliability standards and their proportional share of the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction requirements for Commission's portion of the electric sector. Within their plans, the LSEs specify the types of resources they already have under contract for their portfolios, as well as the types of resources they plan to procure in the future. Based on their customer base, leadership goals, and community goals, LSEs may differ in emphasis, with some focusing more on clean energy development and others emphasizing lower cost service. But all LSEs must meet the minimum thresholds for reliability and clean energy set by the Commission.

Once the Commission staff collect all of the information in the individual IRPs about existing and planned resources and aggregate it into a complete portfolio for serving the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) balancing area, the portfolio is then analyzed for its reliability and environmental characteristics and adjusted further based on the results of RESOLVE capacity

expansion modeling, usually to fill in gaps either in reliability or emissions reduction requirements. One of the aggregated portfolio scenarios analyzed is then later adopted as a Preferred System Plan (PSP) portfolio.

Adoption of the PSP portfolio is arguably the most important function of the IRP process, aggregating individual preferences of the LSEs into a system-wide portfolio, and assessing it for its feasibility in terms of reliability, environmental, and cost characteristics. The feedback that is created by this aggregation and analysis ultimately flows into transmission planning, and should, this ruling argues, drive LSE procurement, because it takes into account the procurement preferences of the individual LSEs. If not for the Commission's aggregation of the individual plans and assessment for compliance with reliability and GHG reduction goals, LSEs could simply plan and execute procurement for their own needs, which may or may not lead to a coherent overall portfolio that meets reliability and environmental goals overall.

In addition, currently every year, the Commission recommends to the CAISO a reliability base case and a policy-driven base case portfolio (usually one and the same) to use as the basis for analyzing the transmission needs of the CAISO electric grid as a whole, as part of the Transmission Planning Process (TPP). Often, the base case TPP portfolio that the Commission transmits to the CAISO is based on a PSP portfolio that incorporates LSE resource preferences, and includes additional optimally-selected least-cost resources from capacity expansion modeling that are needed to meet the reliability and GHG reduction needs.

The TPP base case portfolio always uses a GHG emissions target for the electricity sector as a binding constraint, along with a reliability analysis that shows that the portfolio can meet a standard of less than 0.1 loss of load

expectation (LOLE). Often, though not always, the base case portfolio recommended for the TPP is the PSP portfolio, though there could be reasons that the Commission might deviate from the PSP portfolio.

After the adoption of a PSP portfolio or a TPP base case, there is currently no mechanism to ensure that the LSEs procure the resources or resource attributes identified in those portfolios, even though they are most often based on the LSEs' own plans. For TPP purposes, those resources are assumed to be coming online to utilize the transmission upgrades that are identified and approved annually to support the electric grid and move it towards the state's long-term emissions and reliability goals embedded in the statutory requirements. In addition, there is no mechanism in place to compel LSEs procure the necessary diverse resource mix consistent with the overall system needs, even if they are represented in the individual LSE IRPs, rather than simply the lowest cost resources (which are usually, currently, solar and four-hour storage).

The premise of the proposal in this ruling is that the LSE plans that form the basis of the PSP portfolio and/or the TPP base case portfolio (in interim years) should drive procurement actions by LSEs in support of the overall optimal resource portfolio identified and approved by the Commission, in furtherance of overall state goals for the electricity sector.

This proposal is also intended to integrate and link the planning and procurement functions of the IRP process and the cyclical nature of the IRP process more directly.

2.2. Need Determination

This proposal would require that each PSP portfolio and/or TPP base case portfolio identify the mix of electricity resources that would be optimal for the

electric system overall at five, ten, and fifteen years out. Currently, the PSP portfolios focus on the ten-year time horizon and TPP portfolios focus on the ten- and fifteen-year timeframes for transmission planning purposes. This ruling's proposal would introduce reliance on the five-year timeframe for LSE procurement purposes. As is typical, the PSP and/or TPP base case portfolio in the five, ten, and fifteen year timeframe would be tested using production cost modeling to ensure it meets the LOLE reliability standard.

Once this analysis was performed, the new resource attributes identified as needed in the five-year timeframe would constitute the total procurement need determination for the year five years into the future from the adopted portfolio. This ruling proposes that the procurement requirement would then only be for new resources, but those resources would serve both environmental/clean energy and reliability purposes. The need determination would take into account the balanced portfolio adopted as either the PSP portfolio or the TPP base case (or both), and then require procurement to meet that portfolio.

It is clear that making this a binding requirement on LSEs to procure will put additional emphasis on the need to correctly characterize and analyze candidate electricity resources that will be available to serve load in the capacity expansion (RESOLVE) modeling that underpins the PSP portfolio adopted by the Commission and derived from LSE plans.

The new resource need determination would be expressed in net qualifying capacity (NQC) amounts, not nameplate capacity, by resource type or by resource attributes. Procurement requirements could be specified by archetypical resource categories in RESOLVE, as it would likely be preferable to group resources into attribute-based categories to maximize flexibility for LSEs based on market realities. The categories could be similar to those already used

in the mid-term reliability (MTR) procurement requirements, such as particular storage minimum durations, “clean firm” resources with specific capacity factors, or similar types of categories. This ruling seeks parties’ comments on the best way to express the NQC need determination under such a framework and the appropriate resource categories to be required.

If the Commission is aware, at the time that the PSP portfolio and/or TPP base case is adopted, that any long lead-time (LLT) resources determined to be needed by the Commission in Decision (D.) 24-08-064 and expected to be procured by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) as the central procurement entity (CPE) are contracted for and expected to come online within the five-year timeframe, the Commission would subtract those contracted LLT resources from the total need determination, leaving the remaining need to be procured by LSEs individually.

In addition, similar to the RCPPP Staff Proposal, this ruling proposes a buffer amount, to account for multiple types of uncertainty, including uncertainty in the load forecast, uncertainty in LSE compliance, and to allow for a competitive market. This ruling does not propose a collective capacity reserve to be procured by a CPE. But a small buffer of one percent, in addition to the amounts in the base case portfolio, seems prudent to cover small amounts of uncertainty or non-compliance with procurement requirements overall, without unnecessarily increasing costs.

2.3. Need Allocation

Under this proposal, when a PSP portfolio and/or TPP base case portfolio is adopted, each LSE would become responsible for procuring its proportional share of the new resources identified as needed in the five-year timeframe. The proportional share for each LSE would be based on the load forecast adopted in

the California Energy Commission's (CEC) adopted Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) from that same year, usually adopted in January or February; the TPP base case portfolio is usually adopted in a similar timeframe (by February). This share could be determined based on demand in critical hours, annual energy demand, or a combination of both.

Once the IEPR load forecast and PSP portfolio and/or TPP base case are adopted, Commission staff would calculate the need allocation for each LSE and post it publicly, with electric service providers (ESPs) posted in aggregate and transmitted confidentially to individual ESPs. The LSE allocations would be posted by the end of March in the year in which the TPP base case or PSP portfolio is adopted.

Each LSE would also be afforded some flexibility in choosing the exact resources to purchase for its portfolio. Each LSE would be required to meet the total NQC requirement, but could show compliance with the individual resource type or attribute-based category requirements in a range with a minimum and maximum level. For example, LSEs could be deemed in compliance with the individual resource or attribute-based category requirements if their contracted and online resource amounts are between 70 and 130 percent for each resource or attribute-based category. The minimums and maximums could be smaller or larger (50-150 percent, 80-120 percent, *etc.*). This concept is intended to allow for some portfolio flexibility to accommodate individual LSE preferences, as well as account for uncertainty in availability, while continuing to move procurement toward the identified optimal electricity portfolio in aggregate. Enforcement and penalties (discussed further in Section 2.6 below) would be based on not meeting the minimum amount or exceeding the maximum amount in each resource category.

In addition, this proposal would naturally accommodate load migration among LSEs, on a rolling basis, because load forecasts would be adjusted with each compliance year. Compliance rules could be developed that allow for fair outcomes for LSEs experiencing load departure, through options to trade or sell resources that are no longer needed to serve load or for program compliance.

Likewise, LSEs would be incentivized to affect their load shape and/or their load in general through investment in demand-side management (for example, energy efficiency or demand response) to help reduce their resource needs in the future.

This proposal would likely require some ongoing baseline analysis, including identification of resources already online, those under contract or in development, and those planned by LSEs, in order to ensure a fair allocation to LSEs based on previous procurement contributions.

2.4. Compliance

The compliance requirements for this proposal would be two-fold. First, LSEs would be required to show by the third year after the adoption of the TPP base case portfolio and/or PSP portfolio that they had 100 percent of the resources required by their individual allocation under contract for the year five years out from the most recently-adopted TPP base case and/or PSP portfolio. Contracts would be required to be long term (meaning, for a period of ten years or more) to show compliance.

Then, by the compliance year five years after the adoption of the TPP base case portfolio and/or PSP portfolio, each LSE would be required to have the identified resources actually online and delivering to the grid to meet its individual allocation.

Again, there would be flexibility in each resource amount or attribute-based category (with associated minimum or maximum), but the total NQC amounts would be required to be contracted by three years after the need determination is made, and required to be online by five years later.

Compliance deadlines would be June 1 of each relevant year, and procurement compliance filings would continue to be required of LSEs on this date every year. The December procurement data filings would be eliminated in favor of a once-a-year showing. Compliance would be assessed on a rolling basis, for each year of new resource requirements, on an ongoing basis.

2.5. Resource Accreditation

Because the procurement required by this proposal would be for new resources, all resources would need to be incremental to a baseline. This ruling proposes to use the same baseline as the previous MTR procurement requirements (*see* D.21-06-035, D.23-02-040 (as modified by D.24-02-047), and D.26-02-057). Namely, any resource that came online after January 1, 2020 could be used for compliance with a particular requirement, if it has not already been used to comply with a previous procurement requirement. LSEs with excess procurement beyond what was required previously could use the additional resources to meet a later procurement need allocated to them.

This ruling also recognizes that the Commission may need to address how to handle repowering of existing resources, and that future consideration of those resources could change the baseline process. Accounting for repowering issues can be addressed later in the RCPPP development process.

This ruling further proposes that resources would be accredited toward the NQC procurement requirements for compliance purposes based on marginal ELCC values. This is chiefly because marginal ELCCs are designed to assess the

relative value of different types of resources based on the overall portfolio mix anticipated during each time period. It is an advantage that the marginal ELCCs shift over time, because they represent the changing value that each resource type brings to the portfolio, particularly as particular resource types become saturated and new portfolio needs are identified.

This ruling recognizes that there is likely some economic inefficiency in having two separate accreditation systems for RCPPP and RA, but the Commission would rely on LSEs' procurement expertise to keep this to a minimum. No matter the timeframes chosen for an IRP procurement requirement and the RA program, there will need to be a transition from the IRP planning assumptions to the real-time reliability system in RA.

In addition, to facilitate this recommendation and for some amount of certainty and predictability, a new marginal ELCC study would be published each year that a PSP portfolio and/or TPP base case portfolio is adopted, in August, for the resource procurement compliance year five years out. Thus, LSEs would know what to expect in terms of resource accreditation almost five years before the required online date occurs.

2.6. Enforcement

Similar to the MTR procurements, this ruling proposes that LSEs be penalized for any deficiency in total required procurement NQC on the basis of the net cost of new entry (CONE). Specifically, this penalty would be applied only on the total capacity requirements required by their online deadline, annually, for each uncured deficiency over a ten-year period.

For LSEs who comply with the total NQC requirements but miss the specific resource or attributed-based category requirements within the total, a penalty is proposed on the amount of NQC by which each LSE drops below the

minimum amount in the range for any resource type other than the least-cost resource (currently likely four-hour lithium-ion battery storage). The exact configuration of this idea would depend upon the category of resources or resource types required in each PSP portfolio.

The penalty for falling below the minimum required NQC for each resource category could be based on the highest-cost marginal resource in the portfolio, but could also change over time as the resource portfolio composition changes.

The purpose of this portion of the penalty structure concept is to dissuade LSEs from procuring only the lowest-cost resources to meet their total requirements, while leaning on the system (and the other LSEs and their customers) to procure the more expensive resource types. Again, this penalty would be assessed annually until the required resource comes online, for up to ten years.

LSEs would also be subject to a lower penalty basis for any amount of resources in NQC for which they do not have signed contracts in the compliance year three years out. This penalty should likely have an administrative basis, rather than being based on the cost of a particular resource. Parties are invited to comment on the appropriate basis for and/or level of such a penalty.

To facilitate this enforcement regime, every other year in August, a study would be published containing all of the values necessary to calculate penalties for LSEs (net CONE, lowest-cost marginal resource, highest-cost marginal resource, and any other value implicated in the enforcement framework).

2.7. Relationship to Individual Load-Serving Entities' Integrated Resource Planning Filings

This planning and procurement process would rely on LSEs filing individual IRPs containing their own plans for meeting the various IRP goals, including their preferred mix of resources to be procured, based on their individual preferences. These individual IRPs would be, as they are now, periodically aggregated and analyzed to form a PSP portfolio that would be adopted and used as the basis for the procurement requirements. The cyclical nature of the process would allow LSEs to take into account prior procurement experiences when preparing their next individual IRPs.

This ruling suggests that these LSE plans be required to be filed every four years on June 1, beginning in the year 2030. This would allow for a consolidated IRP and RCPPP procurement compliance filing every four years, for purposes of efficiency.

2.8. Relationship to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Order 1920

As most parties are aware, the CAISO has filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) its proposal in response to FERC Order 1920. If CAISO proposals are implemented, among other changes, the TPP cycle would begin every two years instead of annually. The proposal described above in this ruling assumes that this two-year cycle will be adopted, and that the proposed RCPPP process would occur every two years, with procurement requirements applying to a deadline every other year.

2.9. Relationship to Resource Adequacy and Renewables Portfolio Standard Programs

Under the proposal in this ruling, the resource adequacy and RPS programs would continue as is, with periodic changes to occur within the

separate rulemakings for each program. This ruling does not propose any changes to either program, as those programs would not automatically be required to align with the proposal herein. Therefore, there would not be any multi-year RA requirement or any changes to resource eligibility under the RPS program. However, as is the case now, LSEs would be encouraged to harmonize and optimize their portfolios and their procurement to comply with the requirements of the RA and RPS programs, in addition to the requirements proposed in this ruling.

In addition, it would be expected that the requirements summarized in this ruling as falling under the RCPPP paradigm would lead to more procurement of renewable and/or zero-emissions resources than the current RPS program alone, because the GHG target associated with the IRP program would require additional procurement to meet the RCPPP requirements than would be driven by the current level of RPS requirements.

3. Summary

This section summarizes how the first individual compliance cycle would unfold, based on the description above. This ruling proposes that June 1, 2033 would be the first full procurement compliance deadline with this proposal. Table 1 below shows the events that would lead up to that initial compliance year. Every other year after 2028 in which a PSP portfolio and/or TPP base case portfolio is adopted, the steps shown in Table 1 would repeat for the following two-year compliance period. Table 2 shows the potential parallel activities for the next cycle, leading to the proposed June 1, 2035 second compliance deadline.

Table 1. Potential Schedule Leading to First RCPPP Compliance Deadline

EVENT	DATE
CEC IEPR load forecast adopted by CEC	February 2028

EVENT	DATE
PSP portfolio and TPP base case portfolio adopted by Commission	February 2028
Procurement need for 2033 allocated to each LSE, based on TPP base case and IEPR load forecast	March 2028
Marginal ELCC values for 2033 published	August 2028
Penalty values for 2033 published	August 2029
LSEs file individual IRPs (to be approved by February 2032)	June 1, 2030
LSEs file procurement data	June 1, 2031
LSEs responsible for 100% of identified new resources under contract	June 1, 2031
Compliance assessment begins for resources under contract, based on procurement data filings	June 1, 2031
LSEs file procurement data	June 1, 2033
LSEs responsible for 100% of identified new resources online	June 1, 2033
Compliance assessment begins for resources online, based on procurement data filings	June 1, 2033

Table 2. Potential Schedule Leading to Second RCPPP Compliance Deadline

EVENT	DATE
CEC IEPR load forecast adopted by CEC	February 2030
TPP base case adopted by Commission	February 2030
Procurement need for 2035 allocated to each LSE, based on TPP base case and IEPR load forecast	March 2030
LSEs file individual IRPs (to be approved by February 2032)	June 1, 2030
Marginal ELCC values for 2035 published	August 2030
Penalty values for 2035 published	August 2031
LSEs file procurement data	June 1, 2033

EVENT	DATE
LSEs responsible for 100% of identified new resources under contract	June 1, 2033
Compliance assessment begins for resources under contract, based on procurement data filings	June 1, 2033
LSEs file procurement data	June 1, 2035
LSEs responsible for 100% of identified new resources online	June 1, 2035
Compliance assessment begins for resources online, based on procurement data filings	June 1, 2035

4. Questions for Parties

This section contains a list of questions parties to which parties are requested to respond. If parties wish to comment on other aspects of this ruling's proposal that are not directly covered in the specific questions, parties should provide those additional points at the end of their filed comments.

1. Does this ruling describe a workable framework for an RCPPP that will achieve the goals of IRP, pursuant to SB 350? Why or why not?
2. Will the proposal described in this ruling be simpler to implement than other proposals under consideration? Why or why not? Compare and contrast benefits and costs as directly as possible.
3. Is this ruling's proposal preferable to the current ad hoc procurement order process? Why or why not? Compare and contrast benefits and costs as directly as possible.
4. Are there other proposals already under consideration that better make the connection between long-term resource and transmission planning and LSE resource procurement? If so, which ones, and why? Compare and contrast benefits and costs as directly as possible.
5. If the Commission were to implement the proposal in this ruling, should the need determination be based on

specific identified resources or resource attributes? How (in general) and how (specifically) should the procurement need be expressed?

6. Comment on whether this ruling's proposal is workable in its relationship to any potential CPE procurement for LLT resources.
7. Comment on the proposal for a smaller buffer than included in the Staff Proposal from April 2025.
8. Is it appropriate to require the LSEs to procure resource and/or resource attributes with minimum and maximum levels within a range (*e.g.*, 80-120 percent, 40-150 percent)? Propose appropriate minimum and maximum ranges, provide your rationale, and/or explain why this proposal is unworkable.
9. Comment on this ruling's proposal for need allocation to specific LSEs.
10. Comment on the proposed requirement for 100 percent of required resources to be under contract three years out.
11. Comment on the proposed requirement for 100 percent of required resources to be online within five years from the date the need is identified and allocated.
12. Comment on the reasonable of the proposed cadence and sequencing of work to support the proposed framework, including (but not necessarily limited to) ELCC development, net CONE calculation, and procurement data filings.
13. Comment on the reasonableness of using marginal ELCC accreditation toward the procurement requirements for the resources identified in this proposal.
14. Comment on the proposal to penalize non-compliance with online resource requirements using a net CONE calculation.
15. Comment on the proposal to penalize failure to procure a minimum of non-lowest-cost resource procurement at the level of the highest-cost marginal resource.

16. Comment on the proposal to penalize non-compliance with contracting requirements with an administrative penalty and suggest a basis for this calculation.
17. Comment on the proposal to move to a four-year interval for consideration of individual LSE IRPs.
18. Comment on the relationship of this proposal to the FERC Order 1920 proposals.
19. Comment on the relationship of this proposal to the RA program.
20. Comment on the relationship of this proposal to the RPS program.
21. Please comment on anything else that is not already covered in the list above.

IT IS RULED that:

1. Interested parties may file and serve comments in response to this ruling and the questions in Section 4 by no later than July 22, 2026.

2. Interested parties may file and serve reply comments in response to this ruling by no later than August 7, 2026.

3. For awareness of parties, this ruling shall be served on the service lists for the new Integrated Resource Planning Rulemaking (R.25-06-019), the Renewables Portfolio Standard Rulemaking (R.24-01-017), and the Resource Adequacy Rulemaking (R.25-10-003).

Dated June 23, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ JULIE A. FITCH

Julie A. Fitch
Administrative Law Judge