

COM/CHG/vhj 8/6/2026



FILED

08/06/26

10:32 AM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application Of Southern California
Edison Company (U338E) Regarding
2026 Risk Assessment Mitigation
Phase.

Application 26-05-018

ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S SCOPING MEMO AND RULING

This scoping memo and ruling sets forth the issues, need for hearing, schedule, category, and other matters necessary to scope this proceeding pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1701.1 and Article 7 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules).

1. Procedural Background

Southern California Edison Company (SCE) filed the instant application on May 15, 2026, requesting Commission approval of its 2026 Risk Assessment Mitigation Phase.

On June 15, 2026:

- The Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA) filed a timely response to the Application; and

On June 29, 2026:

- The Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates), the Energy Producers and Users Coalition (EPUC), and The Utility Reform Network (TURN) filed timely protests to the Application; and
- Mussey Grade Road Alliance (MGRA) filed a timely response to the Application.

On July 09, 2026:

SCE filed a timely reply to the responses and protests to its Application.

A Prehearing Conference (PHC) was held on July 21, 2026, to address the issues of law and fact, determine the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and address other matters as necessary.

After considering the discussion at the PHC, I have determined the issues and initial schedule of the proceeding to be as set forth in this Scoping Memo.

2. Issues

After considering the Application, party protests and responses, and the discussion at the PHC, the issues to be determined or otherwise considered are:

1. Whether SCE's Risk Assessment and Mitigation Phase (RAMP) filing is complete and in compliance with previous RAMP-related and governing decisions. This includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. Whether SCE identifies and integrates the full set of benefits that are the result of the incurred costs into its benefit cost ratio (BCR) estimates; demonstrates adequate consideration of these costs and benefits when assessing its risk mitigation programs; and calculated and uses its BCR estimates in compliance with the directives of D.22-12-027, D.24-05-064, and D.25-08-032.
 - b. Whether SCE's proposed alternative tranching methods for a set of risks (employee and contractor safety, cyber attack, hydro dam failure, seismic, physical security, and public safety risk not attributable to asset failure) are acceptable alternatives to the Commission's best-practice quintile approach to tranching, as set forth in D.24-05-064.
 - c. Whether SCE shows the potential CoRE as a probability distribution from which an expected value or tail risk value can be calculated, explaining for each enterprise risk how SCE derived the probability distribution for

the potential CoRE, in compliance with the directives of D.25-08-032.

- d. Whether SCE's RAMP filing includes four optimized enterprise portfolios with differing budget scenarios and whether the enterprise portfolios' budget scenarios are based on the baseline cost forecast in compliance with the directives of D.25-08-032.
 - e. Whether SCE incorporates overall residual risk reporting in compliance with the directives of D.25-08-032.
 - f. Whether SCE developed and provides adequate description of its Risk Reporting Units (RRUs) in compliance with the directives of D.25-08-032.
 - g. Whether SCE provides pre- and post-mitigation values for likelihood of a risk event (LoRE), consequences of a risk event (CoRE), monetized risk value, risk reduction, and benefit-cost ratios for all RRUs that aggregate up to a mitigation program subject to RAMP analysis in compliance with the directives of D.25-08-032.
 - h. Whether SCE has reasonably implemented the Environmental and Social Justice Pilot Study in compliance with the directives of D.22-12-027.
- 2. Whether SCE's RAMP filing adequately describes how SCE uses its risk model and risk analysis in the selection and implementation of its mitigation programs.
 - 3. Whether there are gaps in SCE's RAMP filing in identifying enterprise-level risks and considering mitigation options, including but not limited to:
 - a. Whether SCE reasonably assesses and analyzes the cost efficiency of its mitigation programs.
 - b. Whether SCE considers and adequately discusses reasonable alternatives to its proposed mitigation plans.
 - c. Whether SCE demonstrates the reasonableness of its risk-averse scaling functions and their application.

- d. Whether SCE demonstrates the reasonableness of its tail-risk analysis, including wildfire tail-risk treatment.
4. Whether SCE's analysis is transparent and allows for independent validation of its results.
5. Whether feedback on SCE's RAMP Application has been adequately incorporated into SCE's 2029 Test Year General Rate Case filing.
6. Whether SCE's RAMP Application aligns with or impacts the achievement of any of the nine goals of the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan.

3. Need for Evidentiary Hearing

The proceeding was preliminarily categorized as ratesetting, and there were no objections to the category during discussions at the PHC. This ruling affirms that this is a ratesetting proceeding. Accordingly, ex parte communications are restricted and must be reported pursuant to Article 8 of the Commission's Rules.

Based on discussions at the PHC concerning the scope and schedule of the proceeding, it is determined that hearings are not necessary.

4. Schedule

The following schedule is adopted but may be modified by the assigned Commissioner or ALJ as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of this proceeding:

Event	Date
Informal Comments on RAMP Application due to SPD and RAMP Service List	September 4, 2026
Ruling issuing SPD Report	October 23, 2026
Opening Comments on SCE RAMP Application and SPD Report, filed and served	November 18, 2026
Reply Comments filed and served	December 12, 2026
Proposed Decision	No later than 90 days after submission

In their protests and responses parties noted that the schedule proposed by SCE in its RAMP application does not provide time for informal comments to be submitted and considered by Safety Policy Division (SPD), while previous RAMP proceedings have extended SPD's evaluation period to allow it to consider informal comments. The Rate Case Plan in D.20-01-002 does not include informal comments.¹ As such, parties to the proceeding are not required to submit informal comments prior to filing their comments on SCE's RAMP application and SPD's evaluation report.²

The proceeding will stand submitted upon the filing of reply comments on SCE's RAMP application and SPD's evaluation report unless the ALJ requires further evidence or argument. Based on this schedule, the proceeding will be resolved within 18 months as required by Public Utilities Code Section 1701.5.

¹ D.20-01-002, Appendix A at A-1.

² Parties are welcome to submit informal comments prior to the publication of SPD's evaluation report but SPD may not consider them.

5. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Program and Settlements

The Commission's Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) program offers mediation, early neutral evaluation, and facilitation services, and uses ALJs who have been trained as neutrals. At the parties' request, the assigned ALJ can refer this proceeding to the Commission's ADR Coordinator. Additional ADR information is available on the Commission's website.³

Any settlement between parties, whether regarding all or some of the issues, shall comply with Article 12 of the Rules and shall be served in writing. Such settlements shall include a complete explanation of the settlement and a complete explanation of why it is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with the law and in the public interest. The proposing parties bear the burden of proof as to whether the settlement should be adopted by the Commission.

6. Category of Proceeding and Ex Parte Restrictions

This ruling confirms the Commission's preliminary determination⁴ that this is a ratesetting proceeding. Accordingly, ex parte communications are restricted and must be reported pursuant to Article 8 of the Rules.

7. Public Outreach

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1711(a), where feasible and appropriate, before determining the scope of the proceeding, the Commission sought the participation of those likely to be affected, including those likely to derive benefit from, and those potentially subject to, a decision in this proceeding. This matter was noticed on the Commission's daily calendar.

³ <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/adr/>

⁴ Resolution ALJ 176-3582 at 5.

Where feasible and appropriate, this matter was incorporated into engagements conducted by the Commission's External Affairs Division with local governments and other interested parties.

8. Intervenor Compensation

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1804(a)(1), a customer who intends to seek an award of compensation must file and serve a notice of intent to claim compensation by August 20, 2026, 30 days after the prehearing conference.

9. Response to Public Comments

Parties may, but are not required to, respond to written comments received from the public. Parties may do so by posting such response using the "Add Public Comment" button on the "Public Comment" tab of the online docket card for the proceeding.

10. Public Advisor

Any person interested in participating in this proceeding who is unfamiliar with the Commission's procedures or has questions about the electronic filing procedures is encouraged to obtain more information at <http://cpuc.ca.gov/pao> or contact the Commission's Public Advisor at 866-849-8390 or send an e-mail to public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov.

11. Filing, Service, and Service List

The official service list has been created and is on the Commission's website. Parties should confirm that their information on the service list is correct and serve notice of any errors on the Commission's Process office, the service list, and the ALJ. Persons may become a party pursuant to Rule 1.4.⁵

⁵ The form to request additions and changes to the Service list may be found at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/additiontoservicelisttranscriptordercompliant.pdf>

When serving any document, each party must ensure that it is using the current official service list on the Commission's website.

This proceeding will follow the electronic service protocol set forth in Rule 1.10. All parties to this proceeding shall serve documents and pleadings using electronic mail, whenever possible, transmitted no later than 5:00 p.m., on the date scheduled for service to occur. Rule 1.10 requires service on the ALJ of both an electronic and a paper copy of filed or served documents.

When serving documents on Commissioners or their personal advisors, whether or not they are on the official service list, parties must only provide electronic service. Parties must not send hard copies of documents to Commissioners or their personal advisors unless specifically instructed to do so.

Persons who are not parties but wish to receive electronic service of documents filed in the proceeding may contact the Process Office at process_office@cpuc.ca.gov to request addition to the "Information Only" category of the official service list pursuant to Rule 1.9(f).

The Commission encourages those who seek information-only status on the service list to consider the Commission's subscription service as an alternative. The subscription service sends individual notifications to each subscriber of formal e-filings tendered and accepted by the Commission. Notices sent through subscription service are less likely to be flagged by spam or other filters. Notifications can be for a specific proceeding, a range of documents and daily or weekly digests.

12. Receiving Electronic Service from the Commission

Parties and other persons on the service list are advised that it is the responsibility of each person or entity on the service list for Commission

proceedings to ensure their ability to receive emails from the Commission. Please add “@cpuc.ca.gov” to your email safe sender list and update your email screening practices, settings and filters to ensure receipt of emails from the Commission.

13. Assignment of Proceeding

Christine Harada is the assigned commissioner and Syche Cai is the assigned ALJ and presiding officer for the proceeding.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The scope of this proceeding is described above and is adopted.
2. The schedule of this proceeding is set forth above and is adopted.
3. Evidentiary hearings are not needed.
4. The presiding officer is Administrative Law Judge Syche Cai.
5. The category of the proceeding is ratesetting.

Dated August 6, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ CHRISTINE HARADA

Christine Harada
Assigned Commissioner