

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



FILED

08/05/26

02:54 PM

A2512009

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric
Company (U 902-E) for Approval of Palomar
Decarbonization Demonstration Project

Application 25-12-009

**SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 902-E)
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE,
MOTION FOR MODIFICATION**

Krista deBoer
Roger A. Cerda
8330 Century Park Court CP32D
San Diego, CA 92123
Telephone: (760) 271-8839
Email: KdeBoer@sdge.com

Attorneys for
**SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
COMPANY**

August 5, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....	3
III.	SDG&E’S UNDERSTANDING OF THE RULING AND CURRENT COMPLIANCE EFFORTS	6
IV.	THE RULING’S REASONING REFLECTS A PROJECT-LIMITED PRODUCTION ..	8
V.	ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFICATION IS WARRANTED BECAUSE FULL RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 33 AND 48 WOULD IMPOSE EXTRAORDINARY AND DISPROPORTIONATE BURDEN	9
A.	Rule 10. 1 Requires Proportionality.....	9
B.	Full Responses Would Require Extraordinary E-Discovery Efforts	10
C.	Commission Proceedings Should Not Require Broad Civil-Litigation Style E- Discovery Absent Clear Need.....	12
VI.	REQUESTED RELIEF.....	13
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

STATUTES AND LEGISLATION

Cal. Civ. Code § 2017.010	11, 12
Cal. Civ. Code § 2031.060(i)	8
Cal. Civ. Code § 2031.230	9
Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 1701(a).....	9

COURT CASES

<i>Calcor Space Facility, Inc. v. Superior Court</i> (1997) 53 Cal.App.4th 216.....	11
<i>Ellis v. Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc.</i> (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 853.....	8
<i>Irvington-Moore v. Super. Ct.</i> (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 733	11
<i>Oppenheimer Fund v. Sanders</i> (1978) 437 U.S. 340133 <i>Park v. Law Offices of Tracey Buck-Walsh</i> (2021) 73 Cal.App.5th 179	11
<i>Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc. v. Superior Court</i> (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 762	11

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION DECISIONS

D.20-08-025, 2020 Cal. PUC LEXIS 465	9, 11
--	-------

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, Rule 10.1	<i>passim</i>
Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, Rule 11.1.....	1
Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, Rule 11.3	9
Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, Rule 13.6(a)	9

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

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric
Company (U 902-E) for Approval of Palomar
Decarbonization Demonstration Project

Application 25-12-009

**SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 902-E)
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE,
MOTION FOR MODIFICATION**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (“Rules”), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (“SDG&E”) respectfully requests clarification, or alternatively modification, of the Administrative Law Judge’s (“ALJ”) July 29, 2026 Email Ruling Granting the Utility Consumers’ Action Network’s (“UCAN”) Motion to Compel (the “Ruling”). SDG&E appreciates the ALJ’s prompt consideration of the discovery dispute and does not seek reconsideration of the central determination that Project-related communications responsive to UCAN Data Request Set No. 1 Questions 33 and 48 should be produced. Rather, SDG&E seeks guidance regarding the scope of the production required by the Ruling so that SDG&E may ensure complete and timely compliance.

SDG&E understands the Ruling to require production of communications *relevant* to the Palomar Decarbonization Demonstration Project (“Project”), specifically communications with the turbine manufacturer, General Electric (“GE”), concerning hydrogen blending at the Project and communications regarding SDG&E’s collaboration or contemplated collaboration with the University of California Irvine (“UCI”) concerning the hydrogen blending aspects of the Project. That understanding is supported by the Ruling’s discussion, which characterizes the requests as seeking Project-relevant communications with the manufacturer and communications concerning the specific UCI collaboration described in SDG&E’s testimony.¹

¹Ruling at 2.

Acting consistent with that understanding, SDG&E has already undertaken additional searches of custodial files following issuance of the Ruling. For Question 33, SDG&E searched the archived records of three former employees reasonably likely to possess Project-related communications with GE, including a former employee known to have served as a principal point of contact with GE concerning matters associated with the Project. Those searches, utilizing Project-focused search criteria, yielded more than 800 documents containing the search terms. Review is currently underway and a preliminary assessment indicates that only a limited subset appears responsive to the Project-related issues discussed in the Ruling. SDG&E presently anticipates that it will be able to complete its review and production by the August 13 deadline.

Similarly, with respect to Question 48, SDG&E searched the archived records of the departed employee who served as SDG&E's primary point of contact regarding the UCI collaboration and did not identify responsive communications, due to SDG&E's routine document retention policy.

And, as reflected in SDG&E's discovery responses and UCAN's Motion to Compel SDG&E to Respond to Data Request No. 1, Questions 33 and 48, filed July 21, 2026 ("UCAN's Motion"), discussed more fully below, SDG&E has already conducted multiple searches of the files current employees assigned to the Project and previously produced all documents found in those searches that were related to the Project.²

The need for clarification arises because the Ruling's discussion describes a Project-focused production, while the ordering paragraph grants UCAN's motion in full and directs SDG&E to produce all responsive documents identified in UCAN's Motion.³ Read literally, the UCAN requests at issue sweep substantially more broadly than the categories discussed in the

² UCAN's Motion, Attachment C.; SDG&E 7/14 and 7/20 Supplemental Responses to Question 33 (disclosing prior employee was point of contact for the turbine manufacturer, and producing email correspondence identified from current employee's files).

³ Ruling at 2; *compare* basis for ruling, referencing "[P]roject-relevant communications" and the "hydrogen blending aspect of the Project" with Ordering Paragraph ("OP") 1 and 2, granting UCAN's Motion and ordering production of "all responsive...documents identified in UCAN's Motion to Compel."

Ruling. As explained below, the broader interpretation would require precisely the type of expansive and disproportionate electronic discovery effort that Rule 10.1 is intended to prevent.⁴

SDG&E respectfully requests clarification that the Ruling compels production of Project-related communications only or, alternatively, modification of the Ruling to expressly incorporate that limitation.

II. BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The discovery dispute between SDG&E and UCAN concerns the scope of Questions 33 and 48, not whether SDG&E should respond to them.

From the outset, SDG&E participated extensively in discovery, served timely responses to UCAN's 52 data requests (many of them multi-part), engaged in multiple meet-and-confer discussions, and repeatedly augmented its responses as additional information became available.⁵ Between June 19 and July 20, 2026, SDG&E served its initial responses and, through iterative discussions with UCAN, supplemental responses. During that period, SDG&E cooperated with UCAN's requests—some of which verged on arguably improper, including requests to revise answers to relay the same information with different words UCAN preferred—and most of UCAN's concerns were resolved without motion practice.⁶ The number of supplemental responses provided by SDG&E reflects continued cooperation, not evasion.

Importantly, SDG&E did not refuse discovery on Questions 33 and 48, as UCAN's Motion contends.⁷ Throughout the discovery process, SDG&E consistently advised UCAN that it was continuing to investigate Questions 33 and 48. During the June 24, 2026 meet-and-confer, SDG&E specifically advised UCAN that it was determining whether manufacturer communications regarding hydrogen blending existed and would continue investigating the issue.⁸ In current employee files, SDG&E identified one email chain with UCI staff reflecting a

⁴ SDG&E intended to file a Response to UCAN's Motion by the July 31, 2026 deadline to explain the basis for its objections to Questions 33 and 48 and provide information to support the ALJ's assessment under Rule 10.1.

⁵ *See*, generally, UCAN's Motion, Attachment A (SDG&E's Responses to UCAN's Data Request 01); Declaration of Krista deBoer in Support of SDG&E's Motion For Clarification, or in the Alternative, Motion for Modification of the ALJ's July 29, 2026 Email Ruling Granting UCAN's Motion to Compel ("deBoer Decl.") at paras. 2-5.

⁶ *See*, generally, UCAN's Motion, Attachment A; deBoer Decl. at paras. 2-5, and Exhibit ("Ex.") A and B.

⁷ *See* UCAN's Motion at 8, 10.

⁸ deBoer Decl. at Ex. B.

Project site tour, and one responsive email chain between SDG&E and GE.⁹ The email chain with GE also referenced an attached power point, which is marked as GE proprietary information and has a direction not to share with third-parties, and linked to two GE proprietary whitepapers. The email also contained a directive not to share GE's confidential materials with third parties.¹⁰ SDG&E provided a response to Question 33 that notified UCAN that SDG&E did not have permission to share the proprietary materials at the time of the production.¹¹ SDG&E has been engaging in outreach to GE to obtain this permission and will produce the white papers and slide deck if and when GE approves SDG&E's request.¹²

Likewise, SDG&E explained that certain responses stating SDG&E "*reserved the right to supplement*" reflected the temporary unavailability of subject-matter experts and SDG&E's intent either to provide additional information or confirm that no additional information existed once further investigation was completed.¹³ UCAN appeared to understand that context, but in its Motion omits any mention of it.

Questions 33 and 48, in particular, presented unusual circumstances because the principal custodians most likely to possess relevant communications had departed SDG&E before the Project Application itself was filed.¹⁴ SDG&E explained in its responses that the director of generation who met with the turbine manufacturer retired in 2020, and that the point of contact for UCI left the company in 2025, the role had not been filled yet, and SDG&E was awaiting a decision on the Application to resume collaboration with the UCI team.¹⁵ SDG&E also informed UCAN that broader archival searches of former employee files would require engagement of Information Technology personnel, outside vendor support, collection of substantial quantities of electronically stored information, and extensive attorney review.¹⁶ Rather than refusing

⁹ See SDG&E 7/20 Supplemental Response to Question 33 (identifying and producing document GE_SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion); SDG&E 7/14 Supplemental Response to Question 48a (identifying and producing email communication regarding November 13, 2025 UCI tour of the Project).

¹⁰ See UCAN Motion, Attachment C (email from GE transmitting proprietary materials and responding to SDG&E request to share with other parties, "I would recommend you to not share GE documentation to third parties.").

¹¹ See SDG&E 7/20 Supplemental Response to Question 33.

¹² deBoer Decl. at para. 16.

¹³ *Id.* at para. 6, and Exs. A and B.

¹⁴ *Id.* at para. 15.

¹⁵ SDG&E 7/14 Supplemental Responses to Question 33 and Question 48a.

¹⁶ SDG&E 7/20 Supplemental Responses to Question 33 and Question 48a.

discovery, SDG&E attempted to determine whether the potential value of those searches justified the substantial burden associated with them. The correspondence between the Parties shows that SDG&E repeatedly offered further discussion, including a specific offer to discuss the information UCAN sought from the former custodians, its probative value, and whether it could be obtained through less burdensome means.¹⁷

SDG&E asked UCAN during the meet-and-confer over Questions 33 and 48 to provide more information about what it was looking for in the emails so SDG&E could evaluate burden versus probative value and determine whether to stand on objections or conduct a search.¹⁸ UCAN's meet-and-confer explanations reinforced SDG&E's overbreadth concern.

As transcribed contemporaneously by SDG&E counsel, UCAN stated that it "want[ed] to know what [SDG&E's] understanding from the entities is regarding hydrogen" and it "want[ed] to know what these entities have said about hydrogen."¹⁹ Given this vague and broad explanation provided in the meet and confer, Questions 33 and 48 read as requests to explore general hydrogen-related views of outside entities, not as narrowly tailored requests tied to hydrogen blending in the Palomar GE Frame 7 turbines or tied to particular collaboration with UCI on this specific Project. The reasons UCAN provided in the meet-and-confer reflect that the requests were fishing expeditions, are objectionably broad, and seek information irrelevant to the Project.

SDG&E never took the position that Project-related communications should not be produced if they could reasonably be located. Rather, the parties disagreed regarding whether Rule 10.1 required SDG&E to undertake expansive archival searches untethered to the Project and directed at broad categories of communications whose relevance to the issues before the Commission was uncertain. Throughout the meet-and-confer process, SDG&E continued investigating, continued supplementing its responses, and continued offering to discuss narrowed approaches that would balance relevance and burden.

The present motion therefore does not seek to revisit whether SDG&E should produce Project-related communications (SDG&E agrees it should). Instead, SDG&E seeks clarification regarding the scope of the Ruling and whether the ALJ intended to order the narrower Project-

¹⁷ deBoer Decl. at Ex. A.

¹⁸ *Id.* at para. 3.

¹⁹ *Id.*

focused discovery described throughout the Ruling's discussion, or the significantly broader discovery reflected in the literal wording of Questions 33 and 48.

III. SDG&E'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE RULING AND CURRENT COMPLIANCE EFFORTS

SDG&E understands the Ruling to require production of communications relevant to the Project. In discussing Question 33, the Ruling describes UCAN's request as seeking "[P]roject-relevant communications between SDG&E and the turbine manufacturer regarding hydrogen blending" that "bear directly on the technical feasibility, safety margins, and scalability of the technology of the Project." Similarly, in discussing Question 48, the Ruling characterizes the requested information as communications regarding SDG&E's collaboration with UCI "to develop a data collection framework for the hydrogen blending aspect of the Project."²⁰

SDG&E agrees that such communications are appropriately discoverable and has acted accordingly.

As discussed above, prior to UCAN filing its Motion, SDG&E searched current Project personnel files multiple times and produced the responsive materials those searches located, including the GE email chain and the November 13, 2025 UCI facility-tour communication.²¹ SDG&E is also actively working to obtain GE's permission to produce its proprietary materials.²²

The fact that only two documents were identified in these searches is consistent with SDG&E's ordinary business practices. SDG&E generally designates a single point of contact for communications with outside organizations to avoid duplication and conflicting communications.²³ Current Project team members were not designated points of contact and therefore not likely to possess numerous communications with GE or UCI.²⁴ Moreover, emails that are not specifically coded to be retained beyond SDG&E's standard retention timeframe are

²⁰ Ruling at 3.

²¹ SDG&E 7/20 Supplemental Response to Question 33; SDG&E 7/14 Supplemental Response to Question 48a.

²² deBoer Decl. at para. 16.

²³ *Id.* at para. 11.

²⁴ *Id.* at para. 10.

automatically deleted, which may have also contributed to the small number of relevant documents.²⁵

Following issuance of the Ruling, SDG&E expanded its search efforts. For Question 33, SDG&E searched archived records associated with three former employees reasonably likely to possess Project-related communications involving GE and hydrogen. Using Project-specific search criteria, those searches yielded more than 800 documents containing the search terms.²⁶ Review is ongoing and a preliminary assessment indicates that only a relatively small subset appears responsive to the Project-related issues discussed in the Ruling.²⁷ SDG&E anticipates completing production by August 13.

For Question 48, SDG&E searched archived records associated with the departed employee who served as SDG&E's principal point of contact regarding the contemplated collaboration with UCI.²⁸ That search did not locate responsive communications due to SDG&E's routine document retention policy for departed employees.²⁹

SDG&E maintains a limited document-retention practice for departed employees. Emails are not retained indefinitely and are frequently unavailable unless specifically preserved beyond ordinary retention periods.³⁰ Consequently, archival searches often reveal—as is the case here with the UCI point of contact—that departing custodians' emails no longer exist because they were deleted pursuant to routine retention practices before any proceeding-specific preservation obligation arose.³¹

²⁵ *Id.* at para. 8.

²⁶ *Id.* at paras. 17-18.

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.* at para. 12.

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *Id.* at para. 8.

³¹ UCAN suggested in its Motion, with no evidence of spoliation, that SDG&E “may be allowing project-relevant communications...to be lost to routine document deletion notwithstanding this pending discovery request and proceeding.” (*see* UCAN’s Motion at 7.) UCAN’s preservation insinuation is unsupported. The mere statement that historic email may not exist under routine retention practices does not establish that responsive information was destroyed after a duty to preserve arose or after service of DR-01. Moreover, the former employees whose emails are now at issue departed SDG&E prior to the Application for approval of the Project was ever filed. (deBoer Decl. at para. 15.) California law is instructive; it distinguishes information lost through routine, good-faith operation of an electronic information system while preserving independent preservation obligations. (California Code of Civil Procedure (“C.C.P.”) Section (“§”) 2031.060(i); *Ellis v. Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc.* (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 853, 878.)

IV. THE RULING’S REASONING REFLECTS A PROJECT-LIMITED PRODUCTION

The Ruling grants UCAN’s Motion and orders SDG&E to “comprehensively produce and serve on UCAN complete, substantive, and non-evasive responses to Questions 33 and 48 of UCAN’s Data Request No. 1, including all responsive, non-privileged documents identified in UCAN’s Motion to Compel.”³² Clarification now sought by SDG&E is appropriate because the Ruling’s substantive discussion is narrower than the language of the requests themselves.

The Ruling focuses on communications relevant to evaluating the Project currently before the Commission. For Question 33, the Ruling discusses “[*P*roject-relevant *communications* between SDG&E and the turbine manufacturer regarding hydrogen blending, *which bears directly* on the technical feasibility, safety margins, and scalability of the technology *of the Project*.” For Question 48, the Ruling discusses “communications since the start of 2019 between SDG&E and faculty and staff of the University of California, Irvine Combustion Laboratory (UCI) *regarding a collaboration to develop a data collection framework for the hydrogen blending aspect of the Project*.”

However, the Ruling’s descriptions are not coextensive with UCAN’s requests as drafted.

- UCAN’s Question 33 seeks “all correspondence with the Palomar Energy Center’s turbine manufacturer discussing hydrogen blending,” without limitation to the Project or relevant time period.
- UCAN’s Question 48b seeks “all communications since the start of 2019 between SDG&E and faculty and staff of the University of California Irvine regarding hydrogen”—i.e. *company-wide* without limitation by the purpose or Project.³³

Read literally, UCAN’s requests extend well beyond the Project discussed in the Ruling’s reasoning. They potentially encompass communications concerning numerous unrelated hydrogen initiatives, operational projects, research partnerships, conferences, academic collaborations, transportation applications, safety initiatives, policy matters, and other business

³² Ruling at OP 2.

³³ UCAN clarified in a meet and confer that this question was intended to encompass *all* SDG&E employees and *all* UCI employees, and was only limited by hydrogen. *See* deBoer Decl. at para. 3 (emphasis added).

activities occurring over more than six years, and—as discussed more fully below—they implicate a search of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of documents.

Yet the Ruling's discussion does not evaluate the relevance of those broad categories of information. Instead, the Ruling consistently ties discovery to evaluation of the Project and SDG&E's testimony concerning the Project. SDG&E therefore respectfully believes the Ruling is best understood as directing production of Project-related communications.

V. ALTERNATIVELY, MODIFICATION IS WARRANTED BECAUSE FULL RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS 33 AND 48 WOULD IMPOSE EXTRAORDINARY AND DISPROPORTIONATE BURDEN

On the other hand, if the Ruling was intended to compel the full scope of Questions 33 and 48 as drafted, SDG&E respectfully requests modification.

A. Rule 10.1 Requires Proportionality

Rule 10.1 expressly permits discovery only unless “the burden, expense, or intrusiveness of that discovery clearly outweighs the likelihood that the information sought will lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.” The Commission has recognized that Rule 10.1 operates as a flexible balancing test and grants ALJs substantial discretion to tailor discovery according to the needs of the proceeding.³⁴ In other words, the Commission also is “not bound by the technical rules of evidence.”³⁵

Moreover, even civil discovery requires a reasonable, good-faith search;³⁶ it does not require a party to conduct every conceivable company-wide search, to produce documents that no longer exist, or to undertake extraordinary archived-email restoration and review that is disproportionate to the likely value of the information.³⁷

³⁴ Decision (“D.”) 20-08-025 at 4, citing Rule 13.6(a) and California Public Utilities Code (“Pub. Util. Code”) § 1701(a).

Rule 11.3’s meet-and-confer requirement should be applied in that same practical manner. Rule 11.3 requires a good-faith meet-and-confer before a motion to compel or limit discovery and is intended to encourage informal resolution of discovery disputes where reasonable, targeted steps may resolve or narrow issues without unnecessary motion practice. A party that conducts reasonable searches, produces what it finds, explains the limits of those searches, supplements as additional information becomes available, and continues to evaluate targeted next steps is cooperating with discovery—not refusing it.

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ *See, e.g.*, C.C.P. § 2031.230 (requiring affirmation of a diligent search and reasonable inquiry in the event of inability to comply with discovery request).

³⁷ Rule 10.1.

The dispute here was never whether Project-related communications should be produced. Rather, the dispute concerned whether SDG&E should be required to engage in expansive, litigation-style electronic discovery untethered from the specific issues being adjudicated.

B. Full Responses Would Require Extraordinary E-Discovery Efforts

The burden associated with literal compliance with Questions 33 and 48 is substantial. Following the emergence of the discovery dispute, SDG&E engaged IT personnel and outside vendor support to evaluate what broader archival searches according to the literal terms of Questions 33 and 48b would entail.³⁸ Those efforts demonstrated the extraordinary scope of the exercise and the merit of SDG&E's discovery objections.

Searches involving only the three former employees likely to correspond with GE yielded approximately 21.7 gigabytes of data, representing an estimated 108,500 to 217,000 emails before any responsiveness review, privilege review, confidentiality review, deduplication, or production processing.³⁹ And expanding the search to encompass the full breadth of Question 33 would require identifying and searching additional custodians across multiple organizations and functions. The resulting review population would expand dramatically.

Question 48b presents an even greater burden. As drafted, it seeks all communications since 2019 between SDG&E, *enterprise-wide*, and UCI personnel, *university-wide*, regarding hydrogen, regardless of whether such communications relate to the Project. Because SDG&E engages in numerous hydrogen-related activities unrelated to the Project, a literal interpretation would require a company-wide search spanning more than six years and involving potentially millions of electronically stored files. Such a search could encompass communications relating to unrelated research efforts, academic collaborations, public-policy discussions, transportation initiatives, gas operations, conferences, safety programs, and other matters with limited or no connection to the Project before the Commission.

The burden is not limited to identification of records. Archived materials must first be collected and restored by IT personnel and outside vendors. Those collections must then be searched, processed, deduplicated, reviewed for responsiveness, reviewed for privilege, reviewed for third-party proprietary information, and prepared for production. SDG&E IT previously

³⁸ deBoer Decl. at para. 7.

³⁹ Document range calculated using the usual estimate that each GB represents about 5,000 to 10,000 emails; deBoer Decl. at para. 13.

estimated that archival collection and processing of the 21.7 GB of data for the three custodians alone would require 2-3 weeks, followed by additional time to process the documents for review, and then several weeks of attorney review.⁴⁰ And SDG&E incurs additional costs to a vendor platform to host the documents for review. California authority recognizes that broad discovery relevance is counterbalanced by the authority to limit discovery where burden, expense, or intrusiveness outweighs likely evidentiary benefit.⁴¹ Limiting or protective conditions are warranted where, as here, technical extraction, privilege review, and data volume create undue expense.⁴²

Indeed, SDG&E's Project-focused review described above demonstrates the point. Even after narrowing searches to Project-specific criteria, SDG&E located more than 800 potentially responsive documents requiring attorney review.⁴³ That experience confirms that relevance and burden change dramatically depending upon whether production is confined to the Project or extended to every communication concerning hydrogen generally.

Though the Commission is not bound by civil discovery rules, state court precedent addressing discovery issues is instructive. California courts likewise require active management burdensome electronic discovery. The Court of Appeal has held that restoring and translating backup data can entail extraordinary, non-routine expense, and the trial court should evaluate whether and to what extent costs should be borne by the demanding party.⁴⁴ Courts caution against using broad production demands merely to discover whether documents exist.⁴⁵

UCAN's Motion states that Rule 10.1 and Code of Civil Procedure Section 2017.010 "identically provide" a broad relevance standard.⁴⁶ They do not. Rule 10.1 adds a separate and explicit balancing clause that UCAN omits from its statement of the legal standard, which limits discovery that is burdensome, expensive, or intrusive.⁴⁷ Thus, even assuming some potential

⁴⁰ deBoer Decl. at para. 14.

⁴¹ *Irvington-Moore v. Super. Ct.* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 733, 738; D.20-08-025 at 4 (noting Rule 10.1 is a flexible balancing test).

⁴² *Park v. Law Offices of Tracey Buck-Walsh* (2021) 73 Cal.App.5th 179, 188-190.

⁴³ deBoer Decl. at para. 18.

⁴⁴ *Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 762, 770-772.

⁴⁵ *Calcor Space Facility, Inc. v. Superior Court* (1997) 53 Cal.App.4th 216, 221-223.

⁴⁶ UCAN's Motion at 4.

⁴⁷ UCAN's Motion at 4 (providing excerpt of Rule 10.1 that omits the language, "unless the burden, expense, or intrusiveness of that discovery clearly outweighs the likelihood that the information sought will lead to the discovery of admissible evidence"); see C.C.P. § 2017.010 ("Unless otherwise limited by

relevance, the ALJ must weigh the likelihood of useful evidence against the burden, expense, and intrusiveness of the requested discovery.

That balance favors SDG&E. The additional search UCAN demands would require technical investigation into whether former custodians' mailboxes still exist, restoration of archived data, application of search terms to an unreasonably large universe of documents, attorney review for responsiveness, confidentiality, and privilege—all over weeks or months. UCAN offers no evidence that this extraordinary effort is likely to yield unique, material information unavailable from current witnesses, produced documents, or testimony. Nor does the passage of approximately six weeks since DR-01 was served change the analysis.⁴⁸ A disproportionate request remains disproportionate even if SDG&E theoretically could have begun broader work earlier.

C. Commission Proceedings Should Not Require Broad Civil-Litigation Style E-Discovery Absent Clear Need

Rule 10.1's proportionality limitation reflects a deliberate choice by the legislature to preserve the Commission's discretion to balance broad disclosure and practical administration according to the needs of a proceeding. Unlike civil litigation, Commission proceedings involve ongoing regulatory oversight, compressed procedural schedules, extensive technical subject matter, and costs *that ultimately affect ratepayers*. The Commission's discovery rules are designed to obtain information necessary to evaluate testimony, test applications, and develop a complete administrative record, while avoiding unnecessary burden and expense.

The Project-focused interpretation of the Ruling is fully consistent with those principles. The Project-related communications referenced throughout the Ruling directly concern the issues before the Commission. By contrast, requiring SDG&E to conduct broad enterprise-wide searches for all communications concerning hydrogen would dramatically expand discovery beyond the issues identified in the Ruling while imposing very substantial costs and burdens.

order of the court in accordance with this title, any party may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action or to the determination of any motion made in that action, if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.”).

⁴⁸ See Motion at 6-7, claiming that SDG&E has not conducted a robust email search in the six weeks since DR-01 was served.

Interpreting the Ruling to require only Project-related communications therefore harmonizes the Ruling with Rule 10.1, the Commission's traditional discovery framework, and the practical realities of utility proceedings.

A discovery standard that permits company-wide, multi-year email search or archival restoration campaigns simply because a request is directed at a regulated utility, rather than tailoring discovery to the specific project or issue before the Commission, risks converting Commission proceedings into the kind of resource-intensive, all-encompassing discovery associated with complex civil litigation, without the offsetting cost-control mechanisms available in civil discovery, such as proportionality-based cost-shifting orders and sanctions for disproportionate demands.⁴⁹ Rule 10.1's proportionality requirement, and the Commission's and reviewing courts' consistent application of a flexible balancing test, is best understood as a safeguard against exactly that outcome.

VI. REQUESTED RELIEF

SDG&E respectfully requests that the ALJ clarify that the July 29, 2026 Ruling requires production of communications concerning the Palomar Decarbonization Demonstration Project and does not require production of communications unrelated to or beyond the Project merely because they concern hydrogen or hydrogen blending generally. Alternatively, SDG&E requests modification of Ordering Paragraph 2 to read:

- Within ten business days, SDG&E shall produce and serve complete, substantive, and non-evasive responses to Questions 33 and 48 of UCAN Data Request Set No. 1, including responsive, non-privileged communications concerning the Palomar Decarbonization Demonstration Project. For Question 48, responsive communications shall be limited to communications concerning the Project and SDG&E's collaboration or contemplated collaboration with the University of California Irvine regarding the hydrogen blending aspects of the Project.

⁴⁹ See, e.g., *Oppenheimer Fund v. Sanders* (1978) 437 U.S. 340, 358 (party “may invoke the district court’s discretion under Rule 26(c) to grant orders protecting him from undue burden or expense” by cost-shifting).

VII. CONCLUSION

SDG&E appreciates the Administrative Law Judge's prompt attention to the parties' discovery dispute and is actively undertaking additional actions and review efforts to comply with the Ruling.

SDG&E respectfully submits that the Ruling's reasoning demonstrates an intent to compel production of Project-related communications and that SDG&E has acted consistently with that understanding. Because other language in the Ruling could be construed more broadly, however, clarification is warranted. Alternatively, modification is appropriate to ensure that the required production remains consistent with Rule 10.1's proportionality requirements and the Project-focused rationale articulated throughout the Ruling.

DATED at San Diego, California, this 5th day of August 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Krista deBoer
Krista deBoer

Attorney for
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 Century Park Court CP32D
San Diego, CA 92123
Telephone: (760) 271-8839
Email: kdeboer@sdge.com

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

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric
Company (U 902-E) for Approval of Palomar
Decarbonization Demonstration Project

Application 25-12-009

[PROPOSED] RULING

On August 5, 2026, San Diego Gas & Electric Company (“SDG&E”) filed a Motion for Clarification, or in the alternative, Motion for Modification of the July 29, 2026 Ruling on Utility Consumers’ Action Network (“UCAN”)’s Motion to Compel.

Having reviewed the motion, response, and record, and good cause appearing,

IT IS RULED that [Check One]

_____ SDG&E’s Motion for Clarification is Granted. This Ruling clarifies that the July 29, 2026 Ruling requires production of communications concerning the Palomar Decarbonization Demonstration Project and does not require production of communications unrelated to or beyond the Project merely because they concern hydrogen or hydrogen blending generally.

_____ SDG&E’s Motion for Modification is Granted. Within ten business days, SDG&E shall produce and serve complete, substantive, and non-evasive responses to Questions 33 and 48 of UCAN Data Request Set No. 1, including responsive, non-privileged communications concerning the Palomar Decarbonization Demonstration Project. For Question 48, responsive communications shall be limited to communications concerning the Project and SDG&E's collaboration or contemplated collaboration with the University of California Irvine regarding the hydrogen blending aspects of the Project.

Dated: _____

Administrative Law Judge

Exhibit A

Email Re: SDGE Response

Fucci-Ortiz, Lisa

From: edward@ucan.org
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2026 9:56 AM
To: deBoer, Krista S; Kirchhoff, Tyler M; 'Tyson Siegele'
Cc: 'Courtney Cook-Sloan'; Central Files
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

CAUTION! External Sender

This email came from outside the company. If you're unsure whether this message is harmless, click the "Report Suspicious" button.

[Report Suspicious](#)

OK, thanks!

Let me make 1 quick call beforehand . . . right around 10:15 I should call from my cell # = [REDACTED].

Thanks!

Ed

From: deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2026 9:53 AM
To: edward@ucan.org; Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>; 'Tyson Siegele' <tyson@cleanstrat.com>
Cc: 'Courtney Cook-Sloan' <courtney@ucan.org>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Hi Edward,

Sure, that window works. Please call my cell: [REDACTED].

Thanks,
Krista

From: edward@ucan.org <edward@ucan.org>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2026 9:52 AM
To: deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>; Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>; 'Tyson Siegele' <tyson@cleanstrat.com>
Cc: 'Courtney Cook-Sloan' <courtney@ucan.org>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01
Importance: High

Krista:

I appreciate your prompt reply. Tyson and I would like to discuss, even for a few minutes, your responses below.

How about sometime between 10 and 11 am this morning? Perhaps a simple phone call – I can call you – and then conference in Tyson?

Please let me know if this works for you.

Thanks!

Ed

From: deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>

Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2026 8:07 AM

To: edward@ucan.org; Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>; 'Tyson Siegele' <tyson@cleanstrat.com>

Cc: 'Courtney Cook-Sloan' <courtney@ucan.org>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Edward,

I respectfully disagree that SDG&E's responses to 33, 45, and 48 are non-responsive:

- The answer provided to Q.45 regarding affordability metrics is complete, and is SDG&E's response. It appears UCAN would like SDG&E to provide an affordability metric that SDG&E has not calculated and does not calculate, which we explained in the response. If we are misunderstanding the question, or why you view the response as non-responsive, I would be happy to meet and confer further.
- With regard to Q.33 and Q.48, as the updated responses explain, the custodians of those communications have both left the company and their emails are not readily available, and collaboration with UCI will resume when that role within SDG&E is backfilled. We would need to engage tech to determine whether the custodians' emails were permanently deleted, per company policy, or filed by the custodians in a way that would permit them to be recovered. SDG&E does not believe that the probative value of these communications outweighs burden of taking efforts to recover the custodial emails, run searches through them for potentially relevant correspondence, and conduct reviews of that world of documents. However, again, I would be happy to meet and confer further to discuss in more detail the information UCAN seeks to uncover in these emails, its probative value, and whether the information can be obtained in other ways.

I am available any time Monday to discuss, except for 2-2:30, if you believe it would be helpful to meet.

Thank you,
Krista

From: edward@ucan.org <edward@ucan.org>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2026 3:15 PM

To: Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>; deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>; 'Tyson Siegele' <tyson@cleanstrat.com>

Cc: 'Courtney Cook-Sloan' <courtney@ucan.org>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Importance: High

Krista & Tyler:

Thank you, we are in receipt of the most recent, supplemental production re: July 14, 2026, DR01 supplemental response.

UCAN still finds the production not responsive. UCAN requests that you please provide all documents and information requested in DR01 requests 33, 45, and 48 by close of business on Monday July 20, 2026. (Please also refer to our Meet-and-Confer discussions and emails from Tyson addressing the outstanding, specific requests.)

While we do appreciate the efforts to reply to our concerns regarding the requests, should UCAN not receive the requested information and documents, we may move next to file a Motion to Compel.

Thank you.

Ed

Edward Lopez
Executive Director

Utility Consumers' Action Network
404 Euclid Avenue, Suite 377
San Diego, CA 92114
(619) 696-6966
edward@ucan.org
www.ucan.org

From: Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>

Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 10:24 AM

To: deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>; Tyson Siegele <tyson@cleanstrat.com>

Cc: Edward Lopez <edward@ucan.org>; Courtney Cook-Sloan <courtney@ucan.org>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Tyson, attached please find SDG&E's fourth supplemental response to UCAN DR01 in A.25-12-009.

Thanks,
Tyler

Tyler Kirchhoff

Regulatory Affairs & Compliance

P 619-676-3898

E TMKirch2@sdge.com

Follow Us:



[\[twitter.com\]](https://twitter.com)

[\[linkedin.com\]](https://linkedin.com)

[\[instagram.com\]](https://instagram.com)



Committed to the safety of the communities we serve.

From: deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2026 1:28 PM

To: Tyson Siegle <tyson@cleanstrat.com>

Cc: Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>; Edward Lopez <edward@ucan.org>; Courtney Cook-Sloan <courtney@ucan.org>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Thanks so much, Tyson. This is helpful. I'll provide an update as soon as I have one.

Regards,
Krista

From: Tyson Siegle <tyson@cleanstrat.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2026 1:01 PM

To: deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>

Cc: Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>; Edward Lopez <edward@ucan.org>; Courtney Cook-Sloan <courtney@ucan.org>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Hi Krista,

To narrow the scope for you, the request numbers for which UCAN still needs answers are listed below with a short description of each request (not the actual language of the request):

33: communications with the turbine manufacturer

45: affordable \$/kg of hydrogen

48: communications with UCI

If SDG&E refuses to provide the information requested, please let me know as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Tyson Siegle

Principal Consultant, Clean Energy Strategies

917-771-2222

On Thu, Jul 9, 2026 at 12:18 PM deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com> wrote:

Hi Tyson,

We are regrouping tomorrow when everyone is back in the office, and I hope to have updated answers for you early next week.

Thanks,

Krista

From: Tyson Siegele <tyson@cleanstrat.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 9:01 AM
To: deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>
Cc: Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>; Edward Lopez <edward@ucan.org>; Courtney Cook-Sloan <courtney@ucan.org>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Hi Krista,

Can you provide an update regarding SDG&E's planned timeline for sending responses to the unanswered requests? Thank you.

Tyson Siegele

Principal Consultant, Clean Energy Strategies

917-771-2222

On Wed, Jul 1, 2026 at 12:57 PM deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com> wrote:

Hi Tyson –

We are working to include 10, 12, 17, 34, and 50 in tomorrow's production.

Regarding the other responses, as I mentioned in my previous email, responses where we “reserved the right to supplement” indicate that we may have additional information we can provide (or confirm we have no additional information) once key custodians return to the office.

Thanks,

Krista

From: Tyson Siegele <tyson@cleanstrat.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 10:34 AM
To: Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>
Cc: Edward Lopez <edward@ucan.org>; Courtney Cook-Sloan <courtney@ucan.org>; deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Thank you Tyler. I was able to download the supplemental response and the confidential IRP files.

Your message with the response stated that a forthcoming supplemental response will include: 10, 12, 17, 34, 50a, 50b. Will these be delivered tomorrow?

I see that #33, 42, 48a, 48b, have not been answered either, although the responses in some cases were updated. Will those be included in tomorrow's response? Specifically, UCAN still needs the communications with turbine manufacturer and communications with UC Irvine.

Thank you,

Tyson Siegele

Principal Consultant, Clean Energy Strategies

917-771-2222

On Tue, Jun 30, 2026 at 5:14 PM Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com> wrote:

Hi Tyson,

SDG&E provided supplemental responses yesterday and today including confidential information via Sempra Electronic Data Transfer (EDT). Would you please confirm receipt? Thank you.

Tyler Kirchhoff

Regulatory Affairs & Compliance

P 619-676-3898

E TMKirch2@sdge.com

Follow Us:



[\[twitter.com\]](https://twitter.com) 

[\[linkedin.com\]](https://www.linkedin.com) 

[\[instagram.com\]](https://www.instagram.com)



Committed to the safety of the communities we serve.

From: Tyson Siegele <tyson@cleanstrat.com>

Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 9:14 AM

To: Connaughy, Joanna T <Jconn@sdge.com>

Cc: Edward Lopez <edward@ucan.org>; Courtney Cook-Sloan <courtney@ucan.org>; deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>; Central Files <CentralFiles@sdge.com>; Kirchhoff, Tyler M <TMKirch2@sdge.com>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: SDGE RESPONSE: A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Thank you Joanna.

I downloaded each file and completed some spot checks. It looks like I can access the downloaded files. I will complete my review and provide any additional feedback by email and during tomorrow's meet and confer.

Tyson Siegele

Principal Consultant, Clean Energy Strategies

917-771-2222

On Fri, Jun 19, 2026 at 2:10 PM Connaughey, Joanna T <Jconn@sdge.com> wrote:

Hi Tyson,

Please see attached for SDG&E's response to UCAN's Data Request Set 01 and supporting documents for questions 11 and 15. We have provided previous data requests through SDG&E's Electronic Data Transfer (EDT) system. Please confirm that you have received them and are able to access. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Responses to the following questions will be provided on July 2:

- 6
- 12
- 17- 20
- 25
- 35
- 42
- 45 - 50
- 52

Best,

Joanna Connaughy
Regulatory Case Manager
T 619.676.7038
E Jconn@sdge.com
Follow Us:



[facebook.com]
[twitter.com]

[linkedin.com]
[instagram.com]



For more information about privacy at SDG&E visit sdge.com/privacy.

From: Tyson Siegle <tyson@cleanstrat.com>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 2:10 PM
To: deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>
Cc: Edward Lopez <edward@ucan.org>; Courtney Cook-Sloan <courtney@ucan.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] A.25-12-009 (Palomar) - UCAN Data Request Set 01

Ms. deBoer,

See the attached file for UCAN Data Request Set 01. Please confirm receipt of this email.

SDG&E might assert that some responses are confidential. To ensure timely responses to the request, please provide UCAN with a copy of SDG&E's proposed NDA as soon as possible.

The responses to this data request are due June 19, 2026. It is crucial that UCAN receives the responses within the traditional 10-day deadline for data request responses due to the near-term deadline for intervenor testimony. The next two business days are June 22 and June 23. Please provide a time on each of those days when SDG&E is available for a meet and confer regarding SDG&E's forthcoming response to the data request. If SDG&E fully answers each data request in the set, we can cancel the scheduled meet and confer.

Please email copies of the data request responses to me and the individuals copied on this email, including:

- Edward Lopez (edward@ucan.org)
- Courtney Cook-Sloan (courtney@ucan.org)
- Tyson Siegele (tyson@cleanstrat.com)

Thank you,

Tyson Siegele

Principal Consultant, Clean Energy Strategies

917-771-2222

Exhibit B

Email Re: UCAN Data Request Set 01

From: [deBoer, Krista S](#)
To: [edward@ucan.org](#); "Tyson Siegele"
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: UCAN Data Request Set 01 - Meet & Confer Follow-up
Date: Monday, June 29, 2026 7:33:00 PM

Edward and Tyson,

You'll notice in the production today that there are a few questions where SDG&E reserves the right to supplement our response. These are questions for which we may be able to provide more information once a couple of our key SMEs are back in the office. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Krista

From: edward@ucan.org <edward@ucan.org>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2026 12:04 PM
To: 'Tyson Siegele' <tyson@cleanstrat.com>; deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: UCAN Data Request Set 01 - Meet & Confer Follow-up
Importance: High

CAUTION! External Sender

This email came from outside the company. If you're unsure whether this message is harmless, click the "Report Suspicious" button.

[Report Suspicious](#) ?

Krista:

Thank you (and your team) very much for your follow-up and cooperation!

Thanks!

Ed

From: Tyson Siegele <tyson@cleanstrat.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2026 8:30 AM
To: deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com>
Cc: Edward Lopez <edward@ucan.org>
Subject: Re: UCAN Data Request Set 01 - Meet & Confer Follow-up

Thank you Krista. Have a good weekend.

Tyson Siegele

Principal Consultant, Clean Energy Strategies

917-771-2222

On Fri, Jun 26, 2026 at 6:30 PM deBoer, Krista S <KdeBoer@sdge.com> wrote:

Edward and Tyson,

Thank you for meeting with me this morning. Following up on our conversation, it looks like SDG&E will be able to produce almost all outstanding questions on Monday, including most of the questions for which we have the July 2 extension. There are a couple questions subject to our discussion below that may require until the July 2 extension to complete, and we can let you know which, specifically, on Monday when we send you the other responses.

If you have additional questions after receiving the production Monday, I'm available to meet next week.

Have a good weekend,
Krista

From: deBoer, Krista S

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 4:40 PM

To: Tyson Siegele <tyson@cleanstrat.com>; Edward Lopez <edward@ucan.org>

Subject: UCAN Data Request Set 01 - Meet & Confer Follow-up

Hi Tyson and Edward,

Thanks again for meeting with me today. Below are the questions we discussed and SDG&E's response. I should have revised responses to you no later than Monday, 6/29, and sooner if possible.

- Q4: We are working to pull hourly data. It looks like we can pull hourly data from October 2024 for sure, and are looking into whether we can access earlier data.
- Q5: Revising to clarify that the array is not connected to CAISO or the grid.
- Q9c: Providing more details regarding use cases for the two sedans.
-

Q10: You stated that you wanted the contract dates to be able to create a timeline for the project.

- On SDG&E's end, this is not uncomplicated because, in addition to the sheer number of contracts involved, some work was conducted under existing contracts, and we'll need to piece that together. Moreover, this means the contract date may not necessarily reflect when project-specific work started. We are looking into how burdensome (to us) and useful (to you) it would be to provide contract dates, and are also exploring other options for data that reflects when vendors started working on the project that we could propose to you. I should have more information in the next two days and we can discuss further as needed.
- Q11: Updating answer to clarify that 9 is inapplicable.
- Q22: Augmenting answer to detail data collection and evaluation efforts.
- Q26: Will augment to the extent there is more information to provide.
- Q32: Adding percentage for round trip efficiency.
- Q33: We are looking to see if we have manufacturer communications regarding hydrogen blending.
- Q34: We are confirming whether PCC1 is correct.
- Q36a: Clarifying that audit is pending and confirming anticipated completion date.
- Q37a / b: We are confirming whether there is additional analysis we can provide.
- Q51: I'll let you know as soon as possible regarding the 2022 IRP.

Please let me know if you have any questions. My schedule tomorrow is fairly tight, but I can hop on a call at 4 or later if it would be helpful to talk again.

Thanks,
Krista

Exhibit C
SDGE Responses and Emails

UCAN DATA REQUEST 01
PALOMAR DECARBONIZATION DEMONSTRATION – A.25-12-009
SDG&E FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE
PROVIDED PURSUANT TO JUNE 24, 2026 MEET & CONFER
DATE RECEIVED: JUNE 5, 2026
DATE RESPONDED: JULY 20, 2026

QUESTION 33:

Provide all SDG&E correspondence with the Palomar Energy Center's turbine manufacturer discussing hydrogen blending.

SDG&E RESPONSE TO QUESTION 33:

SDG&E objects to this request under Rule 10.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure to the extent it seeks the production of information that is neither relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending proceeding nor is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. SDG&E further objects to the request on the grounds that it is overbroad and calls for information that is confidential, proprietary, contains trade secrets, is privileged or otherwise entitled to confidential protection by reference to statutory protection.

SDG&E 6/29 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 33:

SDG&E reserves the right to supplement this response.

SDG&E 7/14 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 33:

SDG&E's director of generation had several meetings with the turbine manufacturer in September 2020. He has retired and his communication on the hydrogen blending with the turbine manufacturer is not readily available. However, an internal record shows a discussion with the turbine manufacturer on performance impact of hydrogen on a separate GE engine (LM6000) in September 2020.

SDG&E 7/20 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 33:

SDG&E reiterates its above objections to this request under Rule 10.1 and on the basis that it is overly broad, burdensome and to the extent it seeks production of information that is not relevant to the pending proceeding. SDG&E further objections to this request on the grounds it seeks confidential and proprietary third-party materials for which SDG&E expressly does not have permission to disclose. Subject to and without waving the foregoing objections, SDG&E responds as follows:

SDG&E's director of generation had several meetings with the turbine manufacturer in September 2020. He has retired and his communication on the hydrogen blending with the turbine manufacturer is not readily available or may not exist at all due to SDG&E's document retention policies. SDG&E's technical staff estimates that it would likely take several weeks to several months to search archived emails and determine if any relevant communications still exist. Current SDG&E employees involved in the Project conducted a search of their files and identified the email chain attached hereto:

GE_SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion

UCAN DATA REQUEST 01
PALOMAR DECARBONIZATION DEMONSTRATION – A.25-12-009
SDG&E FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE
PROVIDED PURSUANT TO JUNE 24, 2026 MEET & CONFER
DATE RECEIVED: JUNE 5, 2026
DATE RESPONDED: JULY 20, 2026

QUESTION 45:

SDG&E Testimony at AB-8 states that “electrolytic hydrogen was favored due to its commercial availability and the general consensus that it had the ability to scale to generate abundant, affordable, and reliable clean hydrogen within the decade.” State the dollar amount of hydrogen in \$/kg, including delivery cost, that SDG&E defines as “affordable.”

SDG&E RESPONSE TO QUESTION 45:

SDG&E will address this question in its supplemental response.

SDG&E 6/29 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 45:

SDG&E objects to this question on the basis it calls for speculation, and to the extent it mischaracterizes testimony. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SDG&E responds as follows:

SDG&E does not independently or in a vacuum make determinations about affordability metrics that are in actuality defined by the market and a host of variables, contexts, and relative factors. The testimony does not suggest an objective \$/kg affordability number, but rather indicates that the potential for electrolytic hydrogen to scale to the point that hydrogen is made affordable is a driving force and justification for developing the demonstration project. SDG&E also notes that the US Department of Energy “Hydrogen Shot” and the BloombergNEF Hydrogen Economy Outlook (as referenced on AB-8) state that electrolytic hydrogen is cost-effective.

SDG&E 7/14 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 45:

SDG&E objects to this question on the basis it calls for speculation, and to the extent it mischaracterizes testimony. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SDG&E responds as follows:

In 2022, the Legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 1075, which called for California Air Resource Board (CARB), in consultation with the California Energy Commission and California Public Utilities Commission, to produce a comprehensive report on hydrogen. This report will cover the development, deployment, and use of hydrogen across all sectors. There are benchmarks for hydrogen production cost range forecasts for 2045 for several technologies, including electrolyzers with solar.¹

SDG&E 7/20 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 45:

SDG&E reiterates its objections to this request on the basis it calls for speculation and mischaracterizes testimony. SDG&E further objects to the extent a response would require SDG&E to conduct analysis or create documents that do not exist. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, and following the July 20 meet and confer with UCAN, whereby UCAN contended SDGE's previous answer was nonresponsive, SDG&E responds as follows:

SDG&E reiterates that its direct response to this request continues to be that SDG&E does not independently or in a vacuum make determinations about affordability metrics that are in actuality defined by the market and a host of variables, contexts, and relative factors. The testimony does not

¹ Analysis of Hydrogen in California for Senate Bill 1075 Report, California Air Resource Board, Available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/sb-1075-workshop-022525-presentation-e3.pdf>

UCAN DATA REQUEST 01
PALOMAR DECARBONIZATION DEMONSTRATION – A.25-12-009
SDG&E FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE
PROVIDED PURSUANT TO JUNE 24, 2026 MEET & CONFER
DATE RECEIVED: JUNE 5, 2026
DATE RESPONDED: JULY 20, 2026

suggest an objective \$/kg affordability number, but rather indicates that the potential for electrolytic hydrogen to scale to the point that hydrogen is made affordable is a driving force and justification for developing the demonstration project. It appears UCAN would like SDG&E to provide an affordability metric that SDG&E has not calculated and does not calculate, because, as noted above, affordability metrics are defined by the market and a host of variables, contexts, and relative factors external to SDG&E. SDG&E also continues to point UCAN to the US Department of Energy “Hydrogen Shot” and the BloombergNEF Hydrogen Economy Outlook (as referenced on AB-8), which state that electrolytic hydrogen is cost-effective, and to Analysis of Hydrogen in California for Senate Bill 1075 Report, California Air Resource Board, Available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/sb-1075-workshop-022525-presentation-e3.pdf>.

UCAN DATA REQUEST 01
PALOMAR DECARBONIZATION DEMONSTRATION – A.25-12-009
SDG&E FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE
PROVIDED PURSUANT TO JUNE 24, 2026 MEET & CONFER
DATE RECEIVED: JUNE 5, 2026
DATE RESPONDED: JULY 20, 2026

QUESTION 48:

SDG&E Testimony at AB-11 states that “SDG&E is also collaborating with faculty at the University of California Irvine Combustion Laboratory to develop a data collection framework for the hydrogen blending aspect of the Project, including emissions and system performance. The goal is to collect and disseminate meaningful data and compare results with other projects that use blended hydrogen for power generation.”

QUESTION 48a:

Provide all data and communications since the start of 2019 between SDG&E and faculty and staff of the University of California Irvine related to the Project.

SDG&E RESPONSE TO QUESTION 48a:

SDG&E will address this question in its supplemental response.

SDG&E 6/29 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 48a:

With respect to the requests for all data and communications since the start of 2019 between SDG&E and University of California Irvine (UCI), SDG&E objects to this request under Rule 10.1 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure to the extent “all data and communications” seeks the production of information that is neither relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending proceeding nor is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SDG&E responds as follows:

Per the testimony of Ari Beer and Pooyan Kabir and Kevin Counts, communications with UCI are related to data collection framework for the hydrogen blending aspect of the Project. SDG&E reserves the right to supplement this response.

SDG&E 7/14 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 48a:

SDG&E has communicated with UCI faculty however the individual who was in direct communications has left the company in late 2025, and the role has not been filled yet. The UCI faculty was on campus for a tour of the facility on November 13, 2025. SDG&E is awaiting a decision on the application to formally start engaging with UCI faculty for collaboration on hydrogen combustion at the turbine.

SDG&E provided email communication on November 13, 2025, in a separate document.

SDG&E 7/20 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 48a:

SDG&E objects to this request under Rule 10.1 and on the basis that it is overly broad, burdensome and to the extent it seeks production of information that is not relevant to the pending proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, SDG&E responds as follows:

As noted, SDG&E has communicated with UCI faculty however the individual who was in direct communications has left the company in late 2025, and the role has not been filled yet. As a departed employee, their custodial emails are not readily available or may not exist at all due to SDG&E's document retention policies. SDG&E's technical staff estimates that it would likely take several weeks to several months to search archived emails and determine if any relevant communications still exist. Current SDG&E employees involved in the Project conducted a search of their files and—

UCAN DATA REQUEST 01
PALOMAR DECARBONIZATION DEMONSTRATION – A.25-12-009
SDG&E FIFTH SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE
PROVIDED PURSUANT TO JUNE 24, 2026 MEET & CONFER
DATE RECEIVED: JUNE 5, 2026
DATE RESPONDED: JULY 20, 2026

as reflected in the above response—identified that the UCI faculty was on campus for a tour of the facility on November 13, 2025. SDG&E previously provided the email communication that occurred on November 13, 2025 in connection with this tour. As previously noted, SDG&E is awaiting a decision on the Project Application to formally reengage with UCI faculty for collaboration on hydrogen combustion at the turbine.

QUESTION 48b:

Provide all other data and communications since the start of 2019 between SDG&E and faculty and staff of the University of California Irvine regarding hydrogen.

SDG&E RESPONSE TO QUESTION 48b:

SDG&E will address this question in its supplemental response.

SDG&E 6/29 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 48b:

Please see response to 48a.

SDG&E 7/14 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 48b:

Please see response to 48a.

SDG&E 7/20 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO QUESTION 48b:

Please see response to 48a.

END OF REQUEST

deBoer, Krista S

From: Patel, Sagar (GE Gas Power) <sagar.B.patel@ge.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 1:26 PM
To: Sarosa, Sugandi
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: GE - SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion

CAUTION! EXTERNAL SENDER - STOP, ASSESS, AND VERIFY

Do you know this person? Were you expecting this email, any links or attachments? Does the content make sense? If suspicious, do not click links, open attachments, or provide credentials. Don't delete it. **Report it by using the REPORT SPAM option!**

Sungadi,

For injection of 5% H2 blend with NG, there's minimal impact to the change in HR per the deck we provided, even at 35% H2 blend we expect very slight change in the HR.

We do not have other document expect the performance run we provided, if you need additional performance runs specific to certain criteria & parameter then we would have to run additional cases.

Thanks,
Sagar

From: "Sarosa, Sugandi" <SSarosa@sdge.com>
Date: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 at 2:05 PM
To: Sagar Patel <sagar.B.patel@ge.com>
Subject: EXT: RE: GE - SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion

WARNING: This email originated from outside of GE. Please validate the sender's email address before clicking on links or attachments as they may not be safe.

Sagar,

We are looking into up to 5% blending only.

The specific info we are interested is %H2 vs Heat Rate. I cannot find any whitepaper on this, only data I have is from the table in your presentation.

Do you have other document on the Heat Rate I can share with other?

Thanks,
Sugandi

From: Patel, Sagar (GE Gas Power) <sagar.B.patel@ge.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 12:53 PM
To: Sarosa, Sugandi <SSarosa@sdge.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: GE - SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion

CAUTION! EXTERNAL SENDER - STOP, ASSESS, AND VERIFY

Do you know this person? Were you expecting this email, any links or attachments? Does the content make sense? If suspicious, do not click links, open attachments, or provide credentials. Don't delete it. **Report it by using the REPORT SPAM option!**

Hello Sugandi,

Happy New Year! Hope you had good holidays.

I am glad to hear SDG&E is considering blending H2 w/ NG in the Aero Turbines. Do you have rough idea of how much % blend is being considered or expected and potential timing of operation?

I would also like to share couple of whitepapers: [Hydrogen gas turbine \[ge.com\]](#) and [Carbon Capture \[ge.com\]](#) , also I recommend you taking a look at [H2 Turbine web page \[gepower.com\]](#) to help you get more insights on GE's journey and capabilities to operate Turbines on various fuels. GE is currently in process of testing and demonstration to burn H2 in Aero Gas Turbine in New York at NYPA Brentwood Demo, Public announcement: <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-announces-new-york-will-explore-potential-role-green-hydrogen-part> [governor.ny.gov]

I would recommend you to not share GE documentation to third parties. Please let me know if you have any questions and would like to setup another conversation to further understand SDG&E's future Hydrogen Combustion plans.

Thank you,
Sagar

Sagar Patel
GE Gas Power

M: 404-831-7039

[Building a World That Works \[ge.com\]](#)

From: "Sarosa, Sugandi" <SSarosa@sdge.com>

Date: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 at 1:08 PM

To: Sagar Patel <sagar.B.patel@ge.com>

Subject: EXT: RE: GE - SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion

WARNING: This email originated from outside of GE. Please validate the sender's email address before clicking on links or attachments as they may not be safe.

Hi Sagar,

We have a lot of interest and questions on blending Hydrogen on the gas turbine.

Do you have any whitepaper or publish document showing the performance impact table as in the attached presentation?

Or can I share the table with other party?

Regards,

Sugandi Sarosa
Plant Engineer
SDG&E - Electric Generation
Palomar Energy Center
2300 Harveson Place | Escondido CA 92029
Mobile: 951-541-7533
Office: 760-432-2508

From: Patel, Sagar (GE Gas Power) <sagar.B.patel@ge.com>
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2020 6:39 AM
To: Sarosa, Sugandi <[SSarosa@sdge.com](mailto:ssarosa@sdge.com)>; LaPeter, Carl S. <CLaPeter@sdge.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: GE - SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL - Be cautious of attachments, web links, and requests for information ***

Hello Sugandi,

Attached please find high level modification required for blending more than 5% of H2 by volume and associated performance analysis to understand the impact on emissions. Upto 5% of H2 blending has minimal impact to engine and emissions however higher than 5% blending will require modifications to package.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Thank you,
Sagar

Sagar Patel

Senior Sales Manager, Aero Services
GE Gas Power

M: 404-831-7039

E: sagar.b.patel@ge.com

[LinkedIn \[linkedin.com\]](https://www.linkedin.com/in/sagarpatel/)

[www.ge.com \[ge.com\]](http://www.ge.com)

[Building a world that works](#)

From: "Sarosa, Sugandi" <[SSarosa@sdge.com](mailto:ssarosa@sdge.com)>
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2020 at 7:15 PM
To: Sagar Patel <sagar.B.patel@ge.com>, "LaPeter, Carl S." <CLaPeter@sdge.com>
Subject: EXT: RE: GE - SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion

Sagar,

Thank you for the H2 discussion today. It's very informative for me.

Is it possible to get the table data slide on the emission vs H2 percentages so I can discuss this with the team member that missed the meeting today?

Regards,

Sugandi Sarosa
Plant Engineer
SDG&E - Electric Generation
Palomar Energy Center
2300 Harveson Place | Escondido CA 92029
Mobile: 951-541-7533
Office: 760-432-2508

From: Patel, Sagar (GE Gas Power) <sagar.B.patel@ge.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2020 10:24 AM

To: LaPeter, Carl S. <CLaPeter@sdge.com>; Sarosa, Sugandi <SSarosa@sdge.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: GE - SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion

*** EXTERNAL EMAIL - Be cautious of attachments, web links, and requests for information ***

Hello Sugandi,

Do you prefer to keep the meeting as scheduled for today or should we re-schedule it to tomorrow? Want to make sure everyone from SDG&E gets to participate in LM6000PC Hydrogen discussion. Please advise!

Thank you,
Sagar

Sagar Patel
GE Gas Power

M: 404-831-7039

From: "LaPeter, Carl S." <CLaPeter@sdge.com>
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2020 at 12:32 PM
To: Sagar Patel <sagar.B.patel@ge.com>
Subject: EXT: Declined: GE - SDG&E Miramar LM6000PC Hydrogen Fuel Mix Discussion

I have another meeting at this time. I'm available Friday at 0900 or 0930.

Carl S. La Peter
Plant Manager
SDG&E - Electric Generation
Palomar Energy Center
2300 Harveson Place
Escondido, CA 92029
Office: 760-432-2503
Cell: 760-331-7810
Email: clapeter@sdge.com

This email originated outside of Sempra Energy. Be cautious of attachments, web links, or requests for information.

This email originated outside of Sempra Energy. Be cautious of attachments, web links, or requests for information.

This email originated outside of Sempra. Be cautious of attachments, web links, or requests for information.

This email originated outside of Sempra. Be cautious of attachments, web links, or requests for information.