PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

FILED
11/13/26
10:28 AM
R2312008

November 13, 2026

Agenda ID #24641
Quasi-Legislative

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 23-12-008:

This is the proposed decision of Commissioner Reynolds. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's December 17, 2026 Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties of record may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE
Michelle Cooke
Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC: vj4
Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF COM REYNOLDS (Mailed 11/13/2026)**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Transportation Electrification Policy and Infrastructure.	Rulemaking 23-12-008

DECISION ADOPTING TRANSPORTATION ELECTRIFICATION PROACTIVE PLANNING MODELING TOOLS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title **Page**

DECISION ADOPTING TRANSPORTATION ELECTRIFICATION PROACTIVE PLANNING MODELING TOOLS 1
Summary 2
1. Background 2
1.1. Procedural Background 3
1.1.1. TE Proactive Planning Modeling Inputs and Assumptions Ruling 3
1.1.2. TEPP I&A and CDM Stakeholder Comments 4
1.2. Submission Date 5
2. Issues Before the Commission 5
3. Discussion 6
3.1. Public Charging Corridor 6
3.1.1. Party Positions 6
3.1.2. Discussion 10
3.2. TEPP I&A and CDM 11
3.2.1. Party Positions 11
3.2.2. Discussion 11
3.3. TEPP Interaction with Planning Processes 12
3.3.1. Party Positions 12
3.3.2. Discussion 16
3.4. Future Refinement 19
3.4.1. Party Positions 19
3.4.2. Discussion 21
4. Summary of Public Comment 22
5. Conclusion 22
6. Procedural Matters 23
7. Comments on Proposed Decision 23
8. Assignment of Proceeding 23
Findings of Fact 23
Conclusions of Law 26
ORDER 28

Appendix A – CDM Change Log-8.19.26 Version
Appendix B – Corridor Disaggregation Methodology-8.19.26 Version
Appendix C – I&A Change Log-8.19.26 Version
Appendix D - I&A Library Worksheet-8.19.26 Version

Appendix E -TEPP Modeling Inputs and Assumptions Narrative Report-8.19.26 Version

DECISION ADOPTING TRANSPORTATION ELECTRIFICATION PROACTIVE PLANNING MODELING TOOLS

Summary

This decision adopts transportation electrification proactive planning modeling tools for an initial implementation cycle. These modeling tools identify a common set of values and assumptions that Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall use to model transportation electrification charging electric system impacts along California public highway corridors. Collectively, these modeling tools are called Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning Inputs & Assumptions and Corridor Disaggregation Methodology.

These modeling tools disaggregate transportation electrification loads from the California Energy Commission's Integrated Energy Policy Report. This approach to disaggregating loads will provide localized insights to identify the location, size, and timing of expected transportation electrification load growth along public highway corridors in California for use in existing planning processes.

Finally, these modeling tools will serve as inputs to ensure consistent forecasting and scenario building across existing planning processes, including the distribution planning process and transmission planning process.

This proceeding remains open.

1. Background

On December 14, 2023, the Commission issued the Order Instituting this Rulemaking (OIR)[1]. This rulemaking was initiated to continue the Commission's

[1] Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Transportation Electrification Policy and Infrastructure.

oversight of the development of infrastructure to support the acceleration of transportation electrification (TE) in California. In particular, the Commission initiated this Rulemaking to consider how vehicle electrification could be effectively and affordably adopted to support the pace and scale of growth required to achieve California's zero-emission vehicle goals.

1.1. Procedural Background

On April 12, 2024, the Assigned Commissioner issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling[2] setting forth the issues, need for hearing, schedule, category, and other matters necessary to scope this proceeding, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section (Section) 1701.1 and Article 7 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules). This Scoping Memo and Ruling stated that this is the venue where the Commission will comprehensively assess the needs for TE policy and infrastructure, beginning with TE proactive planning.

1.1.1. TE Proactive Planning Modeling Inputs and Assumptions Ruling

On October 1, 2025, the assigned Administrative Law Judge issued a ruling requesting comment on TE Proactive Planning (TEPP) Modeling Inputs and Assumptions (I&A) and Corridor Disaggregation Model (CDM). This ruling directed parties to provide formal comments on four sets of documentation for the TEPP I&A and CDM.

First, parties were directed to comment on the I&A, including a Modeling Inputs and Assumptions Report and a Library Worksheet. The purpose of the I&A is to identify a common set of values and assumptions that can be used to model public TE charging's electric system impacts along highway corridors. The I&A identifies and vets the best available data relevant to modeling

[2] Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling.

transportation patterns, charging and fueling patterns, and expected zero emissions charging technology adoption timelines and locations.[3]

Second, parties were directed to comment on the CDM. The CDM leverages the I&A to identify expected TE load associated with public light duty and medium-heavy duty (MDHD) battery electric vehicle charging and depot charging along 150 California highway corridors.[4] Finally, the Ruling released supplemental materials to support parties in vetting the I&A and CDM, which included the Tract Level Domicile Data Addendum and the CDM Visualizations.

As discussed in detail below, and attached to this decision, are the adopted CDM, I&A (including a Narrative Report and a Library Worksheet), and Change Logs. The adopted I&A and CDM have been modified based on stakeholder comment.

1.1.2. TEPP I&A and CDM Stakeholder Comments

On November 14, 2025, the following parties filed opening comments: (1) Acterra: Action for a Healthy Planet (Acterra); (2) CALSTART; (3) Center for Sustainable Energy (CSE); (4) City of Long Beach acting by and through its Board of Harbor Commissioners (Long Beach); (5) Coalition of California Utility Employees (CUE); (6) East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice, Union of Concerned Scientists, and Sierra Club (Joint Commenters); (7) Environmental Defense Fund (EDF); (8) International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT); (9) Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC); (10) Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E); (11) Powering America's Commercial Transportation (PACT); (12) Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates); (13) San Diego Gas & Electric

[3] TE Proactive Planning: I&A at 9.

[4] TE Proactive Planning: CDM at 3.

Company (SDG&E); (14) Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA); (15) Southern California Edison Company (SCE); (16) Tesla, Inc.; (17) Utility Consumers Action Network (UCAN); and (18) Vehicle-Grid Integration Council (VGIC).

On December 5, 2025, the following parties filed reply comments: (1) Acterra; (2) CALSTART; (3) CUE; (4) Joint Commenters; (5) EDF; (6) NRDC; (7) PG&E; (8) PACT; (9) SCE; (10) SDG&E; (11) SBUA; (12) The Utility Reform Network (TURN); and (13) UCAN.

All comments submitted by stakeholders were considered but given the large number of parties and issues, some recommendations may receive minimal or absent discussion in this decision. We note that stakeholder contributions submitted through party comment have meaningfully advanced the Commission's work in this decision, even where a stakeholder comment or recommendation received no direct discussion.

1.2. Submission Date

This matter was submitted on December 5, 2025 upon the submission of reply comments.

2. Issues Before the Commission

The issues before the Commission are:

1. Modeling Input & Assumptions: development of transportation electrification modeling Inputs and Assumptions for use in existing grid infrastructure planning and cost recovery processes.
    a. Establish a process to examine, scrutinize, and adopt transportation electrification inputs and assumptions, beginning with those associated with priority highway corridors. This process may address data needs and sources, process for updates, as well as ensuring stakeholder and interagency input and coordination.

b. Develop a corridor designation tool that can be used to identify priority corridor segments for proactive transportation electrification planning and adopt a process for ongoing reassessment of transportation electrification planning priorities.

c. Conduct a study of priority areas, beginning with identified highway corridors, to identify barriers to transportation electrification.

3. Discussion

Below, we discuss the components related to the implementation of the TEPP. First, we discuss the focus of TEPP, which is to support public charging corridors. Second, we discuss the changes made to the TEPP I&A and CDM in response to stakeholder comment. Finally, we discuss how TEPP interacts across the planning processes that PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E are part of. We now turn to our discussion regarding public charging corridors.

3.1. Public Charging Corridor

3.1.1. Party Positions

Parties commented on whether the Commission should prioritize the public corridor charging use case for the initial TEPP proactive planning cycle.

An array of parties assert that TEPP's proposed public corridor charging scope is reasonable. For example, SCE states that developing a California Energy Commission (CEC) load bus allocation product that integrates the TEPP approach for near-corridor locations can support the investor-owned utilities (IOUs) in identifying the size, timing, and location of long-term EV growth. SCE states that TEPP-informed bus allocations should be used to refine, not replace, existing IOU forecasts, where corridor-level TE growth is likely but not yet

captured in traditional planning inputs. This integration can help proactively assess infrastructure needs.[5]

ICCT states that the macro-level vehicle inputs like EV forecast and use cases are reasonable so long as they are consistent with underlying assumptions and projections made by CEC in the latest Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) vintage.[6]

TURN also supports the current public charging scope of TEPP. TURN argues that parties advocating for inclusion of off-road and additional vehicle types in the I&A misunderstand the objective of the TEPP. TURN states that the scope of the TEPP should track with the proceeding's original objectives which specified that the TEPP process should focus on "priority highway corridors." TURN states that TEPP offers a common methodology for the IOUs to disaggregate one subset of their IEPR TE forecast around major corridors within the broader load growth planning process.[7]

Alternatively, other parties assert that TEPP's focus on public charging along highway corridors does not prioritize the areas that are likely to see the highest demand for TE charging. For example, Acterra asserts that a data input missing from TEPP I&A is the high activity levels occurring at warehouses, seaports, depots, factories, and similar industrial hubs that are situated off busy highway corridors.[8] Likewise, CALSTART argues that the densest areas for

[5] SCE Opening Comments at 9.

[6] ICCT Opening Comments at 3.

[7] TURN Reply Comments at 2.

[8] Acterra Opening Comments at 3-4.

electric fleet charging needs will occur in hot spots and not necessarily along highway corridors.[9]

PG&E states it encourages future iterations of the TEPP I&A and CDM to expand beyond corridors to develop a more comprehensive model of transportation electrification in California. PG&E states that TEPP should incorporate publicly available modeling data at non-corridor locations.[10]

Joint Commenters state that TEPP's scope may be missing important locations that are greater than one mile from the selected corridors. Joint Commenters state that warehouses and other freight hubs are a key location in the calculus of where MDHD EV drivers will charge and therefore, should be included in TEPP's scope.[11]

EDF recommends that the TEPP methodology be modified to include identification of corridor charging demand hotspots that are larger than the three-mile or less segments. EDF asserts that this modification would better account for the reality that availability of electric grid capacity will regularly influence the siting of charging infrastructure and that individual drivers' charging behavior will be influenced by the location of that charging infrastructure.[12]

PACT recommends focusing on hotspots where charging needs are most likely to occur. PACT asserts that the goal should not be to electrify every freight corridor overnight, but rather, to make the most efficient use of limited grid resources by focusing early investments in areas where the data shows clear

[9] CALSTART Opening Comments at 13-14.

[10] PG&E Opening Comments at 12.

[11] Joint Commenters Opening Comments at 9.

[12] EDF Opening Comments at 2.

opportunity. PACT states that existing transportation networks and goods movement patterns anchor hotspots, including in and around: (1) ports and multimodal facilities; (2) warehouse clusters and distribution centers; and (3) key interchanges and intersections along heavily trafficked freight corridors.[13]

CUE agrees with PACT that TEPP as proposed may primarily work on non-urban corridors but does not adequately address urban corridor charging—which is where the near-term MDHD transportation electrification is happening.[14]

SDG&E states that TEPP's focus on corridor-based assumptions and public charging locations overlooks high-activity hot spots of transportation activity, including warehouses, seaports, airports, and industrial hubs situated off-corridor. SDG&E states that these high-activity hotspots are major drivers of electrification demand but fall outside the one-mile corridor width modeled. SDG&E states that TEPP risks producing outputs that misguide infrastructure investments and fail to anticipate real-world operational patterns.[15]

NRDC argues that TEPP must go substantially beyond telematics-based corridor analysis to meet the statutory requirement that utilities demonstrate whether planned distribution infrastructure is sufficient to support the level of electrification anticipated by applicable laws and plans.[16]

[13] PACT Opening Comments at 12.

[14] CUE Reply Comments at 5.

[15] SDG&E Reply Comments at 5.

[16] NRDC Reply Comments at 3.

3.1.2. Discussion

For the following reasons, we find that the TEPP's initial public charging corridor scope is reasonable and therefore, is adopted.

We adopt TEPP's initial public charging scope because it focuses appropriately on priority highway corridors. TEPP's initial focus was not intended to capture all TE load growth but instead, capture a common methodology for the IOUs to disaggregate one subset of their IEPR TE forecast around major corridors within the broader load growth planning process. Additionally, we agree with TURN that parties advocating for the inclusion of off-road and additional vehicle types in the I&A go beyond the initial objectives of the TEPP.[17] Indeed, this initial focus of this proceeding's proactive planning phase prioritized highway corridors and did not contemplate capturing all TE load growth. Rather, TEPP offers a common methodology for the IOUs to disaggregate one subset of their IEPR TE forecast around major corridors within the broader load growth planning process.

Finally, for this initial TEPP cycle, we balance load growth, incremental TE adoption, and uncertain market conditions against affordability constraints. We agree with TURN that we must maintain a focus on affordability and responsible system planning.[18] As we balance these competing objectives, we weigh how TEPP will inform load growth planning against the potential to impact capital costs. And while planning for increased load growth may not scale linearly with cost, given the significant and technical uncertainties associated with load forecasting for new technology groups such as MDHD EVs, there is the potential

[17] TURN Reply Comments at 2.

[18] TURN Reply Comments at 9.

that grid planning costs could increase. Federal policy changes have also created uncertainty around the pace, time, and magnitude of MDHD EV adoption. These risks coupled with the affordability challenges facing California ratepayers necessitate prudent load growth planning. Expanding the scope of TEPP could exacerbate the risk of increased costs at a time when ratepayers are facing high retail rates.

Therefore, given the cyclical nature of planning cycles coupled with affordability constraints, we find that it is reasonable to adopt the public charging corridor scope for TEPP.

3.2. TEPP I&A and CDM

3.2.1. Party Positions

Attached to this decision are appendices titled "CDM Change Log" and "I&A Change Log" which reflect party comments that were adopted in the final CDM and I&A. The final CDM and I&A (Narrative Report and Worksheet Library) are also attached to this decision as appendices.

3.2.2. Discussion

We adopt the TEPP CDM and I&A subject to the stakeholder recommendations submitted in this proceeding's administrative record. The public can review the adopted changes from stakeholders through the appendices attached to this decision. The appendices are titled I&A Narrative Report, I&A Library Worksheet, I&A Change Log, CDM, and CDM Change Log.

The adopted stakeholder recommendations are appropriate because they reflect reasonable changes and enhancements that align with corridor use cases. Additionally, the adopted stakeholder recommendations provide practical granularity for real-word application. Where we declined to adopt a recommendation presented by a stakeholder, we did so because the

recommendation's real-world application would delay the initial implementation of TEPP beyond the 2026-2027 Distribution Planning and Execution Process (DPEP) planning cycle.

Therefore, we direct PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to use TEPP as a B2 Pending Load[19] for the 2027-2028 DPEP cycle. Furthermore, we direct PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to conduct a test case of pending load hotspots incorporating TEPP. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E shall file the results as part of their Grid Needs Assessment (GNA) and Distribution Upgrade Project Report (DUPR) for the 2027-2028 DPEP. In Section 3.3.2 of this decision, we discuss the test cases' criteria in greater detail.

Next, with respect to implementing I&A, we direct PG&E and SCE to file at Tier 1 Advice Letter within 60 days upon issuance of this decision that identifies a suitable dataset or datasets to inform land use and zoning in their territory. PG&E and SCE shall consult with appropriate metropolitan planning organizations, associations of governments, and/or other relevant organizations within their respective service territories.

3.3. TEPP Interaction with Planning Processes

3.3.1. Party Positions

Stakeholders commented on an array of planning processes to inform planning processes and TEPP coordination. We discuss the party positions on planning processes coordination, below.

[19] D.24-10-030 required the IOUs to create a pending loads category which was adopted by Resolution E-5413. Resolution E-5413 defines B2 pending loads as "studies based on customer-based data inputs, and utility analysis-based compliance obligations" which are "capped at IEPR except for hot spots." Resolution E-5413 adopts minimum criteria for B2 Pending loads as "customer-based data inputs (e.g., EV charging plans, vehicle telematics, municipal zoning data, etc.) or for longer term analysis-based studies, regulatory compliance obligations used to forecast load growth in hot spots where the exact customer is not yet known."

TEPP application to DPEP: PG&E states its DPEP does not use the CEC load bus allocations. PG&E instead relies on its own spatial disaggregation model and agent sets, which distribute EV load growth by circuit based on vehicle counts, adoption propensities, and potentials.

SDG&E states it has historically disaggregated the CEC IEPR EV component. SDG&E asserts that it is unclear how the TEPP or CDM approach will provide any benefit to that process. For MDHD, SDG&E states it uses granular, localized data that is more complete and reliable than what is identified in the IEPR and TEPP. Therefore, SDG&E states that a load bus allocation product derived from the IEPR would not reflect the granular localized data from the SDG&E forecast and could lead to specific buses being severely under- or over-forecasted.[20]

SCE recommends that TEPP be updated once a year to capture CEC IEPR updates and account for IOU modeling inputs ahead of time. SCE proposes that Energy Division's technical consultant engage closely with the IOUs to make sure all the necessary data inputs are timely delivered so IOUs can incorporate TEPP into the DPEP. SCE recommends receiving the inputs by June.[21]

TEPP as a source for Pending Loads: PG&E, EDF, and Cal Advocates state that TEPP could inform pending loads. For example, PG&E states it sees value in the CDM for planning purposes but encourages the Commission to treat incremental CDM-forecasted loads as Category B2 pending loads, as defined in the draft resolution E-5413, for distribution planning. PG&E recommends that the loads should be added to the IEPR additional achievable TE load to enable

[20] SDG&E Opening Comments at 10.

[21] SCE Opening Comments at 13.

transmission capacity planning and treated as Category B2 pending loads as defined in draft resolution E-5413 for distribution planning.[22] EDF states it agrees with PG&E that the TEPP results appear to be appropriately considered as a Category B2 pending load.[23]

Cal Advocates asks that the Commission resolve whether the TEPP is meant to be wholly separate from the pending loads process, or "describe how the IOUs should treat categories of load (and even specific loads) included in both the TEPP and the pending load framework."[24]

CALSTART state that TEPP could inform B2 pending loads and hot spot identifications. CALSTART states the according to Resolution E-5413, hot spots are critical, but the current CDM design will miss many hot spots. CALSTART argues that this omission is significant because logistics centers are often served by the same substation as charging hubs closer to an official "corridor."[25] Alternatively, UCAN opposes using TEPP CDM outputs as Category B2 pending loads.[26]

Finally, Cal Advocates, EDF, and TURN assert that there is risk for TEPP to overlap with other pending loads and therefore, the Commission should consider the risk of double counting.[27]

---

[22] PG&E Opening Comments at 12.

[23] EDF Reply Comments at 5.

[24] Cal Advocates Opening Comments at 11-12.

[25] CALSTART Opening Comments at 14.

[26] UCAN Reply Comments at 9.

[27] Cal Advocates Opening Comments at 11; EDF Reply Comments at 5; and TURN Reply comments at 6.

Transmission Planning Process (TPP): PG&E states that for TPP, PG&E would use the updated IEPR load bus allocation in accordance with existing planning process.[28]

SCE states that the IOUs should retain flexibility to adjust or override TEPP outputs based on local conditions and more detailed insights into load growth.[29]

TEPP Integration to Load Bus Allocation: SCE states that developing a CEC load bus allocation product that integrates the TEPP approach for near-corridor locations can support the IOUs in identifying the size, timing, and location of long-term EV growth. SCE further states that TEPP-informed bus allocations should be used to refine, not replace, existing IOU forecasts, where corridor-level TE growth is likely but not yet captured in traditional planning inputs.[30]

Interagency Coordination: SDG&E recommends that the Commission should coordinate closely with the CEC to determine how the TEPP outputs can be integrated into the existing load modifier components of the IEPR forecast. SDG&E states that this approach allows for the well-established forecasting processes used in distribution and transmission planning to remain intact while continuing to support downstream grid planning activities effectively.[31]

Mapping CDM Outputs to IOU Infrastructure: PG&E states that for the DPEP, it would take TEPP loads as pending loads at the busbar and spatially disaggregate in accordance with its existing LoadSEER model. For transmission

[28] PG&E Opening Comments at 9.

[29] SCE Opening Comments at 11.

[30] SCE Opening Comments at 13.

[31] SDG&E Opening Comments at 1-2.

planning, PG&E states it would use the updated load bus allocation according to its existing process.[32]

SCE states that to map the outputs of the CDM to IOU-associated infrastructure, additional locational and operational details are required. Specifically, SCE states that the IOUs need: (1) location information (e.g., mapping coordinates or address) for each corridor segment; (2) estimated load amount and type of load (e.g., MDHD, LD); and (3) expected timeline for when the load will come online. With this information, SCE states that IOUs generally follow a process that associates projected load growth with the nearest suitable infrastructure. If multiple options exist, IOUs select the infrastructure that best supports system reliability and planning objectives.[33]

3.3.2. Discussion

Given the above stakeholder comment regarding how TEPP should interact with other planning processes, we adopt the following:

- Once CEC adopts IEPR values in 2027, we direct the Commission's Energy Division staff, with support from their technical consultant, to update the TEPP I&A with the updated IEPR values, as described in the I&A Appendix;
- We direct Energy Division staff, with support from their technical consultant, to update Energy Division models with updated I&A so that new CDM outputs are generated;
- We direct Energy Division staff to release the updated I&A and TEPP CDM outputs via electronic notice to the service list of Rulemaking 23-12-008, or its successor proceeding, notifying parties of the updated TEPP CDM outputs;

[32] PG&E Opening Comments at 9.

[33] SCE Opening Comments at 10-11.

Next, we direct PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to map the TEPP CDM outputs to their electrical infrastructure across their respective service territories. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E, as part of their DPEP, shall use TEPP CDM outputs as a B2 Pending Load[34] to inform TE loads along corridors for the 2027-2028 DPEP. We note that within the pending load framework adopted by the Commission in E-5413, category B2 pending loads are capped at the IEPR, except for locations identified as hot spots.[35]

For the 2027-2028 DPEP cycle, and in addition to using TEPP as a category B2 pending load, PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E shall conduct a test case studying pending load hotspots incorporating TEPP CDM outputs. The objective of this test case should inform whether incorporating TEPP CDM outputs into the criteria for hot spot[36] identification within the DPEP results in identification of

[34] Resolution E-5413 at 19 Table 1 defines B2 pending loads "studies based on customer-based data inputs, and utility analysis-based compliance obligations" which are "capped at IEPR except for hot spots." Resolution E-5413 at 20 Table 2 adopts "minimum criteria for B2 Pending loads "Customer-based data inputs (e.g., EV charging plans, vehicle telematics, municipal zoning data, etc.) or for longer term analysis-based studies, regulatory compliance obligations used to forecast load growth in hot spots where the exact customer is not yet known. Published methodology, based on customer data inputs, and assumptions."

[35] Resolution E-5413 at 18.

[36] Resolution E-5413 at 23-24 defines hot spots as: (i) a geographical area that is served by electrical infrastructure that is expected to experience substantial forecasted load growth from multiple sources including known loads, Category A, and Category B1 pending loads; and (ii) that area includes specific electrical infrastructure, i.e., substations and circuits which are forecasted to be capacity-constrained within the five-year planning period. An area is capacity constrained if the total capability of its infrastructure is only marginally greater than the demand served by the infrastructure after all low cost/no cost solutions have been considered. A hot spot will be considered a constrained area if the difference between the total capacity and total demand is less than or equal to half the total amount of Category B2 pending loads. If this occurs, all Category B2 pending loads served in the specific capacity constrained area may exceed the IEPR if necessary.

distinct hot spots or significant changes to load magnitude for hot spots.[37] To achieve this objective, this test case shall use the criteria adopted to identify hot spots in Resolution E-5413 which include: (1) IEPR disaggregation; (2) known loads; [38] (3) Category A[39] and Category B1[40] pending loads; and (4) incorporate TEPP CDM outputs to identify hotspot locations.

We direct PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to report the results of this test case study as part of the GNA/DUPR filing for the 2027-2028 DPEP in August 2028.[41] If PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E find value in incorporating TEPP into the hot spot identification based on the results from the test case, the IOUs may propose modifications to the hot spot definition as it relates to TEPP into their Tier 3 Pending Loads Evaluation Advice Letter pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 14 of Decision 24-10-030.

---

[37] Resolution E-5413 at 24 states that the Commission also acknowledges the role that the TEPP work product originating from the R.23-12-008 Transportation Electrification Policy and Infrastructure proceeding may play as a potential future source of data focused on identifying hot spots in transportation corridors. The TEPP may be informed by state transportation electrification policies and could eventually serve as a source for hot spot identification or inform a different category of pending loads.

[38] A known load is a customer energization request; *see* D.24-10-030 at 42.

[39] Resolution E-5413 at 19 states Category A Pending Loads are "high confidence projects and are based on detailed customer plans." *See* also Resolution E-5413 at 20, Table 2 for adopted minimum criteria for this category.

[40] Resolution E-5413 at 19 states Category B1 Pending Loads are "Medium confidence projects based on less detailed customer plans." *See* Resolution E-5413 at 20, Table 2 for adopted minimum criteria for this category.

[41] Resolution E-5413 at 24 states the Commission finds it necessary for the utilities to report a list of identified hot spots and utilized hot spots in the GNA/DUPR. In their GNA/DUPR filings, the utilities shall provide quantitative support for each forecast year of the five-year planning period for each hot spot: (i) the list of Known Loads and Pending Loads in the hot spot, and (ii) the calculations used for determining that the hot spot is capacity constrained including the list of infrastructure (including but not limited to substation banks, circuits and ties) and their capabilities, the forecasted demand within the hot spot and the available margin between the two.

We clarify that TEPP outputs should not be interpreted as a cap for all TE loads especially when viewed through the scrutiny of a general rate case. TE load growth and any capital expenditure requests made in the general rate case should not be predicated upon the TEPP outputs.

As a B2 pending load source, TEPP should support PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E's DPP efforts to identify corridor locations with likely TE charging needs that may require distribution upgrades or general rate case funding. However, TEPP should not be used on its own as the basis for general rate case (GRC) requests.

Advice Letter Requirement: By September 30, 2027, we direct PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to file a joint Tier 2 Advice Letter that:

- Describes the methodology PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will use to map TEPP outputs in their infrastructure for use as a B2 Pending Load;
- Describes how PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will avoid double-counting TEPP with other TE pending loads;
- Discusses the benefits and challenges of TEPP relative to other pending load sources; and
- Proposes refinements that could be considered for future cycles.

3.4. Future Refinement

3.4.1. Party Positions

In their comments, an array of parties recommend that the Commission formalize a process to make future refinements or changes to TEPP.

For example, PG&E states it encourages updates to the TEPP I&A and CDM through a public process with stakeholder engagement. PG&E recommends that the Commission consider the availability of new data, specifically fleet interviews and fleet telematics data, at future IEPR workshops

where the availability and veracity of new data can be discussed for incorporation into the TEPP I&A and/or CDM.[42]

CALSTART asserts that TEPP assumptions must be refreshed often to meet needs of the rapidly evolving EV industry.[43]

Cal Advocates states that the Commission should evaluate the I&A annually in a workshop and request comments from stakeholders regarding new datasets. Cal Advocates states that the Commission should then decide whether to include these new datasets in the I&A on a provisional basis before conducting a full update of the CDM.[44]

Joint Commenters assert that the future refinements to TEPP should include rerunning the TEPP model when each new set of IEPR inputs becomes available. Joint Commenters also state that updates would benefit from stakeholder input before such updates are made, rather than after updates are baked in.[45]

CUE states that the Commission should consider establishing a stakeholder working group or leveraging an existing transportation electrification or distribution planning working group, to update TEPP. CUE states that this working group could evaluate whether the CDM adds value beyond existing forecasting tools and to develop a shared understanding of its appropriate scope and limitations.[46]

---

[42] PG&E Opening Comments at 11.

[43] CALSTART Opening Comments at 15.

[44] Cal Advocates Opening Comments at 12.

[45] Joint Commenters Opening Comments at 10-11.

[46] CUE Opening Comments at 8.

SCE states that TEPP should be updated once a year to capture CEC IEPR updates and IOU feedback, and to engage IOUs on modeling inputs ahead of time. SCE also states that Energy Division's technical consultant needs to engage closely with IOUs to make sure all the necessary data inputs are timely delivered so IOUs can incorporate TEPP into the distribution planning process. SCE states that developers do not plan chargers the way grid planners would. SCE argues that future TEPP iterations may need to build in a buffer for surge traffic and for growth so that developers consider when sizing their sites.[47]

3.4.2. Discussion

To manage the TEPP implementation process, we agree with stakeholders that it is critical to know if TEPP data and planning assumptions are having their intended impact and to have pathways to correct course if necessary to ensure planning data is relevant.

However, given the nascency of TEPP, we decline to adopt a formal TEPP refinement process. The Advice Letter filings required by this decision will inform future Commission regulatory action to assess whether and how TEPP should be updated or refined.

At that time, the Commission may begin to consider refinements to TEPP in this proceeding. This approach captures efficiencies and avoids creating duplicative or burdensome processes which could strain limited resources without providing meaningful guidance into future needs and regulatory action for vehicle electrification.

[47] SCE Opening Comments at 13-14.

4. Summary of Public Comment

Rule 1.18 allows any member of the public to submit written comment in any Commission proceeding using the "Public Comment" tab of the online Docket Card for that proceeding on the Commission's website. Rule 1.18(a) requires that all written public comment submitted prior to the submission of the proceeding are part of the administrative record of the proceeding. Rule 1.18(b) requires that relevant written comment submitted in a proceeding be summarized in the final decision issued in that proceeding. Two submitted comments were presented in support of enhanced electric vehicle public charging along highway corridors.

5. Conclusion

This decision adopts transportation electrification proactive planning modeling tools. These modeling tools identify a common set of values and assumptions that Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall use to model transportation electrification charging electric system impacts along public highway corridors. Collectively, these modeling tools are called Transportation Proactive Planning Inputs & Assumptions and Corridor Disaggregation Methodology.

These tools will inform modeling used to disaggregate transportation electrification loads from the California Energy Commission's Integrated Energy Policy Report to provide localized insights to identify the location, size, and timing of expected transportation electrification load growth along public highway corridors in California for use in existing planning processes.

Additionally, these modeling tools will serve as inputs for consistent forecasting and scenario building across existing planning processes, including the distribution planning process and transmission planning process.

6. Procedural Matters

This decision affirms all rulings made by the Administrative Law Judge and assigned Commissioner in this proceeding. All motions not ruled on are deemed denied.

7. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of President John Reynolds in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____, and reply comments were filed on _____ by _____.

8. Assignment of Proceeding

John Reynolds is the assigned Commissioner and Colin Rizzo is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. On December 14, 2023, the Commission opened this Rulemaking as a venue for the Commission's oversight of the development of infrastructure to support the acceleration of transportation electrification.
2. On April 12, 2024, the Assigned Commissioner issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling establishing a scope to comprehensively assess the needs for TE policy and infrastructure, beginning with TEPP Modeling Inputs and Assumptions.
3. On October 14, 2025, the assigned Administrative Law Judge issued a ruling requesting comment on TEPP Modeling I&A and CDM.

4. The I&A identifies a common set of values and assumptions that can be used to model TE charging electric system impacts along highway corridors.

5. The CDM identifies expected TE load associated with public light duty and MDHD battery electric vehicle charging and depot charging along 150 California highway corridors.

6. TEPP's initial implementation cycle focuses solely on public charging corridors rather than off-road and expanded vehicle types because it balances the need to plan for load growth, incremental TE adoption, and uncertain market conditions against affordability constraints.

7. Modifying TEPP I&A and CDM according to the stakeholder recommendations, as reflected in the appendices to this decision, reflects reasonable changes and enhancements to align with public corridor use cases.

8. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will use TEPP as a B2 Pending Load[48] for the 2027-2028 DPEP.

9. PG&E, SCE, and SD&GE will conduct a test case studying pending load hotspots incorporating TEPP CDM and file this test case result as part of their GNA and DUPR for the 2027-2028 DPEP of August 2028.

10. Within 60 days of this decision's issuance, PG&E and SCE will file a Tier 1 Advice Letter that identifies a suitable dataset or datasets to inform land use and zoning in their territory.

[48] D.24-10-030 requires the IOUs to create a pending loads category which was adopted by Resolution E-5413. Resolution E-5413 defines B2 pending loads as "studies based on customer-based data inputs, and utility analysis-based compliance obligations" which are "capped at IEPR except for hot spots." Resolution E-5413 adopts minimum criteria for B2 Pending loads as "customer-based data inputs (e.g., EV charging plans, vehicle telematics, municipal zoning data, etc.) or for longer term analysis-based studies, regulatory compliance obligations used to forecast load growth in hot spots where the exact customer is not yet known."

11. PG&E and SCE will consult with appropriate metropolitan planning organizations, associations of governments, and/or other relevant organizations within their respective service territories prior to submitting the Tier 1 Advice Letter that identifies a suitable dataset or datasets to inform land use and zoning in their territory.

12. Once the CEC publishes the IEPR values in 2027, the Commission's Energy Division staff, with support from their technical consultant, will update the TEPP I&A with 2026 IEPR values, as described in the I&A Appendix.

13. The Commission's Energy Division staff, with support from their technical consultant, will update Energy Division models with updated I&A so that new CDM outputs are generated.

14. The Commission's Energy Division staff will release the updated I&A and TEPP CDM outputs via electronic notice to the service list of Rulemaking 23-12-008, or its successor proceeding, notifying parties of the updated TEPP CDM outputs.

15. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will map the TEPP CDM outputs to their electrical infrastructure across their respective service territories.

16. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E, as part of their DPEP, will use TEPP CDM outputs as a B2 Pending Load[49] to inform TE loads along corridors for the 2027-2028 DPEP.

[49] Resolution E-5413 at 9 Table 1 defines B2 pending loads as "studies based on customer-based data inputs, and utility analysis-based compliance obligations" which are "capped at IEPR except for hot spots." Resolution E-5413 at 20 Table 2 adopts minimum criteria for B2 Pending loads "customer-based data inputs (e.g., EV charging plans, vehicle telematics, municipal zoning data, etc.) or for longer term analysis-based studies, regulatory compliance obligations used to forecast load growth in hot spots where the exact customer is not yet known. Published methodology, based on customer data inputs, and assumptions."

17. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E, during the 2027-2028 DPEP cycle, will conduct a test case studying pending load hot spots by incorporating TEPP CDM outputs.

18. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will report this test cast as part of their GNA/DUPR filing for the 2027-2028 DPEP of August 2028.

19. If there is value to incorporate TEPP into hot spot identification based on the results of the test case, then it is prudent for PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to propose modifications to the hot spot definition as it relates to applying TEPP into their Pending Loads Evaluation Advice Letter pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 14 of D.24-10-030.

20. By September 30, 2027, PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will file a joint Tier 2 Advice Letter that: (1) describes the methodology PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will use to map TEPP outputs in their infrastructure for use as a B2 Pending Load; (2) describes how PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will avoid double-counting TEPP with other TE pending loads; (3) discusses the benefits and challenges of TEPP relative to other pending load sources; and (4) proposes refinements that could be considered for future cycles.

Conclusions of Law

1. Given the need to balance load growth, incremental EV adoption as well as uncertain market conditions, against affordability constraints, TEPP's initial public highway charging corridor scope is reasonable and should be adopted.

2. TEPP's I&A and CDM, as modified by stakeholder comment to this proceeding, is reasonable and should be adopted.

3. Requiring PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to use TEPP as a B2 Pending Load for the 2027-2028 DPEP is reasonable and should be adopted.

4. Requiring PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to conduct a test case of pending load hotspots incorporating TEPP is reasonable and should be adopted.

5. Requiring PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E to file the results of the test case of pending load hotspots incorporating TEPP as part of their August 2028 GNA/DUPR for the 2027-2028 DPEP is reasonable and should be adopted.

6. Requiring PG&E and SCE to file a Tier 1 Advice Letter within 60 days upon issuance of this decision that identifies a suitable dataset or datasets to inform land use and zoning in their territory is reasonable and should be adopted.

7. Requiring PG&E and SCE to consult with appropriate metropolitan planning organizations, associations of governments, and/or other relevant organizations within their respective service territories prior to submitting their Tier 1 Advice Letter identifying data to inform land use and zoning is reasonable and should be adopted.

8. Requiring Energy Division with its technical consultant to update the TEPP I&A with the new IEPR values, as described in the I&A Appendix of this decision, is reasonable and should be adopted.

9. Requiring Energy Division, with its technical consultant, to update its models with new I&A inputs so that new CDM outputs are generated is reasonable and should be adopted.

10. Requiring Energy Division to release the TEPP I&A and CDM outputs via electronic notice to the service list of Rulemaking 23-12-008, or its successor proceeding, notifying parties of the updated TEPP I&A and CDM outputs is reasonable and should be adopted.

11. Requiring PG&E, SCE, SDG&E to map the TEPP CDM outputs to their electrical infrastructure across their respective service territories is reasonable and should be adopted.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Transportation Proactive Planning Inputs & Assumptions (Narrative Report and Library Worksheet), Corridor Disaggregation Methodology, and the Change Logs are attached to this decision and adopted.

2. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall use the Transportation Proactive Planning Inputs & Assumptions and Corridor Disaggregation Methods, attached to this decision, as a B2 Pending Load[50] for the 2027-2028 Distribution Planning Execution Process cycle.

3. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall conduct a test case of pending load hotspots incorporating the Transportation Proactive Planning Inputs & Assumptions and Corridor Disaggregation Methods and file the results as part of their Grid Needs Assessment and Distribution Upgrade Project Report for the 2027-2028 Distribution Planning and Execution Process.

4. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and Southern California Edison (SCE) Company shall file a Tier 1 Advice Letter, within 60 days upon issuance of this decision, that identifies a suitable dataset or datasets to inform land use and zoning in their territory. PG&E and SCE shall consult with appropriate

[50] D.24-10-030 requires the IOUs to create a pending loads category which was adopted by Resolution E-5413. Resolution E-5413 defines B2 pending loads as "studies based on customer-based data inputs, and utility analysis-based compliance obligations" which are "capped at IEPR except for hot spots." Resolution E-5413 adopts minimum criteria for B2 Pending loads as "customer-based data inputs (e.g., EV charging plans, vehicle telematics, municipal zoning data, etc.) or for longer term analysis-based studies, regulatory compliance obligations used to forecast load growth in hot spots where the exact customer is not yet known."

metropolitan planning organizations, associations of governments, and/or other relevant organizations within their respective service territories.

5. In 2027, Energy Division and its technical consultant, shall use the California Energy Commission's Integrated Energy Policy Report to update the Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning Inputs & Assumptions with the 2026 Integrated Energy Policy Report values, as described in the I&A Appendix attached to this decision. Energy Division shall also:

- Update its models with new values for Inputs and Assumptions that utilize 2026 Integrated Energy Policy Report values so that new Corridor Disaggregation Method outputs are generated; and
- Release the Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning Corridor Disaggregation Method outputs via electronic notice to the service list of R.23-12-008, or its successor proceeding, notifying parties of the updated outputs.

6. For the 2027-2028 Distribution Planning and Execution Process, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall conduct a test case of pending load hotspots informed by the Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning Inputs & Assumptions and Corridor Disaggregation Method. This test case shall:

- Inform whether incorporating Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning Corridor Disaggregation Methody outputs into the Distribution Planning and Execution Process result in identification of distinct hot spots or significant changes to load magnitude for hot spots;[51]

[51] Resolution E-5413 at 23-24 defines hot spots as: (i) a geographical area that is served by electrical infrastructure that is expected to experience substantial forecasted load growth from multiple sources including known loads, Category A, and Category B1 pending loads, and (ii)

Footnote continued on next page.

- Use the criteria from Commission Resolution E-5413 which include: (1) IEPR disaggregation; (2) known loads;[52] (3) Category A[53] and Category B[54] pending loads; and (4) incorporate Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning Corridor Disaggregation Methodology outputs to identify hotspot locations;
- Be reported as part of the Grid Needs Assessment and Distribution Upgrade Project Report filing for the 2027-2028 Distribution Planning and Execution Process in August 2028; and
- Enable Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company to propose modifications to the hot spot definition as it relates to Transportation Proactive Planning into their respective Tier 3 Pending Loads Evaluation Advice Letter pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 14 of Decision 24-10-030.

7. By September 30, 2027, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall file a joint Tier 2 Advice Letter that:

---

that area includes specific electrical infrastructure, i.e., substations and circuits which are forecasted to be capacity-constrained within the five-year planning period. An area is capacity constrained if the total capability of its infrastructure is only marginally greater than the demand served by the infrastructure after all low cost/no cost solutions have been considered. A hot spot will be considered a constrained area if the difference between the total capacity and total demand is less than or equal to half the total amount of Category B2 pending loads. If this occurs, all Category B2 pending loads served in the specific capacity constrained area may exceed the IEPR if necessary.

[52] A known load is a customer energization request; *see* D.24-10-030 p 42.

[53] Resolution E-5413 at 19 defines Category A Pending Loads as "high confidence projects and are based on detailed customer plans." *See also* Resolution E-5413 at 20, Table 2 for adopted minimum criteria for this category.

[54] Resolution E-5413 at p 19 defines Category B1 Pending Loads as "medium confidence projects based on less detailed customer plans." *See* Resolution E-5413 at 20, Table 2 for adopted minimum criteria for this category.

- Describes the methodology PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will use to map Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning outputs in their infrastructure for use as a B2 Pending Load;
- Describes how PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E will avoid double-counting Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning with other transportation electrification pending loads;
- Discusses the benefits and challenges of Transportation Electrification Proactive Planning relative to other pending load sources; and
- Propose refinements that could be considered for future cycles.

8. Rulemaking 23-12-008 remains open.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California