BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED
10/16/26
09:08 AM
A2609019

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) Regarding Energy Resource Recovery Account Trigger Mechanism; Expedited Treatment Requested	A.26-09-019

JOINT PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT

JANET S. COMBS
ASHLEY K. MOORHEAD

Southern California Edison Company
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Rosemead, CA 91770
Telephone: (562) 491-2875
Email: Ashley.Moorhead@sce.com

Attorneys for
Southern California Edison Company

Date: October 16, 2026

JOINT PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section			Page
I.	INFORMATION FOR THE PHC AS REQUESTED IN THE RULING		2
	A.	Identification of the Speakers	2
	B.	Proposed Issues	2
	C.	List of Disputed Facts	3
	D.	Proposed Procedural Schedule	3
	E.	Appropriate Category for this Proceeding	3
	F.	Other Matters	3
II.	CONCLUSION		4

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) Regarding Energy Resource Recovery Account Trigger Mechanism; Expedited Treatment Requested	A. 26-09-019

JOINT PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Rule 7.2(a) of the California Public Utilities Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling on Expedited Schedule Notice of Prehearing Conference and Preliminary Categorization dated October 2, 2026 (Ruling), and the Email Ruling Modifying PHC dated October 9, 2026 (Email Ruling), Southern California Edison Company (SCE) respectfully files this Joint Prehearing Conference Statement (PHC) Statement (Joint PHC Statement) on behalf of itself, California Community Choice Association (CalCCA), and the Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates),[1] which participated in a Meet and Confer on October 14, 2026, as directed in the Ruling.

This Joint PHC Statement addresses the list of proposed issues, a list of disputed facts, proposed procedural schedule, the need for evidentiary hearings, appropriate category for this proceeding, and a list and description of other matters the parties wish to address at the PHC. As stated in the Email Ruling, this Joint PHC statement also includes the identification of the speakers at the remote PHC.

[1] Pursuant to Rule 1.8(d), SCE confirms that counsels for CalCCA and Cal Advocates have authorized SCE to file this Joint PHC Statement on behalf of their organizations.

I.

INFORMATION FOR THE PHC AS REQUESTED IN THE RULINGS

A. Identification of the Speakers

Yonatan Moskowitz Telephone: (202) 599-2556 Email: ymoskowitz@keyesfox.com **Attorney for CalCCA**	Ashley Moorhead Telephone: (562) 491-2875 Email: Ashley.Moorhead@sce.com **Attorney for SCE**
David Gibbs Telephone: (213) 576-7031 Email: david.gibbs@cpuc.ca.gov **Attorney for Cal Advocates**	

B. Proposed Issues

In its Response to SCE's Application, CalCCA proposed the following list of issues:

1) Whether SCE complied with the law and Commission orders, including D.02-10-062, D.04-12-048, D.06-06-051, D.19-12-001, and D.22-01-023 in filing its Trigger Application;

2) Whether the ERRA trigger point-related balance exceeded the trigger point, and whether it was likely that the balance would self-correct within 120 days of the trigger point balance exceedance;

3) The causes of the overcollection SCE reported (excluding reasonableness review or compliance with SCE's bundled procurement plan); and

4) Whether it is reasonable for SCE to maintain its ERRA-related rates at current levels and to address the ERRA Trigger Balance through the 2026 year-end balances incorporated into its 2027 ERRA Forecast rates, including SCE's proposed 12-month amortization period, and whether this results in just and reasonable rates.[2]

SCE and Cal Advocates do not oppose CalCCA's proposed list of issues.

---

[2] CalCCA Response, p. 11. Please note that Issue #3 of the Response originally referred to an "under-collection."

C. List of Disputed Facts

The Parties are not currently aware of any disputed facts in this proceeding.

D. Proposed Procedural Schedule

The Parties agree that the consolidated proceedings (see Section G below) should follow the procedural schedule already established in A.26-05-006 and that the Commission should not establish a separate schedule for this Application.

E. Need for Evidentiary Hearings

The Parties agree that there is no need for evidentiary hearings in this proceeding.

F. Appropriate Category for this Proceeding

The Parties agree that this proceeding is appropriately categorized as ratesetting.

G. Other Matters

CalCCA and SCE agree that consolidating this proceeding with A.26-05-006 would provide the clearest and most administratively efficient means to resolve both applications concurrently. Cal Advocates does not oppose consolidation.

II.

CONCLUSION

The Parties appreciate the opportunity to submit this Joint PHC Statement and look forward to participating in the PHC scheduled for October 19, 2026.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Parties,

JANET S. COMBS
ASHLEY K. MOORHEAD

/s/ Ashley K. Moorhead
By: Ashley K. Moorhead

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (562) 491-2875
E-mail: Ashley.Moorhead@sce.com

Date: October 16, 2026