BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED
09/21/26
04:59 PM
A2411007

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U39E) for Approval of Electric Rule No. 30 for Transmission-Level Retail Electric Service.	**Application 24-11-007** **(Filed November 21, 2024)**

CALIFORNIA LARGE ENERGY CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION REPLY COMMENTS TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S AUGUST 7, 2026 RULING

Sam Harper
John Holler
Harper Advisory LLC
9002 Six Pines Drive
Shenandoah, TX 77380
(214) 463-9423
Sam@harper.energy

Consultants to the California Large Energy Consumers Association

Nora Sheriff
Samir Hafez
Buchalter LLP
425 Market Street, 29th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105-2491
415.227.3551 office
415.227.0770 fax
nsheriff@buchalter.com

Counsel for the California Large Energy Consumers Association

September 21, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. COMMENTS 2

A. The Commission Should Not Require Participation in Flexible Service Arrangements as a Condition of Service.....2

B. If the Commission Stays This Proceeding, It Should Ensure That Decarbonizing and EITE Existing Customers Are Not Left Subject to Interim Rule 30.....4

C. Expedited Approval of the Partial Settlement Should Not Bypass CLECA's Pending Comments 5

III. CONCLUSION.....6

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U39E) for Approval of Electric Rule No. 30 for Transmission-Level Retail Electric Service.	**Application 24-11-007** **(Filed November 21, 2024)**

CALIFORNIA LARGE ENERGY CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION REPLY COMMENTS TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S AUGUST 7, 2026 RULING

The California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA)[1] submits these reply comments pursuant to the Administrative Law Judge's August 7, 2026 Ruling Seeking Comments on Proceeding Status and the August 25, 2026 Email Ruling Setting New Dates for Filing of Comments.[2]

I. INTRODUCTION

CLECA replies to certain of the points raised in the opening comments of The Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates),[3] Pacific Gas and

[1] CLECA member companies produce goods essential for daily life, including critical infrastructure, oxygen for hospitals, and food distribution. CLECA members represent the steel, cement, industrial and medical gas, glass, beverage, minerals processing, cold storage, and pipeline transportation industries. Their aggregate electric demand is about 500 Megawatts, which is equivalent to the electricity consumption of approximately 470,000 average California households. CLECA members are large, high load factor and high voltage industrial electric customers in California for whom the price of electricity is essential to their competitiveness and for whom the reliability of electricity service is critically important. For both reasons, CLECA member companies have participated for decades in the Base Interruptible Program (BIP), providing reliability demand response to the grid in times of need. (For more information, please go to CLECA.org).

[2] *Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Seeking Comments on Proceeding Status*, A.24-11-007, Aug. 7, 2026 (ALJ Ruling); *Email Ruling Setting New Dates for Filing of Comments*, A.24-11-007, Aug. 25, 2026.

[3] *Public Advocates Office Limited Opening Comments On The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Order To CAISO And Its Participating Transmission Owners*, A.24-11-007, Sep. 9, 2026 (Cal Advocates Opening Comments).

Electric Company (PG&E),[4] and the California Community Choice Association (CalCCA).[5] CLECA's positions on the scope and application of Rule 30 remain as set out in its briefs[6] and rebuttal testimony.[7]

II. COMMENTS

A. The Commission Should Not Require Participation in Flexible Service Arrangements as a Condition of Service

Cal Advocates asks the Commission to consider whether flexible service arrangements could serve as an alternative to constructing network upgrades and "whether participation in such arrangements should be required as a condition of service where appropriate."[8]

While CLECA strongly supports *voluntary* flexibility, imposing flexibility as a condition of service is a different matter.

Section 451 of the Public Utilities Code requires PG&E to:

> …furnish and maintain such adequate, efficient, just, and reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment, and facilities … as are necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of its patrons, employees, and the public.[9]

[4] *Pacific Gas And Electric Company's (U 39 E) Opening Comments On Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Seeking Comments On Proceeding Status*, A.24-11-007, Sep. 9, 2026 (PG&E Opening Comments).
[5] *California Community Choice Association Opening Comments On Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Seeking Comments On Proceeding Status*, A.24-11-007, Sep. 9, 2026 (CalCCA Opening Comments).
[6] *Limited Opening Brief Of The California Large Energy Consumers Association*, A.24-11-007, May 8, 2026 (CLECA Limited Opening Brief); *Reply Brief Of The California Large Energy Consumers Association*, A.24-11-007, May 22, 2026 (CLECA Reply Brief).
[7] CLECA-03, *Rebuttal Testimony of Sam Harper on Behalf of California Large Energy Consumers Association*, A.24-11-007, Apr. 8, 2026.
[8] Cal Advocates Opening Comments at 9.
[9] Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 451.

Requiring flexibility as a condition of service is inconsistent with this standard: forcing customers into flexible service does not promote their convenience (and may compromise their safety), rendering such service inadequate within the meaning of Section 451.

Mandatory curtailment may impose unacceptable operational or safety concerns for some customers. Additionally, curtailment imposes significant costs on industrial users in the form of lost product, damaged equipment, and increased idle time, since returning to full production may take several hours or days after power is restored. The utilities have accordingly procured load reductions from industrial customers through compensated programs that let the customer decide whether it can curtail safely and how much flexibility it can afford to supply. Requiring curtailment as a condition of service would ignore these customer-specific operational and safety requirements.

The FERC Order does not support a mandatory requirement. FERC directs CAISO and the Participating Transmission Owners to address transmission services that reflect "flexible large loads that are *willing* and able to limit their use of the transmission system under certain conditions."[10]

CLECA would support offering flexible service as a voluntary *option* that a customer may elect in exchange for lower interconnection costs or earlier energization while network upgrades are under construction, converting to firm service upon completion. A customer that declines should remain entitled to standard firm service on a defined timeline.

[10] Order Instituting Proceeding Under Section 206 of the Federal Power Act, Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp., 195 FERC ¶ 61,214 (2026) (FERC Order) at 25 (emphasis added).

The Commission should not adopt mandatory participation in flexible service arrangements as a condition of transmission-level service. If the Commission develops flexible service options in Rule 30, participation should be voluntary, and at a minimum no mandatory flexibility requirement should apply to Decarbonizing and EITE Existing Customers.[11]

B. If the Commission Stays This Proceeding, It Should Ensure That Decarbonizing and EITE Existing Customers Are Not Left Subject to Interim Rule 30

PG&E states that it "intends to request that the Commission stay this proceeding until PG&E's revised TO tariff is final and effective," and that it "intends to formalize this request in a motion to stay."[12] PG&E's proposed tariff revisions are not due at FERC until November 16, 2026, and a stay measured by when those revisions become final and effective has no ascertainable end.[13]

Interim Rule 30 would continue to operate throughout the stay, because D.25-07-039 remains effective until a subsequent or final decision on Electric Rule 30 is issued.[14] CLECA is concerned about the effect this continued operation would have on Decarbonizing and EITE Existing Customers. Interim Rule 30 requires the applicant to provide a pre-funding loan for 100 percent of the actual costs of all Transmission Network Upgrades, with repayment "determined by the CPUC in a final decision in Application 24-11-007."[15] Contracts entered into under it "shall

[11] *See* CLECA Limited Opening Brief at 2 (referring to existing customers adding incremental load to decarbonize, electrify, support electric vehicle (EV) charging, or expand operations in sectors designated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as Emissions-Intensive and Trade-Exposed (EITE) (collectively, Decarbonizing and EITE Existing Customers)).

[12] PG&E Opening Comments at 1, 6.

[13] Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp., 196 FERC ¶ 61,131 (2026); PG&E Opening Comments at 4.

[14] ALJ Ruling at 3-4 ("D.25-07-039 is effective until a subsequent or final decision on Electric Rule 30 is issued, without prejudicing the determination of these issues in the final decision in this proceeding."). Because a stay would foreclose issuance of any such subsequent or final decision, Interim Rule 30 necessarily would remain in effect for the duration of any stay.

[15] Interim Rule 30, Sheet 17, § F.5.

remain in effect without modification, notwithstanding any subsequent CPUC decision that changes this Rule," except as to refunds, accrued interest, and loan repayments.[16]

A customer that must add transmission-level load during the stay to comply with state decarbonization requirements would therefore take service on terms developed to address speculative new large loads. CLECA has explained why that outcome is unreasonable for these customers, which have long operating histories, are adding load to comply with state law or local mandates, and do not present the load-materialization risk that motivated Rule 30.[17]

CLECA opposes any stay that would leave Decarbonizing and EITE Existing Customers subject to Interim Rule 30 indefinitely and intends to address the specific terms of PG&E's motion once filed.

C. Expedited Approval of the Partial Settlement Should Not Bypass CLECA's Pending Comments

CalCCA asks the Commission to "act expediently to adopt the Partial Settlement" and states that, to the extent additional consideration of the FERC Order is required, "that consideration should not delay approval of the Partial Settlement."[18]

[16] Interim Rule 30, Sheet 1.

[17] *See* CLECA Limited Opening Brief at 7-8 ("Proposed Rule 30 was developed in response to a surge of large, speculative transmission-level interconnection requests-principally from data centers; these data centers' size, uncertainty, and operational characteristics create a heightened risk of stranded infrastructure and cost shifts to other customers. Decarbonizing and EITE Existing Customers do not share those characteristics"); CLECA Reply Brief at 8-9 ("applying data center-driven requirements to Decarbonizing and EITE Existing Customers would exacerbate affordability constraints, chill decarbonization investment, and increase the risk of emissions and economic leakage. The record shows that layering data center-driven risk protections onto thee customers' operations and investments increases uncertainty, compounds already significant electricity-cost barriers, and undermines capital spending decisions that California's policies encourage").

[18] CalCCA Opening Comments at ii,2, 4.

CLECA does not oppose the information-sharing terms as they apply to affected community choice aggregators. CLECA's June 8, 2026 comments contest only the provisions authorizing disclosure of confidential, customer-specific interconnection information to Sierra Club under the non-disclosure agreement attached to the settlement.[19]

Accordingly, if the Commission does act on CalCCA's request to expedite adoption of the Partial Settlement, it should do so only by excluding the Sierra Club disclosure provisions, consistent with the relief CLECA requested in its June 8, 2026 comments.

III. CONCLUSION

CLECA appreciates the opportunity to submit these Reply comments.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHALTER LLP

By:



Nora Sheriff

Counsel for the California Large Energy Consumers Association

CALIFORNIA LARGE ENERGY CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION

September 21, 2026

[19] *See California Large Energy Consumers Association Comments Contesting A Portion Of The Partial Settlement* Agreement, A.24-11-007, June 8, 2026.