169 FERC ¶ 61,177 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, DC 20426

December 3, 2019

In Reply Refer To: Southern California Edison Company Docket No. ER18-169-002

Southern California Edison Company 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue Rosemead, CA 91770

Attention: Matthew Dwyer, Esq.

Dear Mr. Dwyer:

- 1. On September 16, 2019, Southern California Edison Company (SoCal Edison) filed an Offer of Settlement (Settlement) with the Commission in this proceeding. On October 7, 2019, Commission Trial Staff filed comments in support of the Settlement. On October 22, 2019, the Settlement Judge certified the Settlement to the Commission as an uncontested settlement.¹
- 2. The Settlement addresses the issues set for hearing in Docket Nos. ER18-169-000 and EL18-44-000 regarding SoCal Edison's Formula Rate, 2018 Base Transmission Revenue Requirement (Base TRR)² and associated transmission rates.
- 3. Section 6.4 of the Settlement sets forth the following standard of review:

The standard of review applicable to the Commission's review and approval of the Settlement shall be the just and reasonable standard. The standard for review of any changes to portions of the Settlement that affect the TO Tariff, including the Formula Rate Protocols, shall be the just and reasonable standard. The standard of review for any changes to other portions of this Settlement (that do not affect the

¹ S. Cal. Edison Co., 169 FERC ¶ 63,009 (2019).

² SoCal Edison's Bass TRR under the Formula Rate is comprised of three principal components: the Prior Year TRR; the Incremental Forecast Period TRR; and the True Up Adjustment. Together these components form SoCal Edison's Base TRR for each year that the Formula Rate is in effect.

TO Tariff) that are proposed by any Party shall be the "public interest" standard set forth in *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1956) and *Federal Power Commission v. Sierra Pacific Power Co.*, 350 U.S. 348 (1956), as clarified in *Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc. v. Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington*, 554 U.S. 527 (2008) and *NRG Power Marketing v. Maine Public Utilities Commission*, 558 U.S. 165 (2010). The standard of review for any changes to the Settlement proposed by a non-Party or directed by the Commission shall be the just and reasonable standard.

- 4. The Settlement appears to be fair and reasonable and in the public interest, and is hereby approved. The Commission's approval of the Settlement does not constitute approval of, or precedent regarding, any principle or issue in this proceeding.
- 5. Further, the revised Formula Rate Protocols and the five versions of the Formula Rate Spreadsheet submitted with the Settlement are hereby accepted.³ However, SoCal Edison did not include a revision to its Formula Rate Protocols that was previously accepted by the Commission in Docket No. ER18-2440-001,⁴ effective November 16, 2018. Therefore, we direct SoCal Edison to file a revised tariff record in eTariff format⁵ to reflect that revision to its Formula Rate Protocols, effective November 16, 2018, within 30 days of the date of this order.

By direction of the Commission.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr., Deputy Secretary.

⁴ S. Cal. Edison Co., 166 FERC ¶ 61,006 (2019).

⁵ See Electronic Tariff Filings, Order No. 714, 124 FERC ¶ 61,270 (2008).