



FILED
4-15-14
11:15 AM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Conduct a Comprehensive Examination of Investor Owned Electric Utilities' Residential Rate Structures, the Transition to Time Varying and Dynamic Rates, and Other Statutory Obligations.

Rulemaking 12-06-013
(Filed June 21, 2012)

**THIRD AMENDED SCOPING MEMO AND
RULING OF ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER**

1. Summary

This Third Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling of Assigned Commissioner (Third Amended Scoping Memo) does the following: (1) finalizes the Phase 1 schedule, (2) sets the Phase 1 scope, (3) directs the utilities to serve additional Phase 1 testimony, and (4) provides additional information for understanding what specific rate design elements will be evaluated in Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this proceeding.

2. Background

The Commission initiated this Order Instituting Rulemaking to examine current residential electric rate design. On November 26, 2012, the assigned Commissioner issued the original Scoping Memo and Ruling. On October 7, 2013, Assembly Bill (AB) 327 was signed into law. AB 327 lifts many of the restrictions on residential rate design. With its passage, the utilities can now

propose residential rates that are more reflective of cost, in keeping with the Commission's principle that rates should be based on cost-causation. AB 327 also contains limits designed to protect certain classes of vulnerable customers.

On October 25, 2013, the assigned Commissioner issued a ruling (October 25, 2013 Ruling) opening Phase 2 of this proceeding and inviting utilities to submit interim rate change proposals for summer 2014. Southern California Edison Company (SCE), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), and San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E, and collectively with SCE and PG&E, the IOUs) submitted rate change proposals on November 22, 2013, and a Phase 2 prehearing conference (PHC) was held on December 5, 2013.

On January 6, 2014, the assigned Commissioner issued the Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling (January 2014 Scoping Memo). The January 2014 Scoping Memo re-categorized Phase 1 as ratesetting, rather than quasi-legislative. The January 2014 Scoping Memo also presented the rate design proposal of Energy Division (Staff Proposal). The Staff Proposal was based on review of proposals and other documents provided by parties, the bill impact calculators provided by the IOUs, and additional research.

On February 13, 2014, the assigned Commissioner issued a ruling (the Phase 1 ACR) directing the IOUs to file rate design proposals for 2015 through 2018 (Phase 1 Proposals). The Phase 1 ACR also scheduled a Phase 1 PHC for March 14, 2014 (March 2014 PHC), and directed parties to file PHC statements prior to that date. The Phase 1 ACR included a preliminary procedural schedule with an anticipated decision prior to the end of 2014.

As directed, on February 28, 2014, the IOUs filed their Phase 1 Proposals.

On March 10, 2014, Coalition of California Utility Employees, Consumer Federation of California, Interstate Renewable Energy Council, Inc., Office of

Ratepayer Advocates (ORA), Natural Resources Defense and Sierra Club, PG&E, San Diego Consumers' Action Network (SDCAN), SDG&E, Solar Energy Industries Association and The Alliance for Solar Choice, SCE, The Greenlining Institute and Center for Accessible Technology, The Utility Reform Network (TURN), and The Vote Solar Initiative filed PHC Statements.

During this same time frame, the assigned Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) issued a ruling on the Rate Design Element Inventory (Rate Design Element Inventory Ruling). ORA, SCE, SDG&E, TURN and Utility Consumers' Action Network filed comments (Rate Design Element Comments) on the Rate Design Element Inventory Ruling, and parties discussed the rate design elements included in the inventory at the March 2014 PHC.

In the Phase 1 Proposals, the PHC Statements and the Rate Design Element Comments, and at the March 2014 PHC, parties identified issues to be included in the Phase 1 scope. Several parties expressed concern about whether the Phase 1 Proposals could be fully evaluated before the end of 2014.

SDG&E proposed default time of use (TOU) rates for 2018, and identified certain questions that should be answered prior to implementation. SCE's testimony asserts that defaulting customers to a TOU rate could lead to customer complaints and lack of support for TOU rates generally. TURN and other parties assert that there are still significant gaps in understanding the impacts of default TOU on customers, load shape and the environment.

Based on these comments, my review of the Phase 1 Proposals, and the important goals set by state energy policies, the scope of Phase 1 will be as set forth herein, and the procedural schedule will be extended to allow sufficient time for parties to fully litigate all issues. As a result of this extended schedule, any rates authorized for 2015 would not take effect until summer 2015.

3. Additional Supplementary Testimony

The IOUs are directed to serve the additional testimony listed in Attachment A. I encourage the IOUs to work together and with the intervening parties to facilitate presentation of the information in a consistent and user-friendly format.

4. Scope

The scope below is based on the Phase 1 Proposals, the PHC Statements, and discussions at the March 14 PHC. I also considered the parties comments on the Rate Design Element Inventory Matrix.

4.1. Rate Design Element Inventory

Based on the parties' comments, we have refined the Rate Design Element Inventory. Parties provided written comments on the preliminary Rate Design Element Inventory matrix and discussed it at the March 14 PHC. Generally, parties agreed with the preliminary version of the matrix attached to the Rate Design Element Inventory Ruling. The revised Rate Design Element Inventory is attached to this Third Amended Scoping Memo as Attachment B.

TOU Periods. TOU periods will not be addressed in Phase 1. Because each utility's service territory includes different weather patterns and load shapes, TOU periods will be different across the state. The scope of this Phase 1 does include consideration of what type of proceeding will be best for setting TOU periods. For example, parties may argue for future TOU period changes being limited to general rate cases (GRCs) rather than rate design windows (RDWs). Or, parties may argue that a different type of proceeding, such as a stand-alone application, would be appropriate.

Although this Third Amended Scoping Memo excludes the issue of changes in TOU periods from Phase 1 and Phase 2, it does not change the scope

of other proceedings. Currently, Application (A.) 14-02-027 and A.13-12-015 include proposals to change TOU Periods. Further argument regarding whether changes to TOU periods should be allowed while Phase 1 and 2 of this proceeding are still pending should be raised in the applicable proceeding (A.14-07-027 or A.13-12-015).

Changes to Baseline Percentage. Changes to Baseline Percentage will be considered in this proceeding. Currently, PG&E has changes to its Baseline Percentage under consideration in A.12-02-020, and SDG&E has requested a change in its Baseline Percentage in A.14-01-027. In light of comments from the parties, we will include PG&E Baseline Percentage changes in R.12-06-013. I understand that the scope of A.14-01-027 has not been set yet, and that, based on party protests and comments in A.14-01-027, there is support to shift evaluation of the proposed change in Baseline Percentage into this proceeding. Therefore, SDG&E is directed to supplement their Phase 1 Proposal to include the request for reduction in Baseline Percentage and to serve supporting testimony.

4.2. Phase 1 Scope

The specific issues to be resolved in Phase 1 for all utilities are as follows.

1. Should the Commission adopt a Fixed Customer Charge?
If yes, how should the Fixed Customer Charge be structured such that the cost is transparent, consistent with the law and reflects a reasonable portion of the fixed costs of providing service to both small and large customers? Is it possible for a Minimum Bill to achieve the same or better results?
2. Are the utilities' proposed Fixed Customer Charges reasonable, compliant with law and the optimal rate design principles developed in this proceeding (Rate Design Principles) and in the public interest? Do they support Commission and state policies?

3. Are the utilities' proposed reductions in baseline quantities reasonable, compliant with law and Rate Design Principles and in the public interest? Do they support Commission and state policies?
4. Is flattening tiers, including a reduction in the number of tiers and tier rate differentials, reasonable and consistent with law and Rate Design Principles? Does it support Commission and state policies?
5. Are the utilities' proposed opt-in tariffs and pilot programs for untiered TOU rates, reasonable, compliant with law and Rate Design Principles? Do they support Commission and state policies?
6. How should any revenue collection shortfalls be treated between customer groups on different tariffs? To the extent that methods to address revenue collection shortfalls results in cross-subsidies between customer groups on different tariffs, what level of cross-subsidy is reasonable?
7. In what type of proceeding should the Commission review residential TOU periods?
8. What requirements should be set for short-term outreach programs to communicate changes in rate design in the near-term (including untiered TOU pilot and opt-in outreach, changes to tiers and fixed charges, changes to the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE), Family Electric Rate Assistance (FERA), and medical baseline programs)? Where should funding for this outreach come from? What metrics should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the outreach programs? What budgets are needed to meet the outreach objectives?
9. Does the two-tier minimum set in Section 739.9(c) apply to optional and default TOU rates?
10. What should the IOUs do to comply with the Section 745(a)(5) requirement to provide each customer with a calculation of expected annual bill impacts under each available tariff? Should this service be offered

starting in 2015 as a means of customer education and outreach regarding rate options?

11. In light of the changes to the tier-structure permitted by the passage of AB 327, what, if any, implementation steps are necessary to begin including greenhouse gas (GHG) costs in residential rates pursuant to the direction in Decision 12-12-033 that GHG costs should be included in residential rates once restrictions on lower tier rates are removed?
12. Is SCE's Phase 1 Proposal for 2015-17 reasonable under the law and the Rate Design Principles? Elements of SCE's Phase 1 Proposal include: changes to the Fixed Customer Charge; reduction in the number of tiers and the differential between tiers; changes to CARE, medical baseline and FERA programs necessitated by changes in the overall residential rate structure; corresponding changes to any other tariffs; and creation of memorandum accounts to track certain expenses related to the Phase 1 Proposal such as outreach expenses and TOU opt-in rate expenses.
13. Is PG&E's Phase 1 Proposal for 2015-17 reasonable under the law and the Rate Design Principles? Should PG&E's Phase 1 Proposal for 2015-17 be adopted? Elements of PG&E's Phase 1 Proposal include: Fixed Customer Charge; reduction in the number of tiers and the differential between tiers; untiered TOU pilot or opt-in rates; changes in the Baseline Percentage; changes to CARE, medical baseline and FERA programs necessitated by changes in the overall residential rate structure; corresponding changes to any other tariffs; and creation of memorandum accounts to track certain expenses related to the Phase 1 Proposal such as outreach expenses.
14. Is SDG&E's Phase 1 Proposal for 2015-17 reasonable under the law and the Rate Design Principles? Should SDG&E's Phase 1 Proposal for 2015-17 be adopted? Elements of SDG&E's Phase 1 Proposal include: changes to the Fixed Customer Charge; reduction in the number of tiers and the

differential between tiers; untiered TOU pilot and opt-in rates; changes in the Baseline Percentage; changes to CARE, medical baseline and FERA programs necessitated by changes in the overall residential rate structure; corresponding changes to any other tariffs; and creation of memorandum accounts to track certain expenses related to the Phase 1 Proposal such as outreach expenses and TOU pilot expenses.

15. Default TOU rates are permitted by law starting in 2018. SDG&E has proposed a default TOU rate for 2018 and has identified certain areas for further evaluation prior to implementation.¹ Are there other factual issues that must be resolved before a decision is made to implement default TOU rates? What existing and new data, metrics and resources should be used to evaluate rates before authorizing default TOU rates and, if applicable, after implementation of default TOU rates? Are there specific conditions (for example, achieving minimum customer education and outreach requirements), that should be met prior to implementation of default TOU rates?
16. Should SDG&E's proposal to develop and implement a 2018 default TOU rate be approved? Should SCE and PG&E be required to propose 2018 default TOU rates for

¹ SDG&E states that prior to implementation of specific default TOU rates, SDG&E's pilot programs should be evaluated to determine the following:

- What the optimal TOU period lengths are.
- Are there statistically significant reductions in energy use at time of SDG&E's monthly system peaks?
- Are there statistically significant load reductions in monthly on-peak energy use?
- Are there statistically significant load increases in monthly semi-peak and off-peak energy use?
- For the customers enrolled in the four hour on-peak TOU rates are there statistically significant increases in energy use during the other three hours that are part of the on-peak period of the seven-hour TOU rate?

evaluation? What are the optimal procedural next steps for development, evaluation and implementation of default TOU rates if Phase 1 determines that default TOU rates should be permitted in 2018?

17. What safety considerations are raised by the Phase 1 Proposals?

5. Need for Phase 1 Evidentiary Hearings; Presiding Officer

Based on the many reasons cited in the PHC Statements, evidentiary hearings will be necessary. Although most issues can be addressed through written testimony and briefs, there are a number of issues that may require cross-examination. In particular, the evidentiary record will need to include evidence addressing the disputed factual issues raised by default TOU rates. The exact number of days and issues that will need to be addressed through hearings will be narrowed after direct testimony is served. The schedule below provides for 15 days of hearings. We expect that the number of days required will be reduced after review of written testimony.

ALJ Jeanne M. McKinney and ALJ Julie M. Halligan will be the presiding officers for this proceeding.

Procedural Schedule

In the PHC Statements and at the March 14 PHC, parties expressed concern that the proposed preliminary schedule did not allow sufficient time to address all aspects of the Phase 1 Proposals. Parties assert that if Phase 1 addresses default TOU rates, there should be more time to develop and review factual evidence related to the potential positive and negative impacts of default TOU rates. In light of this, we are extending the procedural schedule to allow for more robust record development and analysis.

At a PHC scheduled for next month, parties will have the opportunity to further identify areas of factual dispute and categories of data and types of

studies that could be used to resolve these disputes. The IOUs will then have the opportunity to file additional written testimony on the areas of factual dispute raised at the PHC. Intervenors will have approximately five months from today’s date to develop written testimony addressing factual disputes and other issues within the scope of this proceeding. Parties will have approximately six months to prepare for Evidentiary Hearings.

The Phase 1 procedural schedule is as follows:

Event	Date
PHC Statements describing types of evidence necessary to resolve factual disputes about default TOU rates, served	May 2, 2014
PHC regarding evidence necessary to resolve factual disputes about default TOU rates	May 13, 2014
Phase 1 Supplemental Utility Testimony (as described in Attachment A to this Third Scoping Memo), served	May 16, 2014
Phase 1 IOU Optional Additional Testimony resulting from May PHC, served	June 13, 2014
Phase 1 Intervenor Opening Testimony, served	September 15, 2014
Phase 1 Rebuttal Testimony, served	October 3, 2014
Phase 1 Evidentiary Hearings	November 3- 21, 2014
Phase 1 Opening Briefs, filed	December 1, 2014
Phase 1 Reply Briefs, filed	December 22, 2014
Proposed Decision issued	March 2015

The assigned Commissioner or an assigned ALJ may modify the schedule as necessary to promote the efficient and fair resolution of this proceeding. In any event, it is anticipated that this proceeding will be resolved within 18 months

of the date of this Third Amended Scoping Memo, pursuant to the requirements of Pub. Util. Code section 1701.5.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The scope of Phase 1 is as set forth above.
2. The utilities are directed to serve the additional supplemental testimony set forth in Attachment A.
3. San Diego Gas & Electric Company is directed to file a supplement to their Phase 1 Proposal to include the request for reduction in Baseline Percentage and to serve supporting testimony.
4. The procedural schedule is as set forth above and may be modified by the Administrative Law Judges if necessary.
5. The presiding officers will be Jeanne M. McKinney and Julie M. Halligan.
6. Hearings are required for Phase 1.

Dated April 15, 2014, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MICHAEL R. PEEVEY

Michael R. Peevey
Assigned Commissioner

ATTACHMENT A

**ATTACHMENT A
ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTARY TESTIMONY**

(1) Energy Burden:

- a. Provide electricity burden ratios for all basic (i.e., not all-electric) non-CARE and CARE residential customers system-wide, broken out by climate zone² for
 - i. March 31, 2014 rates; and
 - ii. Rates under Phase 1 Proposal; and
 - iii. This may be added as a column to the main Bill Impact table or provided separately with equivalent kWh consumption bins.
- b. PG&E and SDG&E Energy Burden. Provide energy burden ratio for (I) all-electric residential customers and (II) basic residential customers, broken out by Climate Zone, for
 - i. March 31, 2014 rates;
 - ii. Rates under Phase 1 Proposal; and
 - iii. This may be added as a column to the main Bill Impact table or provided separately with equivalent kWh consumption bins.
- c. SCE Energy Burden. To approximate energy burden, provide ratios for all-electric customers, broken out by Climate Zone, for
 - i. March 31, 2014 rates;
 - ii. Rates under Phase 1 Proposal; and
 - iii. This may be added as a column to the main Bill Impact table or provided separately with equivalent kWh consumption bins.

(2) Utility Bill Impact Calculators:

- a. Provide modified Bill Impact Calculators to allow for scenarios based on more granular data, including;
 - i. Geographic Impacts by climate zone; and
 - ii. Seasonal Impacts by climate zone.

² PG&E and SCE may group smaller Climate Zones with similar Climate Zones.

(3) Fixed Customer Charge:

- a. Modify the rate design table comparing present and proposed non-CARE and CARE default residential rates for each year to show the Fixed Customer Charge as a percentage of the revenue requirement and as a percentage of fixed costs.

(4) Supporting Data for FERA Discount Percentage:

- a. If a FERA discount percentage is proposed based on the average effective FERA discount for the past 5 years, provide supporting data to demonstrate the average effective FERA discount, including calculations of the 5 year average.

(5) Energy Efficiency, Demand Response and Distributed Generation Programs:

- a. Quantify and discuss the impacts of any proposed rate design changes over the period 2015-17 on customer participation and load impact in Energy Efficiency, Demand Response and Distributed Generation programs.
- b. If data is not currently available, discuss what types of information should be collected and analyzed to quantify the impacts.
- c. Be sure to include impacts of all rate design elements (such as Fixed Customer Charge, changes to tiered rates, TOU rates) in your answer.
- d. Estimate total load reduction and peak period reduction or load shifting using the "Conservation Tab" of the PG&E RROIR Bill Impact Calculator or an equivalent tool. Use an appropriate elasticity assumption and justify and explain your choice of elasticity assumption.

(6) NEM Bill Impacts:

- a. Provide bill impact data for NEM customers for all of the proposed rate options over the 2015-17 transition period.
- b. Quantify and discuss the impact of any rate design changes on the economics of a zero net energy (ZNE) home or multi-family building. If data is not currently available, discuss what types of information should be collected and analyzed to quantify the impacts.

(7) Customer Outreach for 2015 Rate Design Changes:

- a. Provide a summary and customary supporting testimony for customer outreach programs that would be used to promote approved 2015 rate design changes. Include a description of marketing channels, media tools, outreach materials and messages, and performance metrics to measure and evaluate the program effectiveness.

(8) Details on Existing Opt-In Tariffs:

- a. Provide a list of any opt-in tariffs that you propose to modify, close to new customers, or terminate entirely, such as tiered TOU rate schedules. Include the name of the tariff, a short description including any significant eligibility requirements, and the number of customers currently on the tariff.

(9) SDG&E: Reduction in Baseline Allowance:

- a. File supplement to Phase 1 Proposal describing proposed reduction in Baseline Allowance and serve supporting testimony.

(END OF ATTACHMENT A)

ATTACHMENT B

ATTACHMENT B RATE ELEMENT INVENTORY

	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase
1.	PG&E	Updated load data for electric baseline quantities (by climate zone)	Phase 2									
2.	PG&E	Summer 2014 Rate Change Proposal	Phase 2		SCE	Summer 2014 Rate Change Proposal	Phase 2		SDG&E	Summer 2014 Rate Change Proposal	Phase 2	
3.	PG&E	Formula for allocation of future revenue requirement increases and decreases (until Phase 1 decision)	Phase 2		SCE	Allocation of revenue requirement changes until Phase 1 decision	Phase 2		SDG&E	Allocation of future revenue requirement changes until Phase 1 decision	Phase 2	
4.	PG&E	Gradual decrease of CARE discount to between 30% and 35% as mandated by AB 327	Phase 2 <u>and</u> Phase 1		SCE	If necessary, decreases to CARE discount to maintain 30% and 35% effective discount raise as mandated by AB 327	Phase 1		SDG&E	Summer 2014 Revisions to CARE discount consistent with AB 327 effective discount	Phase 2 <u>and</u> Phase 1	
5.	PG&E	Monthly Service Fee for all residential schedules	Phase 1		SCE	Fixed charges	Phase 1		SDG&E	Fixed Charge through 2018	Phase 1	
6.					SCE	Establish formulaic approach to reduce tier differentials and to escalate fixed charges in the future	Phase 1		SDG&E	Formula to reduce tier differentials and to escalate fixed charges in the future	Phase 1	
7.	PG&E	Revisions to tiered rate structure and reduction in tier differentials	Phase 1		SCE	Revised tiered rate structure	Phase 1		SDG&E	Revised tiered rate structure through 2018	Phase 1	

	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase
8.	PG&E	Un-tiered optional TOU rate	Phase 1		SCE	Default and opt-in TOU rates	Phase 1		SDG&E	Default and opt-in TOU rates	Phase 1	
9.	PG&E	Medical Baseline proposal	Phase 1		SCE	Changes to Medical Baseline from tier redefinitions	Phase 1		SDG&E	Medical baseline (to reflect changes to tier rate structure)	Phase 1	
10.	PG&E	FERA proposal - Schedule E-FERA revisions (to reflect changes to tier rate structure)	Phase 1		SCE	Changes to FERA from tier redefinitions.	Phase 1		SDG&E	FERA (to reflect changes to tier rate structure)	Phase 1	
11.	PG&E	Smart Rate incentive Schedule E-RSMART (to reflect changes to tier rate structure)	Phase 1									
12.									SDG&E	Coordination of rate design changes with CPUC demand-side management programs	Phase 1	
13.	PG&E	Formula for allocation of future revenue requirement increases and decreases after Phase 2	Phase 1		SCE	Formula for allocation of future revenue requirement increases and decreases after Phase 2	Phase 1		SDG&E	Formula for allocation of future revenue requirement increases and decreases after Phase 2	Phase 1	
14.	PG&E	Tier changes and monthly service fees for voluntary TOU rate schedules	Phase 1									
15.	PG&E	Revenue neutrality for optional schedules E-7, E-8	Phase 1									

	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase
16.	PG&E	Revise Existing TOU rate design for optional tiered TOU rates (including revising rates where generation rate exceeds total rate for Schedules E-7, EL-7, E-8 and EL-8) – LONG TERM	Phase 1									
17.	PG&E	EV Rate Review in compliance with D.11-07-029		Expected to be part of A.13-04-012 (GRC Phase II) Settlement	SCE	Opt-in residential EV rates for whole house and separately metered		A1312015 RDW				
18.					SCE	Whole house EV rate (TOU-EV-D) for all residential customers (TOU-D)		A1312015 RDW				
19.									SDG&E	TOU period changes		RDW A1401027 (filed 1/31/14 to be effective 1/1/15)
20.									SDG&E	Analysis of rates by season and geographic region	Phase 1	
21.	PG&E	Revise Existing TOU rate design for optional tiered TOU rates (including revising rates where generation rate exceeds total rate for Schedules E-7, EL-7, E-8 and EL-8) – SHORT TERM	Phase 1, if not included in GRC Phase II settlement	Expected to be part of GRC Phase II Settlement								

	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase
22.	PG&E	Baseline Quantity Reduction	Phase 1 and Phase 2						SDG&E	Baseline allowance reductions	Phase 1	
23.	PG&E	Modify Minimum Bill Methodology and Charge		A.12-02-020 (2012 RDW)								
24.	PG&E	Modify SmartRate Peak Day Pricing (PDP)		A.12-02-020 (2012 RDW)								
25.	PG&E	Electric Master Meter Rate		GRC Phase II								
26.	PG&E	Meter Charge for Schedule NEM MT		2015 RDW (to be filed November 2014)								
27.	PG&E	CARE/ESA Low Income Programs		Application to be filed July 2014								
28.	PG&E	PTR (A1002028) Default Residential TVP (A1008005)		2010 RDWs A1002028 and A1008005								
29.	PG&E	Including GHG costs and revenues in residential rates pursuant to D12-12-033	Phase 1		SCE	Including GHG costs and revenues in residential rates pursuant to D12-12-033	Phase 1		SDG&E	Including GHG costs and revenues in residential rates pursuant to D12-12-033	Phase 1	
30.	PG&E	CARE restructuring		Later phase of R.12-06-013 or new proceeding	SCE	CARE Restructuring		Later phase of R.12-06-013 or new proceeding	SDG&E	CARE restructuring		Later phase of R.12-06-013 or new proceeding
31.					SCE	Long Term FERA program changes, remaining exemptions for medical baseline customers (e.g., DWR bond charge)		Low-Income proceeding to be filed June 2014, effective January 2016				

	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase	IOU	Rate Element	Litigate in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of R1206013	Litigate in different proceeding or phase
32.					SCE	Other medical baseline allowance issues (appropriateness of current allowance structure)		Low-Income proceeding to be filed June 2014, effective January 2016				
33.	PG&E	Customer education and outreach, bill simplification	Short-Term Plan: Phase 2 and Phase 1	Long-Term Plan: Later phase of R1206013	SCE	Customer education and outreach, bill simplification	Short-Term Plan: Phase 2 and Phase 1	Long-Term Plan: Later phase of R1206013	SDG&E	Customer education and outreach, bill simplification	Short-Term Plan: Phase 2 and Phase 1	Long-Term Plan: Later phase of R1206013
34.	PG&E	NEM-specific rate design issues		NEM-specific proceeding	SCE	NEM-specific rate design issues		NEM-specific proceeding	SDG&E	NEM rate design issues		NEM-specific proceeding
35.					SCE	Submetering discounts and differentiation of single- and multi-family baseline allowance for all-electric customers		GRC Phase 2				
36.					SCE	Residential rate design issues not included in R.12-06-013 or A.13.12-015		GRC Phase 2				
37.									SDG&E	Move recovery of CSI and SGIP costs from distribution to PPP rate component		RDW A1401027 (filed 1/31/14 to be effective 1/1/15)

(END OF ATTACHMENT B)