

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**
6-23-15
02:11 PM

June 23, 2015

Agenda ID #14093
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 13-04-012

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Long. 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 July 23, 2015 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/ KAREN V. CLOPTONKaren V. Clopton, Chief
Administrative Law JudgeKVC:ek4
Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ LONG** (Mailed on 6/23/2015)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric
Company To Revise Its Electric Marginal
Costs, Revenue Allocation, and Rate Design.
(U39M).

Application 13-04-012
(Filed April 18, 2013)

**DECISION ADOPTING EIGHT SETTLEMENTS AND RESOLVING
CONTESTED ISSUES RELATED TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY'S ELECTRIC MARGINAL COSTS, REVENUE ALLOCATION, AND
RATE DESIGN**

Table of Contents

Title	Page
DECISION ADOPTING EIGHT SETTLEMENTS AND RESOLVING CONTESTED ISSUES RELATED TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S ELECTRIC MARGINAL COSTS, REVENUE ALLOCATION, AND RATE DESIGN	1
Summary	2
1. Procedural History	2
1.1. Submission	3
2. The Record	3
3. Standard of Review	3
4. Adopting a Proposed Settlement	4
5. Pertinent Commission Rules.....	4
6. Required Findings – Rules 12.1(d) and Rule 12.5	5
7. Summary of Settlements.....	6
7.1. Discussion	8
7.1.1. Settlement Agreement on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation	8
7.1.2. Residential Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement	10
7.1.3. Large Light and Power Rate Design Settlement Agreement.....	10
7.1.3.1. Rate Design for Schedules E-19 and E-20.....	10
7.1.3.2. Rate Design for Standby	11
7.1.4. Streetlight Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement	11
7.1.4.1. Improved Network Controlled Dimmable Streetlight Rate 2014 Pilot Program	11
7.1.4.2. Streetlight Settlement Rates	12
7.1.4.3. Schedule Ls-1 LED Streetlight Conversion Program	12
7.1.4.4. Schedule OL-1 Tariff Revisions	13
7.1.5. Amended E-Credit Rate Design Supplemental Agreement.....	13
7.1.6. Medium Commercial Rate Design Settlement Agreement.....	13
7.1.6.1. Illustrative Settlement Rates:	14
7.1.6.2. Basic Rate Design:.....	14
7.1.6.3. Medium Commercial Customer Charge.....	14
7.1.6.4. Medium Commercial Revenue Neutrality:	14
7.1.6.5. Medium/Demand Charges:.....	14
7.1.6.6. Medium Commercial Energy Charges.....	15
7.1.6.6.1. Rate Programs	15
7.1.6.6.2. Elimination of Flat Rates:.....	16

Table of Contents

Title	Page
7.1.7. Small Commercial Rate Design Settlement Agreement....	16
7.1.7.1. Overview.....	16
7.1.7.2. Illustrative Settlement Rates	17
7.1.7.3. Basic Rate Design.....	17
7.1.7.4. Small Commercial Customer Charge.....	17
7.1.7.5 Small Commercial Revenue Neutrality.....	17
7.1.7.6. Small Commercial Energy Charges	18
7.1.7.7. 75kW Size Limitation for A-6	18
7.1.7.8. Elimination of Flat Rates.....	20
7.1.7.9. E-CARE Rate Design.....	20
7.1.8. Agricultural Rate Design Settlement.....	21
7.1.8.1. Summary.....	21
7.1.8.2. Collaborative Process for Agricultural Rate Design Prior to Next Phase 2	21
7.1.8.3. Basic Agricultural Rate Designs and Illustrative Settlement Rates	21
7.1.8.3.1. Customer Charge.....	21
7.1.8.3.2 Demand Charge.....	22
7.1.8.3.3. Energy Charges.....	22
7.1.8.4. Schedules AG-R and AG-V	23
7.1.8.5. Schedule E-37 Elimination.....	23
7.1.8.6 Time of Use Revenue Neutrality	23
7.1.8.7. Retain the 12-Month Interval Data Requirement for Transition to Mandatory Time of Use	24
7.1.8.8. Agricultural Internal Combustion Engine Conversion Incentive Rate	24
7.1.8.9. Peak Day Pricing Updates:.....	24
8. Disputed issues	24
8.1. Summary	24
8.1.1. Adopting a Modified Settlement with Litigated Issues	24
8.1.2. Subsequent Rate Design Filing of a Detailed Analysis of Small Commercial & Industrial Customers.....	25
8.2. Size Limit on A-6 Eligibility - New A-6-N.....	27
8.3 Peak Day Pricing	28
8.4. Demand Charge vs All Volumetric Rates	29
9. Comment Period.....	31

Table of Contents

Title	Page
10. Assignment of Proceeding	32
Findings of Fact	32
Conclusions of Law	32
ORDER	33
Attachment 1 - Application 13-04-012, PG&E 2014 GRC II Proceeding: Party Status by Settlements - April 6, 2015	

**DECISION ADOPTING EIGHT SETTLEMENTS AND RESOLVING
CONTESTED ISSUES RELATED TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY'S ELECTRIC MARGINAL COSTS, REVENUE ALLOCATION, AND
RATE DESIGN**

Summary

This decision adopts eight separate settlements as proposed by the settling parties and resolves the remaining outstanding issues based on the merits of the litigated positions. This completes the current review of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) electric marginal costs, revenue allocation, and rate design. Adoption of these new rates will reallocate the existing authorized revenue requirement amongst the various customer classes and within those customer classes. One settlement was partially contested and this decision resolves those contested issues primarily in accordance with the proposed settlements.

Because this proceeding deals with only rate design related questions and not operating or capital costs, or how PG&E operates its electric system, there are no changes to PG&E's overall authorized revenue requirement, although individual customer's bills may likely change as a result of changes in rate design. Also, there is no impact on employee, customer, or public safety, again because this decision does not change revenue requirement or have any direct impact on electric operations.

This proceeding is closed.

1. Procedural History

The proceeding has a complex history, as parties sought and were granted numerous extensions of time to complete settlement negotiations with various sub-groups of interested parties which resulted in eight separate settlements covering all but a few issues that were litigated. All settlement rules were followed and all parties had notice and opportunity to participate. The

proceeding was initially submitted on January 8, 2015 (pursuant to Rule 13.4(a)), 30 days after the last settlement was filed (in order to allow time for comments pursuant to Rule 12.2).

1.1. Submission

There were separate motions to adopt each settlement as it was filed. After allowing an opportunity for anyone to protest, each settlement was accepted into the record. The outstanding unsettled issues were fully litigated and briefed and the proceeding was submitted on January 8, 2015, 30-days after the last date for anyone to oppose the eighth and final settlement, the Agricultural Rate Design Settlement Agreement, filed December 9, 2014. However, on March 30, 2015 Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed an Amended E-Credit Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement (Amendment) and submission was set aside to allow for comment by a ruling dated April 1, 2015. The proceeding was submitted again on April 29, 2015.

2. The Record

The record in this proceeding consists of all filed documents and all exhibits received into evidence, as well as the transcripts of all hearings. We rule here that all motions for the receipt of various exhibits served outside the evidentiary hearings are granted. All other non-evidentiary motions not otherwise granted by ruling are deemed denied.

3. Standard of Review

PG&E bears the burden of proof to show that the rates it requests are just and reasonable and the related ratemaking mechanisms are fair.

In order for the Commission to consider whether any proposed settlement in this proceeding is in the public interest, the Commission must be convinced that the parties had a sound and thorough understanding of the applications,

and all of the underlying assumptions and data included in the record. This level of understanding of the application and development of an adequate record is necessary to meet our requirements for considering any settlement.

4. Adopting a Proposed Settlement

As the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has observed, in evaluating a settlement the agreement must stand or fall on its own terms, not compared to some hypothetical result that the negotiators might have achieved, or that some believe should have been achieved:

Settlement is the offspring of compromise; the question we address is not whether the final product could be prettier, smarter or snazzier, but whether it is fair, adequate and free from collusion. (*Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1027 (9th Cir. 1998).

Based upon our review of the extensive prepared testimony, evidentiary hearings and comprehensive briefing of the litigated applications, we find that the parties to all of the settlements herein had a sound and thorough understanding of the application, and all of the underlying assumptions and data included in the record and, thus, we can consider the various individual settlements as offered by competent and well-prepared parties able to make informed choices in the settlement process.

5. Pertinent Commission Rules

The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules) specifically address the requirements for adoption of proposed settlements in Rule 12.1 Proposal of Settlements, and subject to certain limitations in Rule 12.5 Adoption Binding, Not Precedential. Specifically, Rule 12.1(a) states:

Parties may, by written motion any time after the first prehearing conference and within 30 days after the last day of hearing, propose settlements on the resolution of any material issue of law or fact or on a mutually agreeable outcome to the

proceeding. Settlements need not be joined by all parties; however, settlements in applications must be signed by the applicant and, in complaints, by the complainant and defendant.

The motion shall contain a statement of the factual and legal considerations adequate to advise the Commission of the scope of the settlement and of the grounds on which adoption is urged. Resolution shall be limited to the issues in that proceeding and shall not extend to substantive issues which may come before the Commission in other or future proceedings.

When a settlement pertains to a proceeding under a Rate Case Plan or other proceeding in which a comparison exhibit would ordinarily be filed, the motion must be supported by a comparison exhibit indicating the impact of the settlement in relation to the utility's application and, if the participating staff supports the settlement, in relation to the issues staff contested, or would have contested, in a hearing.

Rule 12.1(d) provides that:

The Commission will not approve settlements, whether contested or uncontested, unless the settlement is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law, and in the public interest.

Rule 12.5 limits the future applicability of a settlement:

Commission adoption of a settlement is binding on all parties to the proceeding in which the settlement is proposed. Unless the Commission expressly provides otherwise, such adoption does not constitute approval of, or precedent regarding, any principle or issue in the proceeding or in any future proceeding.

6. Required Findings – Rules 12.1(d) and Rule 12.5

Based upon the record of this proceeding we find the parties complied with Rule 12.1(a) by making the appropriate filings and noticing of settlement conferences. Based upon our review of the individual settlement documents we

find that they contain a statement of the factual and legal considerations adequate to advise the Commission of the scope of the settlement and of the grounds for its adoption; that the settlement was limited to the issues in this proceeding; and that the settlement included a comparison indicating the impact of the settlement in relation to the utility's application and contested issues raised by the interested parties in prepared testimony, or that would have been contested in a hearing. These two findings that the settlement complies with Rule 12.1(a), allow us to conclude, pursuant to Rule 12.1(d), that the settlement is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law, and in the public interest.

Based upon our review of the settlement documents we find, pursuant to Rule 12.5, that the proposed settlements would not bind or otherwise impose a precedent in this or any future proceeding. We specifically note, therefore, that neither PG&E nor any party to any of the settlements may presume in any subsequent applications that the Commission would deem the outcome adopted herein to be presumed reasonable and it must, therefore, fully justify every request and ratemaking proposal without reference to, or reliance on, the adoption of these settlements.

7. Summary of Settlements

A copy of all eight of the Settlement Agreements, fully executed by all interested parties, are available at the links below following each settlement. The final language of the settlement controls the terms and conditions of the adopted rates except as specifically modified herein. The proposed settlements are as follows:

1. Settlement Agreement on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation Issues, filed July 16, 2014;

- [http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=99753189;](http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=99753189)
2. Residential Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement, filed July 24, 2014;
[http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=101125976;](http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=101125976)
 3. Large Light and Power Rate Design Settlement Agreement, filed July 25, 2014;
[http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=102226995;](http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=102226995)
 4. Streetlight Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement, filed August 29, 2014;
<http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=103390568>
 5. Amended E-Credit Rate Design Supplemental Agreement, filed March 30, 2015;
[http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=151726093;](http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=151726093)
 6. Medium Commercial Rate Design Settlement Agreement, filed September 5, 2014;
[http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=105647677;](http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=105647677)
 7. Small Commercial Rate Design Settlement Agreement, filed September, 5, 2014; and
<http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=107147806>
 8. Agricultural Rate Design Settlement Agreement, filed December 2, 2014.
[http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=143515264.](http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/SearchRes.aspx?DocFormat=ALL&DocID=143515264)

7.1. Discussion

As can be seen by the detailed and complex nature of each settlement's summary, PG&E and the relevant interested parties have addressed a series of issues to their mutual satisfaction. All parties were required to affirm or assert their specific level of participation and their position on each settlement. They either: agreed to, opposed, did not participate in, or withdrew from the discussions, on every settlement. (See Attachment I.¹) Only the solar manufacturing participants opposed certain rate design issues otherwise settled in the Settlements that were therefore litigated. These contested issues are discussed and resolved herein.

7.1.1. Settlement Agreement on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation

This Settlement resolved the issues raised by marginal costs and revenue allocation. There are three major components to this Settlement. First, it resolves all marginal cost issues. The Settlement adopts the specific marginal costs to be used solely for the purpose of evaluating customer-specific contracts including as

1 The following are the parties that actively participated at some stage in the settlement discussions: Agricultural Energy Consumers' Association (AECA); Bodean Company (Bodean); City & County of San Francisco (CCSF); California City-County Street Light Association (CAL-SLA); California Farm Bureau (CFBF); California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA); California League of Food Processors (CLFP); California Manufacturers & Technology Association (CMTA); California Solar Energy Industries Association (CALSEIA); California City-County Street Light Association (Cal-SLA); City and County of San Francisco (CCSF); Direct Access Customer Coalition (DACC); Energy Producers and Users Coalition (EPUC); Energy Users Forum (EUF); Federal Executive Agencies (FEA); Marin Clean Energy (MCE); Modesto and Merced Irrigation Districts (MMID); Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA); Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E); Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA); Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA); The Utility Reform Network (TURN); and Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association (WMA).

required for Schedule E-31 (Distribution Bypass Deferral Rate) and Schedule EDR (Economic Development Rate). Second, for Revenue Allocation, the Settling Parties² agree that electric revenue should be allocated as a result of A.13-04-012 on an overall revenue-neutral basis to preserve then-required total revenue. Third, for rate changes to implement revenue requirement changes between proceedings, the Settling Parties agree that revenue requirement changes will be identified by function (e.g., nuclear decommissioning, generation, etc.). Each customer class and schedule will be allocated the average percentage change in functional revenue necessary to collect the functional revenue requirement.

In addition, the Settlement Agreement provides that PG&E will conduct certain studies and workshops to be completed prior to filing its next rate design application. All parties to the 2014 rate design proceeding will be invited to participate in all such workshops. First, the Settling Parties agreed to pursue additional analyses to examine the desirability of an Agricultural Class Balancing Account, by reviewing year-to-year variations of agricultural class revenues and sales versus those of other customer classes, and assessing possible over-collections of agricultural class revenue that accounts for variation in both PG&E's cost of service and revenues. The Settling Parties agreed to a detailed process for workshops to discuss such data and analysis, resulting in a workshop report to be finalized at least 4 months before the deadline for PG&E's next rate design application.

² "Settling Parties" is used to generically identify the changing collective groups of parties that joined each settlement. The groups for each settlement vary according to whether an individual party participated. It would be too cumbersome to separately identify each group for all eight settlements. See Attachment 2 for the status of every party for each settlement.

Second, the Settling Parties agreed to a detailed process by which PG&E will hold up to three workshops to discuss methodological issues pertaining to the development of cost of service. Those workshops will be separate from the Agricultural Class Balancing Account Workshops and timed to avoid scheduling conflicts as much as possible. A workshop report will be prepared and included as a compliance item attached to PG&E's next rate design application. The Settling Parties agreed that, to the extent possible, the workshop report will identify potential changes to PG&E's prior marginal cost methodologies that it may consider proposing in its next rate design proceeding. (July 16, 2014 Motion at 2-4.)

7.1.2. Residential Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement

The settled residential rate design issues are: Schedule ET and ES electric master-meter discounts; natural gas baseline quantities; Electric Vehicle rate review in compliance with Decision 11-07-029; and rate design to adjust generation rates such that they do not exceed the total rate for Schedules E-7, EL-7, E-8 and EL-8. (July 24, 2014 Motion at 1.)

7.1.3. Large Light and Power Rate Design Settlement Agreement

One issue is excluded from this settlement but otherwise the parties agreed to the following:

7.1.3.1. Rate Design for Schedules E-19 and E-20

The Settlement Agreement describes how rates for Schedules E-19 and E-20 will be designed, and includes the following fundamental components: Illustrative Settlement Rates; Basic Rate Design; Demand Charges; Customer Charges; Energy Charges; Peak Day Pricing Updates; Transmission Rates; and an

agreement to litigate a proposal to allow Net Energy Metering customers that are on Schedules E-19 and E-20 to take service on Peak Day Pricing rates.

7.1.3.2. Rate Design for Standby

The Settlement Agreement describes how rates for Standby Schedule S will be designed, and includes the following fundamental components: Illustrative Settlement Rates; Basic Rate Design; Reservation Charge; Customer Charges; Energy Charges; and Standby Distribution Diversity Study (PG&E will conduct a study of the diversity of standby load on the distribution system similar to that conducted by Southern California Edison Company). (July 25, 2014 Motion at 4-7.)

7.1.4. Streetlight Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement

The Streetlight Settlement Agreement is supplemental to the Marginal Cost/Rate Design Settlement Agreement. The Streetlight Settlement Agreement uses the agreed revenue allocation and addresses rate design issues that were not resolved in that initial settlement.

7.1.4.1. Improved Network Controlled Dimmable Streetlight Rate 2014 Pilot Program

The Streetlight Settling Parties agreed that it is reasonable for the Commission to adopt a Network Controlled Dimmable Streetlight Rate 2014 Pilot Program (2014 Dimmable Pilot Program), which is set forth in detail in Appendix 1 to the Streetlight Settlement Agreement. The proposed 2014 Dimmable Pilot Program is a revision of the 2011 Dimmable Pilot Program the Commission adopted in PG&E's 2011 Phase II General Rate Case (D.11-12-053). The 2014 Dimmable Pilot Program will provide dimmable streetlight service as an option to Schedule LS-2 that is expected to be simpler

and provide participants with some certainty that they will benefit from related energy savings in a timely and mutually workable way.

7.1.4.2. Streetlight Settlement Rates

The Streetlight Settling Parties agree that it is reasonable for the Commission to adopt rates Schedules LS-1, LS-2, LS-3, OL-1, and CCSF, set forth in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 of the Streetlight Settlement Agreement.

Appendix 2 of the Streetlight Settlement Agreement provides the non-energy facility charge rates for Schedules LS-1, LS-2, OL-1 and CCSF to be implemented over a three year period.

7.1.4.3. Schedule LS-1 LED Streetlight Conversion Program

In Phase I of PG&E's 2014 General Rate Case, PG&E proposed, and the Commission approved, an LED³ Conversion Program to allow customers to elect to have PG&E replace existing PG&E-owned non- decorative High Pressure Sodium Vapor streetlights under Schedule LS-1 with more energy efficient LED technology. Under the program, eligible customers would pay a new, monthly incremental facility charge and the facility charge for Schedule LS-1 through the current rate case cycle, and would receive the benefit of lower total energy charges resulting from lower usage associated with LED technology. A determination of the need to continue the incremental facility charge would be made in PG&E's 2017 General Rate Case.

³ Light-emitting Diode technology is commonly called LED.

7.1.4.4. Schedule OL-1 Tariff Revisions

Currently, the non-energy and energy portions of the total lamp rate are presented separately for each lamp type in tariffs for Schedules LS-1 and LS-2. However, only the total lamp rate for each lamp type is presented in Schedule OL-1 (i.e., energy and non-energy lamp rates are not separately listed). The Streetlight Settling Parties agree to align the presentation of rates in Schedules LS-1, LS-2 and OL-1 by modifying Schedule OL-1 to separately display the non-energy and energy portions of the total lamp rate. This change will allow PG&E the flexibility to introduce LED lamp types without overly complicating the lamp rate presentation format.

7.1.5. Amended E-Credit Rate Design Supplemental Agreement

Schedule E-CREDIT is a tariff that identifies what billing credit a Direct Access customer will receive if certain services (e.g., metering, billing, and/or customer inquiry services) are not provided by PG&E. The values are provided in Appendix A to the attached Amended E-CREDIT Rate Design Settlement.

7.1.6. Medium Commercial Rate Design Settlement Agreement

All relevant interested settling parties in this and the other settlement agreements addressed in this decision agreed that The Solar Energy Industries Association's proposal to allow Net Energy Metering customers that are on Schedule A-10-TOU to take service on Peak Day Pricing Rates should be litigated. Consequently, that issue is resolved separately elsewhere in this decision.

Within this settlement, the Settling Parties agreed to the following:

7.1.6.1. Illustrative Settlement Rates

Rates to collect the revenue allocated to the Medium Light and Power customer class under the Marginal Cost/Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement shall be designed consistent with the illustrative settlement rates set forth in Appendix A to this Settlement Agreement.

7.1.6.2. Basic Rate Design

The basic rate design for each of the applicable medium commercial rate schedules will be updated upon implementation of this Medium Commercial Settlement Agreement, using the methods underlying development of the illustrative settlement rates for Schedules A-10 and A-10-TOU, as presented in Appendix A to the Settlement Agreement.

7.1.6.3. Medium Commercial Customer Charge

Retain the current customer charge for Schedules A-10 and A-10-TOU of \$140 per month.

7.1.6.4. Medium Commercial Revenue Neutrality:

Design Schedules A-10 and A-10-TOU on a revenue neutral basis.

Continue the current annual updates to revise the Peak Day Pricing rate credits for Schedule A-10-TOU to be revenue neutral, based on updated customer and sales forecasts and billing determinants.

7.1.6.5. Medium/Demand Charges:

Schedule A-10 demand charges will be set based on the methods described in Exhibit PG&E-4, Chapter 5 at 5-7 to 5-8. Illustrative demand charges are attached based on the Marginal Cost/Revenue Allocation (MC/RA) Settlement Agreement.

7.1.6.6. Medium Commercial Energy Charges:

Increase the Time of Use differentiation for Schedule A-10-TOU from approximately 3 cents per kWh (differential from summer on peak to off peak) to approximately 8 cents per kWh (differential from summer on peak to off peak) in the generation rate component.

Distribution and generation energy charge principles and seasonal relationships for Schedule A-10 are based upon PG&E's August 16, 2013 filed proposals and methods (*see* Exhibit PG&E-4 at 5-8, 5-9), as updated to reflect the MC/RA Settlement Agreement.

With rate changes for revenue requirement changes between General Rate Case Phase II proceedings, set the Time of Use pricing differentials for Schedule A-10-TOU to be equal (on a cents per kWh basis) to the differentials established in this Phase II decision.

7.1.6.6.1. Rate Programs

Continue the Schedule A-6 Net Energy Metering solar pilot for current load. New customers or additional load from existing customers may not be added to the pilot. After the Commission's decision on the Option R proposal in A.12-12-002, PG&E will address the status of this pilot and present its proposals for the future of this pilot in a subsequent Rate Design Window proceeding.⁴ This A-6 Net Energy Metering solar pilot is for customers over 500 kW in size and is limited to 20 MW of solar capacity in total. It is completely subscribed.

A new rate, Schedule A-8, that is structured like Schedule A-6 (i.e., without demand charges) should not be made available to customers between 75 kW and

⁴ A final decision on Option-R was adopted in D. 14-12-008.

500 kW. This proposal was offered by Solar Energy Industries Association in conjunction with grandfathering certain customers that take Net Energy Metering service under Schedule A-6, if the Commission adopts a new eligibility threshold for Schedule A-6. The Solar Energy Industries Association's proposed Schedule A-8 would be a rate that is revenue neutral to Schedule A-10, but structured as a Time of Use rate with no demand charge, similar to Schedule A-6. While the Medium Commercial Rate Design Settling Parties have agreed a new rate schedule as proposed by Solar Energy Industries Association should not be established, the question of allowing grandfathering of certain Net Energy Metering customers onto Schedule A-6 should be litigated.

7.1.6.6.2 Elimination of Flat Rates

Until the next General rate Case Phase II proceeding, continue the requirement that current/existing-Time of Use customers must have 12 months of interval data before they are transitioned to mandatory Time of Use.

7.1.7. Small Commercial Rate Design Settlement Agreement

7.1.7.1. Overview

This is the settlement where parties focused the litigated dispute. Thus it is a partially contested settlement. The Settling Parties could not agree on whether Net Energy Metering customers currently taking service under Schedule A-6 (or currently planning to take service under Schedule A-6) should be allowed to retain Schedule A-6 even though they would not otherwise qualify for the schedule based on the new 75 kW eligibility threshold (proposed in the settlement); or agree whether Net Energy Metering customers should be allowed to take Peak Day Pricing service. Therefore, the Settling Parties agreed that these issues should proceed to litigation (which they did). The Solar Developers and

BoDean Company chose not to join the Settlement Agreement and reserved the right to oppose the Settlement Agreement - they filed timely comments on the settlement and filed timely briefs on the litigated issues. The balance of this section summarizes the uncontested settled issues.

7.1.7.2. Illustrative Settlement Rates

Rates to collect the revenue allocated to the Small Light and Power customer class under the Settlement Agreement shall be designed consistent with the illustrative settlement rates set forth in Appendix A to this Settlement Agreement.

7.1.7.3. Basic Rate Design

The basic rate design for each of the applicable Small Commercial rate schedules will be updated upon implementation of this Settlement Agreement, using the methods underlying development of the illustrative settlement rates for Schedules A-1, A-1-TOU, A-6, A-15, TC-1, and E-CARE as presented in Appendix A to the Settlement Agreement.

7.1.7.4. Small Commercial Customer Charge

- a. Retain the current \$10/\$20 single/polyphase customer charges for Schedules A-1 and A-6.
- b. Continue the practice of using the Schedule A-1 single phase customer charge for Schedule A-15. Retain the current facility charge for Schedule A-15 (A-15 pays the single phase customer charge in addition to the A-15 facility charge).
- c. Retain the current customer charge for Schedule TC-1 at \$10.

7.1.7.5 Small Commercial Revenue Neutrality

- a. Design Schedules A-1, A-1-TOU, A-6, and A-15 on a revenue-neutral basis. Continue the current practice for

- Schedule A-15 where the allocation for Schedule A-15 includes a revenue neutral allocation plus revenue from the \$25 per month special facility charge for direct current service.
- b. Design Schedule TC- I rates based on the revenue allocated to Schedule TC-1 using the assumptions underlying the MC/RA Settlement Agreement. The bundled allocation to Schedule TC-1 is -2.74% based on the assumptions underlying the Marginal Cost/Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement; however, the actual allocation to Schedule TC-1 may be somewhat different based on the then-required revenue and assumptions in effect at the time of settlement implementation.
 - c. Continue the current annual updates to revise the Peak Day Pricing rate credits for Schedules A-1-TOU and A-6 to be revenue neutral, based on updated customer and sales forecasts and billing determinants.

7.1.7.6. Small Commercial Energy Charges

- a. Increase Time of Use differentials for Schedule A-1-TOU from approximately 3 cents per kWh (differential from summer on peak to off peak) to approximately 5 cents per kWh (differential from summer on peak to off peak) in the generation rate component.
- b. Distribution and generation energy charges for Schedule A-6 will be established based on the same methods and rules underlying the illustrative rates provided in the Settlement's Appendix A.
- c. With rate changes for revenue requirement changes occurring between General Rate Case Phase II proceedings, set the Time of Use pricing differentials for Schedules A-1-TOU, and A-6 to be equal (on a cents per kWh basis) to the Time of Use differentials established with implementation of this Phase II decision.

7.1.7.7. 75.kW Size Limitation for A-6

- a. Revise the size threshold for Schedule A-6 to 75 kW, consistent with Schedule A 1. (This is one of the litigated

issues; thus adopting the settlement and rejecting the opposition, would result in this outcome.) The transfer of eligible customers on Schedule A-6 to an otherwise applicable schedule will begin on November 1, 2015, for customers with 12 months of interval data. The Settling Parties agree that, in addition to the normal process to default customers, customers subject to the change in the Schedule A-6 eligibility threshold will receive information by direct mail intended to explain the rate change and provide information on energy efficiency program opportunities and demand response options.

- b. PG&E shall conduct a study of the following different potential eligibility thresholds for PG&E's next Phase II proceeding.
- PG&E shall develop all information necessary for filing quality revenue allocation for hypothetical eligibility thresholds regarding Schedules A-1 and A-6 of 20 kW and of 50 kW.
 - PG&E shall develop billing determinants for the customers that are less than 20 kW; between 20 kW and 50 kW; and between 50 kW and 75 kW.
 - PG&E shall meet and confer with the Commission's Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) at least 9 months prior to filing PG&E's next Phase II proceeding to discuss an appropriate eligibility threshold. If ORA and PG&E cannot agree, PG&E will provide the information described above as part of its response to the ORA master data request.
 - As part of the above study, PG&E shall determine the customer type based on North American Industry Classification System code, where available and feasible, that fall within each of the hypothetical eligibility thresholds above (i.e., customers that are less than 20 kW; between 20 kW and 50 kW; and between 50 kW and 75 kW). In the size increments described above, PG&E shall develop billing data based on customer type, to the extent such information is

available in PG&E's billing system. In conducting such analysis, PG&E will aggregate customer billing determinants by North American Industry Classification System code so parties can identify the number and type of customers, including small businesses, in each size increment. PG&E will meet and confer at least 9 months prior to filing PG&E's next Phase II proceeding to discuss the matters in this paragraph and the progress in completing the analysis.

- c. Schedule A-15 shall not be subject to a 75 kW eligibility threshold.

7.1.7.8. Elimination of Flat Rates

Until the next Phase II proceeding, continue the requirement that current/existing non-Time of Use customers must have 12 months of interval data before they are transitioned to mandatory Time of Use rates.

7.1.7.9. E-CARE Rate Design

- a. Continue to provide an annual average commercial CARE rate discount percentage that is commensurate with the annual average residential CARE rate discount percentage. The E-CARE discount will be billed on a cents per kWh basis at the rate value level appropriate to each applicable rate schedule.
- b. Retain the current Schedule E-CARE zero minimum bill. However, if the Commission determines in the Residential Electric Rate Design Reform Proposal (A.12-06-013) that the zero-minimum bill should not apply to residential rate schedules, PG&E shall file an advice letter to also eliminate the zero-minimum bill for Schedule E-CARE.
- c. Update Schedule E-CARE discounts to reflect revised residential CARE discounts resulting from changes to residential rates in future proceedings.

7.1.8. Agricultural Rate Design Settlement

7.1.8.1. Summary

The Agricultural Settlement Agreement uses the revenue allocation agreed to in the MC/RA Settlement Agreement, and addresses certain rate design issues that were not resolved in that initial settlement. The settlement includes a provision that any revenue shifts due to customers changing from aggregation to Time of Use will not be shifted to other rate classes.

7.1.8.2. Collaborative Process for Agricultural Rate Design Prior to Next Phase 2

The parties have agreed to a specific collaborative process to be used to develop new agricultural rate design proposals.

7.1.8.3. Basic Agricultural Rate Designs and Illustrative Settlement Rates

Rates designed to collect the revenue allocated to the agricultural customer class under the Marginal Cost/Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement shall be designed consistent with the illustrative settlement rates set forth in Appendix A to this Settlement Agreement. Appendix A of the Agricultural Settlement includes illustrative settlement rates for Schedules AG-1A/B, AG-4A/B/C, AG-5A/B/C, AG-RA/B, AG-VA/B, and E-37.

7.1.8.3.1. Customer Charge

The Agricultural Settling Parties agree it is reasonable for agricultural rate designs to increase all current fixed monthly customer charges by the agricultural bundled class average percentage change. Customer charges will continue to be billed on a daily equivalent basis.

7.1.8.3.2 Demand Charge

The Agricultural Settling Parties agree that it is reasonable to increase total bundled demand charges by an amount approximately equal to the agricultural bundled class average percentage change, while also achieving the capped schedule average total increase for Direct Access and Community Choice Aggregation customers. The changes to Distribution and Generation demand charges at the schedule level will be consistent with the revenue changes to the Distribution and Generation allocations at the overall agricultural class level contained in the Marginal Cost/Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement.

7.1.8.3.3. Energy Charges

The Settling Parties agree to increase total bundled energy charges by an amount approximately equal to the agricultural bundled class average percentage change, while also achieving the capped schedule average total increase for Direct Access/Community Choice Aggregation customers. The changes to Distribution and Generation energy charges at the schedule level will be consistent with the revenue changes to the Distribution and Generation allocations at the overall agricultural class level contained in the Marginal Cost/Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement. The increases to Public Purpose Program energy charges at the schedule level will be consistent with the revenue changes to the Public Purpose Program revenue allocated at the overall agricultural class level contained in the Marginal Cost/Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement. While total customer charge and demand charge increases based upon the combined Distribution and Generation changes as applicable will generally approximate the class average bundled change, the total energy charge changes may deviate slightly more, but will be designed to be as

uniform as possible subject to the revenue and rate design constraints applicable for bundled and Direct Access/Community Choice Aggregation customers.

7.1.8.4. Schedules AG-R and AG-V

Although PG&E received approval in D.11-12-053 to eliminate Schedules AG-R and AG-V to simplify and streamline the number of agricultural rate schedules beginning in March 2014, on February 6, 2014, there was a one-year deferral until March 2015. The Settling Parties agree that the elimination of these schedules should be further delayed pending further discussions about overall agricultural rates.

7.1.8.5. Schedule E-37 Elimination

Schedule E-37 shall be terminated for customers with 12 months of interval data beginning on November 1, 2017. Beginning November 1, 2017, or with each successive November 1, Schedule E-37 customers shall be transferred to their otherwise applicable commercial or industrial rate schedule. Customer notification shall utilize the standard customer notification process and billing system platforms and protocols as applicable to the general small and medium business annual November transition window for time-varying pricing.

7.1.8.6 Time of Use Revenue Neutrality

The settlement details the process whereby time of use rates remain neutral, i.e., do not otherwise change, the revenue recovery by PG&E or impose costs on other customers.

7.1.8.7. Retain the 12-Month Interval Data Requirement for Transition to Mandatory Time of Use

The Settling Parties agree to retain the 12-month interval data requirement before an existing non-Time of Use customer must transition to service on a TOU schedule. Any change is deferred to PG&E's 2017 Phase II proceeding

7.1.8.8. Agricultural Internal Combustion Engine Conversion Incentive Rate

The Agricultural Internal Combustion Engine Conversion program, which provides rate discounts to customers who shift from diesel to electric generation for water pumping, expires for existing participants at the end of 2015. The Settling Parties believe there are numerous benefits to continuing this program. Therefore, the Settling Parties agree to address these issues expeditiously in 2015.

7.1.8.9. Peak Day Pricing Updates

The parties agreed to PG&E's proposals for Peak Day Pricing updates to Schedules AG-4A, AG-4C, and AG-5C. These proposals are limited to continuing the annual adjustments to Peak Day Pricing rate credits to conform rates to updated customer and sales forecasts and billing determinants, as proposed in Exhibit PG&E-7.

8. Disputed issues

8.1. Summary

8.1.1. Adopting a Modified Settlement with Litigated Issues

In summary we adopt the settlements described above except for the specific adjustments we make below based upon the litigated outcome on these limited issues. Generally the Commission gives deference to settlements; more so when all-party, but only when the settlements comport with the settlement rules and are found to be in the public interest. Here we had a large number of

parties who self-selected into a series of settlements. (Attachment II.) Most agreed with the outcome of every issue where they participated and the settlements collectively resolve the entire proceeding. But a small group of closely aligned parties aggressively litigated a number of issues for solar customers and the solar industry who would benefit as a result of favorable rates for solar customers. We note that a large and broadly representative group of intervenors has otherwise settled all issues, and we note that ORA as well as The Utility Reform Network (TURN) who both take a very broad perspective would have settled all issues. Therefore we look for instances where these few narrow-interest parties raise compelling arguments that would lead us to altering the settlements.

We adopt a new rate A-6 as proposed by PG&E, however we leave existing A-6 customers in place and close the tariff to new customers pending the comprehensive review in a subsequent proceeding. We determine that customers of any eligible class who are on a net-energy metering rate are also eligible as a default rate for Peak-Day Pricing. Finally, we determine that a demand charge is still appropriate, and we adopt one herein to the extent it is consistent with the proposed settlement. We otherwise find any other objections to the settlements to be not persuasive and we adopt the balance of the settlements as filed unless specifically modified.

8.1.2. Subsequent Rate Design Filing of a Detailed Analysis of Small Commercial & Industrial Customers

Because of the continued litigation of certain issues within the Small Commercial and Industrial class over this and prior proceedings, PG&E is directed in the first of either its next rate design window proceeding, or the next "Phase II" application, after the Commission has adopted its new policy for

Net Energy Metering in Rulemaking 14-07-002, that it must file a comprehensive study taking into consideration all of the then-current rate design decisions, including this one, that affect small commercial and industrial rates. In particular, we expect an exhaustive examination on the question of the relevant and appropriate demand charge or charges that should be imposed on all small commercial and industrial customers in the same class. This rate design window study should comprehensively look at the rate design and cost allocation within the small commercial and industrial class. We are determined that PG&E must use a sufficiently large data set for all of its analysis of the class. This should limit parties arguing that the data is too limited to allow for a meaningful analysis and policy debate. We take note for example of the recent “Option R” decision, D. 14-12-080, where there was a substantial disagreement over the sufficiency of the data set used in the proceeding. Further, PG&E must use a sufficient data sample – of both the number of customers and of data points of both demand and consumption – to adequately support a fair and reasonable rate design for the class. This class study must also justify the appropriate demand limit for Schedule A-6: for example, we create a new Schedule A-6-N herein and close to new customers the existing A-6 rate. We expect one new rate structure to emerge which would encompass these two rates. We expect this study to appropriately assign those customers that do not fit into the replacement for A-6 and A-6-N to an appropriate rate.

8.2. Size Limit on A-6 Eligibility – New A-6-N

PG&E proposes to reduce Schedule A-6 to a maximum of 75 kW from the current maximum of 500 kW. The Solar Developers⁵ opposed the rate's size reduction arguing that their existing solar customers took service from PG&E in good faith and in reliance upon the availability of the schedule when they elected to install solar. While we are sympathetic to this point, no customer is ever guaranteed that any rate schedule will remain unchanged indefinitely. We believe, however, that PG&E's testimony has shown the need to change Schedule A-6, at least prospectively, and therefore we will close Schedule A-6 to all new customers as of the effective date of this decision. Any prospective customer that has a signed service agreement with PG&E dated prior to the effective date of this decision may still take service under the existing Schedule A-6. We do not accept the Solar Developers' proposal for a new schedule, A-8, because this appears to be the old A-6 with a new label. PG&E proposed to reduce the load size eligibility on A-6 and, but for the dissenting parties, the remaining settling parties including ORA and TURN would support the change. Opponents argue that this change would cause many customers to shift to another tariff because of the size of their load. By our decision to leave existing customers on the same tariff pending a comprehensive class review, no current customer on A-6 is compelled to shift at this time.

No customer is ever guaranteed that a given rate structure will remain in effect forever: rates evolve as load patterns change and as the operating system

⁵ Two closely related parties, Solar Energy Industries Association and California Solar Energy Industries Association are the only parties that briefed the contested issues opposing the settlements. The latter California entity is a member of the national entity.

changes. As noted elsewhere, we want PG&E to file a comprehensive and data-rich study in a subsequent rate design window or subsequent Phase II application to address A-6 and related rate design questions. Therefore we will leave A-6 active for existing customers already on this rate and close it to new customers as of the effective date of this decision. Concurrently, we will adopt a new A-6, "A-6-N" at the new lower 75 kW demand limit. This new A-6-N rate will otherwise match the revised A-6 proposal included in the settlement (it is not the litigants' proposed A-8) and A-6-N adopted herein will be eligible for both Net Energy Metering and Peak Day Pricing as is the existing but closed A-6 rate. The new analysis of the entire Small Commercial and Industrial class ordered in this decision will determine the most appropriate rates for customers going forward who are on either the closed A-6 or the new A-6-N, as well as addressing other related contested issues such as demand charges, etc.

8.3 Peak Day Pricing

In D.06-05-038, the Commission directed the utilities "to incorporate default critical peak pricing tariffs for large customers into their next comprehensive rate design proceeding or other appropriate proceeding if directed by the Commission." (D.06-05-038 at 16.) This rate is intended to offer a rate inducement to reduce load on the days when demand and therefore marginal cost are the highest. As such it is a demand response mechanism that can be layered onto rates for customers who already have a specialized rate design which encourages them at all times to minimize peak consumption and for solar customers to maximize the net energy produced and delivered into the grid. With respect to the Solar Developers' assertion that Peak Day Pricing should be added on top of Net Energy Metering, we agree they have a statutory right to the option. (Pub. Util. Code § 2827.)

We find that Peak Day Pricing is a ratesetting device intended to encourage conservation on those peak days when energy costs spike upwards. Peak Day Pricing is an available default rate, it can in fact be used here in conjunction with Net Energy Metering.⁶ We therefore adopt this position to the extent that it modifies the otherwise proposed settlement for any eligible Net Energy Metered customer.

8.4. Demand Charge vs All Volumetric Rates

PG&E argues that demand charges serve two key purposes. First, they appropriately reflect cost causation. Capacity-related costs are the result of the infrastructure such as generators, transmission lines, substations, circuits and final line transformers that must be put in place so that electricity can be generated and distributed to customers. These infrastructure costs are not driven by kWh sales volumes. Instead, facilities must be sized so that they are sufficient to meet each customer's kW demands during all time periods, including those periods in which demand is the highest. Because kW demand, not kWh usage, is the driver of these costs, volumetric rates (i.e., rates in units of cents per kWh) do

⁶ Net Energy Metering was designed to specifically comply with legislation that set specific parameters for compensating customers whose on-site generation provides energy to the grid. The legislative purpose was to stimulate investment in renewal generation.

D. 11-06-016 states:

“Assembly Bill (AB) 920 amends Pub. Util. Code § 2827 and requires the Commission to establish a program to compensate net energy metering ... customers for electricity produced in excess of on-site load at the end of a 12 month true-up period. In enacting AB 920, the Legislature stated that [a net energy metering] program combined with net surplus compensation ... is one way to encourage substantial private investment in renewable energy resources, stimulate in-state economic growth, and reduce demand for electricity during peak consumption periods. “
(Section 2827(a).)

not properly capture these costs. Second, demand charges are a tool to help reduce demand by providing an incentive for customers on Time of Use demand schedules to limit their demands during particular periods when generation costs are highest.

It is, according to PG&E, a long-established California ratemaking practice that each utility's most fully cost-based tariffs apply to service the very largest electric customers. The Commission's policy supporting demand charges for large customers dates back to the mid-1970s. (PG&E cites to D.87745, D.89711, and D.85-08-017.) Thus, for decades, the Commission has used demand charges to collect capacity-related costs, since doing so is consistent with cost-based rate design. Marginal distribution and generation capacity costs are measured in units of dollars per kW. Rate design based on marginal costs establishes demand charges (in units of dollars per kW) for these services. The rates applicable under Schedules A-10 and E-19 are closer to fully cost-based in this regard. PG&E argues that neither the passage of time nor the evolution of the solar market has changed these rate design principles.

AB 327 directed the Commission to develop a successor tariff to the current Net Energy Metering structure, and to develop a transition period for customers interconnecting prior to the transition date. By D.14-03-041, the Commission set that transition period at 20 years from interconnection. However, this means that existing Net Energy Metering customers will remain on current Net Energy Metering, that is, they will be exempt from standby and most interconnection charges, and will receive a full retail credit for all exports. That decision did not exempt such customers from rate changes for the next 20 years. PG&E argues the decision noted that under its own study of the cost shifts associated with Net Energy Metering:

“the analysis suggests that [Net Energy Metering] generation currently results in a net cost of \$79 to \$252 million, with these additional net costs subsidized by other ratepayers (i.e., those not participating in Net Energy Metering), reaching costs of \$370 million to \$1 billion per year in 2020 with a complete build out of systems to the 5 percent Net Energy Metering program transition trigger level. The report also notes that the costs of Net Energy Metering are largely a function of retail rate designs, and that any future changes to the rate structure would have a significant impact on the results.”
(D.14-03-041 at 7.)

PG&E also argues that the Commission stated in D.14-03-041 that it intended to address the Net Energy Metering cost shift associated with existing customers through changes in rate design, clearly indicating that existing Net Energy Metering customers will not be exempt from rate changes.

Thus we find that the use of a demand charge as provided in the settlements is reasonable and we were not persuaded by the solar industry advocates to eliminate the demand charge and thereby shift costs to other customers. Again, in a total class review in a rate design window proceeding, the question of a demand charge can be fully analyzed as it would or should apply to all customers in the class.

9. Comment Period

The proposed decision of ALJ Long 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 _____.

10. Assignment of Proceeding

Michael Picker is the assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge Douglas Long is the presiding officer.

Findings of Fact

1. There is a full and complete record composed of all filed documents and all exhibits received into evidence, as well as the transcripts of all hearings.
2. The parties engaged in extensive discovery, litigation, and settlement.
3. The parties to the settlements adopted in this decision had a sound and thorough understanding of the application, and all of the underlying assumptions and data included in the record and could make informed decisions in the settlement process.
4. The adopted settlements are between competent and well-prepared parties who were able to make informed choices in the settlement process.
5. The A-6 rate was adjusted by settlement but opposed by some parties.
6. Closing A-6 to new customers would let PG&E open a new A-6-N without harming existing A-6 customers or other customers within the same class.
7. Peak Day Pricing would encourage further conservation by Net Energy Metering customers.
8. Demand charges allocate infrastructure costs to customers.
9. Net energy metering customers contribute to the need for infrastructure recovered in demand charges.
10. A detailed study of the small commercial and industrial class would determine the reasonable cost allocation and any need for demand charges.

Conclusions of Law

1. Applicant alone bears the burden of proof to show that its proposals are reasonable.

2. The rate design and cost allocation settlements are reasonable because they fairly balance intervenor interests and provide sufficient revenue to safely provide reliable service.
3. The adopted settlements provide sufficient information for the Commission to discharge its future regulatory obligations.
4. It is reasonable to close the existing A-6 tariff to new customers.
5. It is reasonable to adopt a new A-6-N tariff for new customers.
6. Peak Day Pricing is a default rate option that should be available to net energy metering customers.
7. Demand charges fairly allocate infrastructure costs to customers.
8. Net energy metering customers contribute to the need for infrastructure recovered in demand charges and should pay demand charges.
9. A data rich and detailed small commercial and industrial customer class cost study would determine the reasonable allocation of costs and any need for demand charges in rates.
10. Any pending motions are unnecessary to resolve this proceeding and should be denied.
11. The proceeding should be closed.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The July 16, 2014 Motion of Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and other settling parties to Approve a Settlement Agreement on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation Issues, is granted. PG&E shall make any necessary filings to implement the specific terms of the Settlement Agreement as one or more Tier 1 advice letters.

2. The July 24, 2014 Motion of Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and other settling parties to Approve Residential Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement, is granted. PG&E shall make any necessary filings to implement the specific terms of the Settlement Agreement as one or more Tier 1 advice letters.

3. The July 25, 2014 Motion of Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and other settling parties to Approve Large Light and Power Rate Design Settlement Agreement, is granted. PG&E shall make any necessary filings to implement the specific terms of the Settlement Agreement as one or more Tier 1 advice letters.

4. The August 29, 2014 Motion of Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and other settling parties to Approve Streetlight Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement, is granted. PG&E shall make any necessary filings to implement the specific terms of the Settlement Agreement as one or more Tier 1 advice letters.

5. The March 30, 2015 Motion of Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and other settling parties to Approve the Amended E-Credit Rate Design Supplemental Agreement, is granted. PG&E shall make any necessary filings to implement the specific terms of the Settlement Agreement as one or more Tier 1 advice letters.

6. The September 5, 2014 Motion of Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and other settling parties to Approve Medium Commercial Rate Design Settlement Agreement, is granted. PG&E shall make any necessary filings to implement the specific terms of the Settlement Agreement as one or more Tier 1 advice letters.

7. The September, 5, 2014 Motion of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and other settling parties to Approve Small Commercial Rate Design Settlement Agreement, is granted. PG&E shall make any necessary filings to implement the specific terms of the Settlement Agreement as one or more Tier 1 advice letters.

8. The December 9, 2014 Motion of Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and other settling parties to Approve Agricultural Rate Design Settlement Agreement, is granted. PG&E shall make any necessary filings to implement the specific terms of the Settlement Agreement as one or more Tier 1 advice letters.

9. Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) shall make any necessary filings to implement the specific terms of the decision as one or more Tier 1 advice letters. Specifically:

- a. The current A-6 tariff is closed to new customers;
- b. A new A-6-N tariff is created for customers with demand limited to 75 kW as proposed in the settlement; and
- c. Net-energy metered customers shall be eligible for Peak-Day Pricing as a default rate option; and

PG&E must include a data-rich analysis for the entire Small Commercial and Industrial class in either the next "Phase II" proceeding or rate design window proceeding after the Commission resolves the Net-Energy Metering Rulemaking 12-11-005. PG&E must hold workshops open to all interested parties and the Commission's Energy Division prior to preparing this analysis.

10. Any pending motions are deemed denied.

11. Application 13-04-012 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, 2015, at San Francisco, California.

Attachment 1

Application 13-04-012, PG&E 2014 GRC II Proceeding:
Party Status by Settlements – April 6, 2015

APPLICATION 13-04-012, PG&E 2014 GRC II PROCEEDING: PARTY STATUS BY SETTLEMENTS April 6, 2015

Party	MARGINAL COST AND REVENUE ALLOCATION SETTLEMENT	LARGE LIGHT AND POWER RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	RESIDENTIAL RATE DESIGN SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT	E-CREDIT RATE DESIGN SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT	MARCH 30, 2015 E-CREDIT RATE DESIGN AMENDED SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT	STREETLIGHT RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	MEDIUM COMMERCIAL RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	SMALL COMMERCIAL RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	AGRICULTURAL RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT
PG&E	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
AECA	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES
BODEAN	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	OPPOSE	OPPOSE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
CAL-5EIA	NOT OPPOSED	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	WITHDREW	OPPOSE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
CAL-SLA	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES	WITHDREW	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
CFBF	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES
CLECA	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE

APPLICATION 13-04-012,PG&E 2014 GRC II PROCEEDING: PARTY STATUS BY SETTLEMENTS April6,2015

Party	MARGINAL COST AND REVENUE ALLOCATION SETTLEMENT	LARGE LIGHT AND POWER RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	RESIDENTIAL RATE DESIGN SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT	E-CREDIT RATE DESIGN SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT	MARCH 30,2015 E-CREDIT RATE DESIGN AMENDED SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT	STREETLIGHT RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	MEDIUM COMMERCIAL RATE DESIGN SETILEMENT	SMALL COMMERCIAL RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	AGRICULTURAL RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT
CLFP	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
CMTA	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	WITHDREW	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
DACC	YES	NOT OPPOSE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	WITHDREW	WITHDREW	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
EPUC	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	YES
EUF	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
FEA	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
MCE	NOT OPPOSED	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	<i>DID NOT PARTICIPATE</i>	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	WITHDREW	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
MMID	NOT OPPOSED	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	DID NOT PARTICIPATE

APPLICATION 13-04-012, PG&E 2014 GRC II PROCEEDING: PARTY STATUS BY SETTLEMENTS April 6, 2015

Party	MARGINAL COST AND REVENUE ALLOCATION SETTLEMENT	LARGE LIGHT AND POWER RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	RESIDENTIAL RATE DESIGN SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT	E-CREDIT RATE DESIGN SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT	March 30, 2015 E-CREDIT RATE DESIGN AMENDED SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT	STREETLIGHT RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	MEDIUM COMMERCIAL RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	SMALL COMMERCIAL RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT	AGRICULTURAL RATE DESIGN SETTLEMENT
ORA	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES	WITHDREW	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	WITHDREW	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
SEIA	NOT OPPOSED	NOT OPPOSED	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	OPPOSED	OPPOSED	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
SBUA	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	WITHDREW	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
CCSF	NOT OPPOSED	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
TURN	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES	YES	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	WITHDREW	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE
WMA	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	YES	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPATE	DID NOT PARTICIPAT	DID NOT PARTICIPATE