

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**11-13-15  
08:11 AM

November 13, 2015

Agenda ID #14465  
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 15-06-001:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Seaneen M. Wilson. 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 December 17, 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/ RICHARD SMITH for  
Karen V. Clopton, Chief  
Administrative Law Judge

KVC:dc3

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ WILSON** (Mailed 11/13/2015)

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Adoption of Electric Revenue Requirements and Rates Associated with its 2016 Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) and Generation Non-Bypassable Charges Forecast and Greenhouse Gas Forecast Revenue and Reconciliation (U39E).

Application 15-06-001  
(Filed June 1, 2015)

**DECISION ADOPTING PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S 2016  
ELECTRIC PROCUREMENT COST REVENUE REQUIREMENT FORECAST**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
DECISION ADOPTING PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY’S 2016 ELECTRIC PROCUREMENT COST REVENUE REQUIREMENT FORECAST .....	1
Summary .....	2
1. Background .....	3
2. Party Positions.....	4
2.1. PG&E .....	4
2.1.1. Application.....	4
2.1.2. Reply to Protests.....	4
2.1.3. Rebuttal Testimony and Briefs.....	5
2.2. Sonoma Clean Power .....	7
2.3. Marin Clean Energy.....	7
2.4. Agricultural Energy Consumers Association.....	9
2.5. CFBF.....	9
2.6. Alliance for Retail Energy Markets and Direct Access Customer Coalition.....	9
2.7. Merced Irrigation District and Modesto Irrigation District.....	10
2.8. California Large Energy Consumers Association.....	10
2.9. Office of Ratepayer Advocates .....	11
2.10. Lean.....	11
3. PG&E’s Updated Request.....	11
4. Discussion and Conclusion .....	11
5. Procedural Issues .....	13
5.1. Categorization and Need for Hearings .....	13
5.2. Motions for Confidential Treatment .....	14
5.3. Admittance of Exhibits into the Record .....	14
6. Compliance with the Authority Granted Herein.....	15
7. Comment Period .....	16
Findings of Fact .....	16
Conclusions of Law.....	17
ORDER .....	19

**DECISION ADOPTING PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S 2016 ELECTRIC PROCUREMENT COST REVENUE REQUIREMENT FORECAST****Summary**

Today's decision: 1) Adopts a 2016 electric procurement cost revenue requirement forecast of \$4,772.0 million for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), which consists of \$4,277.7 million for the Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA), \$187.3 million for the Ongoing Competition Transition Charge, \$118.7 million for the Power Charge Indifference Amount, and \$188.3 million for the Cost Allocation Mechanism; 2) Approves PG&E's 2016 electric sales forecast and rate proposals associated with its electric procurement related revenue requirements to be effective in rates January 1, 2016; 3) Adopts a 2016 Greenhouse Gas (GHG)-related forecast of \$0.8 million for administrative and outreach expenses pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return, \$311.1 million net forecast revenue return amount, and PG&E's proposal to return the revenue to customers in rates in 2016; 4) Adopts a 2016 semi-annual residential California Climate Credit of \$20.94; and 5) Approves a 2014 recorded administrative and outreach expenses of \$1.05 million pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return, as reasonable.

The Commission also orders that a workshop be held in the first half of 2016, outside of any proceeding, by the Commission's Energy Division, to address the methodologies and inputs used for calculating the Power Charge Indifference Amount. Notice of this workshop shall be provided to the service lists of all currently open ERRA proceedings, both forecast and compliance for the three large electric utilities (PG&E, Southern California Edison, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company).

**1. Background**

On June 1, 2015, PG&E filed its Application for Adoption of Electric Revenue Requirements and Rates Associated with its 2016 Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) and Generation Non-Bypassable Charges Forecast and Greenhouse Gas Forecast Revenue and Reconciliation (Application).

On June 11, 2015, Resolution ALJ-176-3358 preliminarily determined that this proceeding was ratesetting and that hearings would be necessary. On June 30, 2015, a protest was filed by Sonoma Clean Power (SCP). On July 2, 2015, protests were filed by Marin Clean Energy (MCE), and the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA). Responses to the Application were filed on July 3, 2015 by Alliance for Retail Energy Matters/Direct Access Customer Coalition (AReM/DACC) and Modest Irrigation District/Merced Irrigation District (Merced/Modesto). PG&E filed its reply to the protests on July 13, 2015.

On June 17, 2015, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued an electronic-mail (e-mail) ruling, giving notice of a Prehearing Conference (PHC). On July 28, 2015, a PHC took place in San Francisco to establish the service list, discuss the scope, and develop a procedural timetable for the management of this proceeding.

In addition to the parties that filed protests, several more parties were added as parties at the PHC, including: 1) California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA); 2) California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF); 3) Lean Energy USA (Lean); and 4) Agricultural Energy Consumers Association (AECA).

The Scoping Memorandum and Ruling of Assigned Commissioner (Scoping Memo) in the ERRA Application was issued August 5, 2015. On September 9, 2015, PG&E informed the assigned ALJ via electronic mail (e-mail) that all parties to the ERRA Application agreed that evidentiary hearings (EHs)

would not be required. On that same date, the assigned ALJ issued an e-mail ruling removing EHs set for September 10, 2015 from the Commission's calendar. PG&E, Lean, MCE, and SCP filed their opening briefs on September 21, 2015. PG&E, SCP, MCE, and AReM/DACC filed reply briefs on October 1, 2015.

## **2. Party Positions**

### **2.1. PG&E**

#### **2.1.1. Application**

In its Application, PG&E requested the following: 1) Adoption of its 2016 electric procurement cost revenue requirement forecast of \$4,772.0 million, which consists of \$4,277.7 million for the ERRR, \$187.3 million for the Ongoing Competition Transition Charge (CTC), \$118.7 million for the Power Charge Indifference Amount (PCIA), and \$188.3 million for the Cost Allocation Mechanism (CAM); 2) Approval PG&E's 2016 electric sales forecast and rate proposals associated with its electric procurement related revenue requirements to be effective in rates January 1, 2016; 3) Adoption of PG&E's 2016 GHG-related forecasts of \$0.8 million for administrative and outreach expenses pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return, \$311.1 million net forecast revenue return amount, and PG&E's proposal to return the revenue to customers in rates in 2016; 4) Adoption of PG&E's 2016 semi-annual residential California Climate Credit of \$20.94; and 5) Determination that adoption of PG&E's 2014 recorded administrative and outreach expenses of \$1.05 million pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return, are reasonable.

#### **2.1.2. PG&E's Reply to Protests**

Parties voiced concern about PG&E's methodology for calculating the CTC, CAM, and PCIA. As noted in Decision (D.) 13-08-023, the Commission will continue to consider the application and overall fairness, on an as-applied basis,

of the Commission's cost allocation methodologies in an ongoing fashion. However, challenges to the Commission's existing policy and/or rules are beyond the scope of this proceeding and must be raised via a Petition for Modification of the decision that established the policy and/or rule in question. Also, many of the policy issues raised by parties would impact California's other Investor-Owned Utilities (IOUs), which are not parties in this proceeding. This proceeding is limited to a year ahead forecast for a single utility and thus is not the appropriate venue for addressing broad policy issues that impact all of California's IOUs. Therefore, this issue was not considered in this proceeding.

### **2.1.3. Rebuttal Testimony and Briefs**

In its rebuttal testimony, PG&E addresses the concerns raised by MCE and SCP in their testimony. In particular, PG&E posits that:

1. MCE's and SCP's concerns regarding the PCIA and CAM methodologies are policy issues that go beyond the scope of the current proceeding; and
2. MCE's proposal to freeze PCIA rates for 2016 at 2015 levels should be rejected because it violates prior Commission decisions and would shift costs to PG&E's bundled customers, possibly causing those bundled customer financial harm.

In its briefs, PG&E reiterates its positions regarding MCE's and SCP's concerns, and added that it believes MCE and SCP ignored a number of factors, some of which are outside PG&E's control, that have caused PG&E's forecasted PCIA to increase, including: 1) The expiration of the California Department of Water Resources contracts; 2) Decreases in market prices, which have the effect of lowering the market price benchmark and increasing stranded costs associated with contracts entered into on behalf of departing customer; 3) Changes in

PG&E's portfolio mix; 4) Other factors such as a reduction in Department of Energy Litigation funds.

MCE believes that the increase in customer bills, resulting from PG&E's PCIA request, is unfair and anti-competitive. In response, PG&E states that it calculated the PCIA using Commission authorized methodologies, and that MCE does not consider possible mitigating factors regarding 2016 rates, such as lower market prices for power.

MCE and SCP also raise concerns regarding the effect of the increased PCIA on CCA California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) customers. PG&E posits that CCA CARE customers are not disproportionately impacted regarding the increased PCIA than PG&E's own bundled CARE customers are.

In response to MCE's proposal that PG&E offset the increased PCIA, PG&E states that:

1. Freezing rates would unjustly burden bundled customers, violate Pub. Util. Code §366.2(a)(4) and (d) which requires the Commission to ensure bundled customer indifference, and result in CCA customers not paying their fair share; and
2. Offsetting the PCIA increase with the negative indifference amount associated with above-market costs arising from Department of Water Resources contracts, prior to 2009, is in violation of Commission decisions.<sup>1</sup> In particular because the negative indifference amount was accrued by DA customers, this negative indifference amount should not be used by a different group of departing load customers.

---

<sup>1</sup> See explanation of the negative indifference in D.06-07-030 and D.14-12-053 at 11-12.

PG&E also states in its briefs that no party has disputed compliance with Commission authorized methodologies in the calculation of its requests.

## **2.2. Sonoma Clean Power**

In its protest, SCP stated that its primary interests in A.15-06-001 are the reasonableness of PG&E's proposed revenue requirement for Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) customers, in particular, for CCA residential customers; and the calculation of the PCIA and CAM.

SCP states that even though PG&E appears to have applied the PCIA and CAM methodologies accurately, the results of these calculations have a detrimental effect on CCA customers, and warrant a reevaluation of the methodologies in a separate proceeding with the next year, possibly including a workshop. SCP also raises concerns regarding the effect of the increased PCIA on CCA CARE customers, which further supports reexamination of the PCIA methodology.

## **2.3. Marin Clean Energy**

In its protest, MCE states that the PCIA in PG&E's service territory is anti-competitive for CCAs and is fundamentally unfair for CCA customers, particular small usage customers such as residential, small commercial and especially CARE<sup>2</sup> eligible customers. Based upon MCE's initial analysis of the current application, if PG&E's request was adopted, the PCIA would increase by 72% for residential customers participating in CCA programs that have a 2015 customer vintage. PCIA charges presently represent approximately 15% of the generation-side charges on MCE's customers' bills, meaning MCE must procure

---

<sup>2</sup> CARE represents California Alternate Rates for Energy.

power at less than 85% of PG&E's generation costs to remain competitive. The proposed increase within this Application would mean that MCE and other CCAs would have to procure power at less than 74% of PG&E's generation costs. MCE proposed that PG&E's application be rejected; and if it is not rejected, close attention should be paid to the issues raised by MCE.

In its testimony and briefs, MCE proposes that: 1) PG&E's proposed increase in the PCIA will result in a significant burden on CCA customers, especially residential and CARE customers; 2) PG&E should not retire the negative indifference amount without Commission authority; 3) PG&E should be required to freeze the PCIA at its current level and use its negative indifference balance to mitigate PG&E's proposed increase to the PCIA; 4) If additional time is necessary to examine whether and how to use PG&E's negative indifference balance, the Commission could establish a second phase to this proceeding; and 5) PG&E should update its departing load forecast to account for CCA programs that PG&E acknowledges in its GRC will be established in 2016.

In particular, MCE states that in a data response, PG&E stated that the negative indifference amount would "simply go away,"<sup>3</sup> raising concerns regarding its disposition. MCE proposes that as an alternative to offsetting the PCIA increase with the negative indifference amount - that CCA providers have the option to amortize a PCIA under-collection balance over 30 months, capping any increase in the PCIA at 15% per year, allowing customers to adapt to this change in costs.

---

<sup>3</sup> MCE Opening Brief at 8.

In its current GRC, A.15-09-001, PG&E expects that the City and County of San Francisco (SF) and Alameda County (AC) will initiate CCA programs in 2016. Based on this expectation, MCE proposes that PG&E should adjust its PCIA calculation for inclusion of these estimated departing load customers.

**2.4. Agricultural Energy Consumers Association**

AECA filed no protest and served no testimony in this proceeding.

**2.5. CFBF**

CFBF filed no protest and served no testimony in this proceeding.

**2.6. Alliance for Retail Energy Markets and Direct Access Customer Coalition**

AReM and DACC did not file testimony but, in their response to the Application, expressed concerns in the calculation and rate treatment of costs charged to Direct Access (DA) customers including calculation of the PCIA, the CTC and CAM charge.

In its briefs, AReM/DACC posit that:

1. The negative indifference amount belongs solely to pre-2009 DA customers and should not be used to reduce PCIA generally;
2. PG&E should not be allowed to retire the negative indifference amount, but should be required to use it for the benefit of DA customers;
3. Freezing the current PCIA or amortizing the balance of the under-collection over 30 months may have unforeseen consequences, such as:
  - a. Significant accounting issues; or
  - b. Freezing the PCIA by a utility in a future proceeding when the PCIA decreases;

4. Any rate stabilization proceeding must address the interests of all departing load customers, both DA and CCA; and
5. A separate phase to consider PCIA-related and rate stabilization issues should be commenced.

### **2.7. Merced Irrigation District and Modesto Irrigation District**

MID did not file testimony, but in their response to the Application, explained that they sought to: 1) Ensure that Ongoing CTC and CAM are properly calculated; 2) Clarify the nature and extent of any New System Generation Charge PG&E proposes to impose on incremental Transferred Municipal Departing Load (MDL); and 3) Reiterate the need to set an end date or develop a plan for phasing out Ongoing CTC.<sup>4</sup>

### **2.8. California Large Energy Consumers Association**

CLECA filed no protest and served no testimony in this proceeding. In its motion of September 16, 2015, CLECA requested that a PG&E response to CLECA Data Request Set #1 be admitted into the record of this proceeding. The information clarifies that, unlike some other non-bypassable charges, the ongoing Competition Transition Charge is not a vintaged rate.

---

<sup>4</sup> Pursuant to the August 5, 2015 Scoping Memo, "I do not include Merced/Modesto's Issue 4 - whether the Ongoing CTC should continue indefinitely or terminate as of a date certain, as a scoped issue. Pursuant to D.13-08-023, Conclusion of Law Number 5, "Certain departing load charges, for example the CTC, are required by state statute and, without legislative action, cannot be discontinued until the specified costs are recovered." Therefore, termination of the CTC can only be performed by legislation, not Commission actions."

**2.9. Office of Ratepayer Advocates**

In its protest, ORA indicates that its examination would concentrate on PG&E's estimates of underlying natural gas prices, load, and other cost inputs to PG&E's model used in determining the forecast revenue requirement.

**2.10. Lean**

Lean filed no protest and served no testimony in this proceeding. In its brief, Lean agrees with MCE that PG&E's proposed PCIA should be mitigated by amortization over 30 months with a 15% increase cap per year. Lean also posits that PG&E's PCIA proposal is inconsistent with state law<sup>5</sup> stating that CCA's should be protected from anti-competitive marketing that might stifle CCA development and inhibit fair competition.

**3. PG&E's Updated Request**

PG&E filed its November 5, 2015 update of its requested 2016 ERRRA forecast. Per the Scoping Ruling, the numbers in this proposed decision will be adjusted to consider PG&E's November 5, 2015 update, and the parties will comment on those updated numbers as part of their comments to this proposed decision.

**4. Discussion and Conclusion**

No concerns were raised regarding PG&E's request, except in regards to PCIA. PG&E followed adopted PCIA and CAM methodologies, but MCE, SCP, and Lean all say the result is too high, the PCIA should either be frozen, offset with a negative PCIA balance, and/or the process should be reviewed in the second phase of this proceeding.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Assembly Bill 117 (2002), Senate Bill 790 (2011) and D.12-12-036.

We recognize Lean's concerns regarding PG&E's proposed PCIA, but because PG&E calculated it pursuant to currently authorized methodologies, PG&E is not out of compliance with current Commission rules and decisions. As discussed below, the Commission will address revision of the currently authorized PCIA methodologies and inputs in the first half of 2016.

Because PG&E followed adopted PCIA and CAM methodologies, we adopt PG&E's proposed PCIA and CAM. Because the negative indifference belongs to DA customers, not CCA customers, we do not offset PG&E's proposed PCIA with the negative indifference. Because freezing the PCIA rates would cause harm to bundled ratepayers, violating applicable law, we do not freeze the PCIA rates at 2015 levels.

Even though PG&E states in its GRC (A.15-09-001) that it expects SF and AC to initiate CCA programs in 2016, this does not mean that this will actually happen.

Since both bundled and CCA CARE customers are affected by the PCIA, it is not reasonable to only adjust CCA customers PCIA rates and not those of bundled customers as well. Therefore we will make no adjustment to either customer groups PCIA.

PG&E shall request authority for its disposition/retirement of the negative indifference amounts associated with pre-2009 DA, in its next ERRRA forecast application.

Except for PG&E, parties that served testimony and briefs agree that either a second phase or a workshop should be held to review the currently authorized PCIA and CAM methodologies and inputs. We order that a workshop shall be held, outside of this proceeding, by the Commission's Energy Division, within the first half of 2016, to address the methodologies and inputs used for

calculating the PCIA. Notice of this workshop shall be provided to the service lists of all currently open ERRA forecast and compliance proceedings, for the three large electric utilities. Because the CAM is addressed in the Long-Term Procurement proceeding (LTPP), we will not address the CAM methodology in our upcoming workshop. In particular, the scope of the workshop will address:

1. The methodology for calculating the PCIA;
  - a. Whether the calculation of the PCIA should be different for DA and CCA entities, and if so, what those different methodologies should be;
2. The inputs to the calculation of the PCIA; and
3. Ensuring that all proposals are in compliance with existing Public Utilities Code Sections, including but not limited to ensuring no bias or harm to DA, CCA, or bundled customers.

Because Commissioner Florio is currently the assigned Commissioner to all ERRA proceedings, we assign him to be the Commissioner overseeing this effort to re-evaluate the PCIA calculation.

## **5. Procedural Issues**

### **5.1. Categorization and Need for Hearings**

In Resolution ALJ 176-3358, dated June 11, 2015, the Commission preliminarily categorized A.15-06-001 (ERRA forecast application) as ratesetting, and preliminarily determined that hearings were necessary. As noted above, on September 9, 2015, PG&E informed the assigned ALJ via electronic mail (e-mail) that all parties to the ERRA Application agreed that EHs would not be required. On that same date, the assigned ALJ issued an e-mail ruling removing EHs set for September 10, 2015 from the Commission's calendar.

Given these developments, we make a final determination herein that a public hearing is not necessary in this proceeding.

**5.2. Motions for Confidential Treatment**

Pursuant to D.06-06-066, D.08-04-023, and D.14-10-033, Rule 11.5, Pub. Util. Code §§ 454.5(g) and 583, and General Order (GO) 66-C, PG&E requests leave to treat as confidential its Exhibit PGE-1C. PG&E states that these documents contain information that complies with the confidentiality requirements of the above listed decisions, Rule, and GO, and should therefore be treated confidentially. No party commented on PG&E's request.

By D.06-06-066, D.08-04-023, and D.14-10-033, the Commission sets forth guidelines for confidential information as it applies to the confidentiality of electric procurement and GHG data (that may be market sensitive) submitted to the Commission. GO 66-C addresses access to records in the Commission's possession. Pub. Util. Code §§ 454.5(g) and 583 addresses the Commission processes regarding confidential documents in general, while Rule 11.5 addresses sealing all or part of an evidentiary record.

PG&E has been granted similar requests in previous ERRA recovery decisions. We agree that the information contained in these exhibits is market sensitive electric procurement-related information. Therefore, we grant PG&E's request to treat as confidential its Exhibit PGE-1C, as detailed in OP 10, of this decision.

**5.3. Admittance of Exhibits into the Record**

Since EHs were not held in A.15-06-001 there was no opportunity to enter prepared testimony and exhibits into the record. In order to fairly assess the

record, it is necessary to include all testimony and exhibits served by PG&E,<sup>6</sup> MCE,<sup>7</sup> SCP,<sup>8</sup> and CLECA.<sup>9</sup>

Pursuant to Rule 13.8(c): 1) PG&E requested that the Commission receive the public and confidential versions of its Exhibits PG&E-1 through 6 into the record of A.15-06-001; 2) MCE requested that the Commission receive its Exhibits MCE-1 through 7 into the record of A.15-06-001; and 3) SCP requested that the Commission receive its Exhibit SCP 1 into the record of A.15-06-001. We identify and receive into the record the public and confidential versions of PG&E's exhibits, and the public versions of MCE's and SCP's Exhibits.

In its motion of September 16, 2015, CLECA requested that a PG&E response to CLECA Data Request Set #1 be admitted into the record of this proceeding. The information clarifies that, unlike some other non-bypassable charges, the ongoing CTC is not a vintaged rate. The information in this exhibit was prepared by PG&E, and PG&E and CLECA have stipulated to the admission of the facts in this exhibit. We identify and receive into the record the Exhibit CLECA-1.

## **6. Compliance with the Authority Granted Herein**

In order to implement the authority granted herein, PG&E must file a Tier 1 Advice Letter (AL) within 30 days of the date of this decision. The tariff sheets filed in these ALs shall be effective on or after the date filed subject to the

---

<sup>6</sup> Motion requesting receipt of testimony into record filed on September 15, 2015.

<sup>7</sup> Motion requesting receipt of testimony into record filed on September 16, 2015.

<sup>8</sup> Motion requesting receipt of testimony into record filed on September 15, 2015.

<sup>9</sup> Motion requesting receipt of testimony into record filed on September 16, 2015.

Commission's Energy Division determining they are in compliance with this decision.

### **7. Comment Period**

The proposed decision of the ALJ 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 \_\_\_\_\_.

### **8. Assignment of Proceeding**

Michel Peter Florio is the assigned Commissioner and Seaneen M. Wilson is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

#### **Findings of Fact**

1. By Resolution ALJ 176-3358, dated June 11, 2015, A.15-06-001 was categorized as ratesetting with hearings needed.
2. In A.15-06-001, PG&E requests, pursuant to its Application, and Update, that the Commission: 1) Adopt a total 2016 electric procurement forecast of \$4,772.0 million, consisting of PG&E's 2016 ERRA revenue requirement forecast of \$4,277.7 million, an Ongoing CTC revenue requirement forecast of \$187.3 million, a PCIA revenue requirement of \$118.7 million, and \$188.3 million for the CAM; 2) Approve PG&E's 2016 electric sales forecast and rate proposals associated with its electric procurement related revenue requirements to be effective in rates January 1, 2016; 3) Adopt a 2016 GHG-related forecasts of \$0.8 million for administrative and outreach expenses pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return, \$311.1 million net forecast revenue return amount, and PG&E's proposal to return the revenue to customers in rates in 2016; 4) Adopt a 2016 semi-annual residential California Climate Credit of

\$20.94; and 5) Adopt PG&E's 2014 recorded administrative and outreach expenses of \$1.05 million pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return, as reasonable.

3. ORA, SCP, and MCE filed protests A.15-06-001.
4. AReM/DACC and Merced/Modesto filed responses to A.15-06-001.
5. PG&E filed a reply to the responses and protests to A.15-06-001.
6. PG&E's November update reflects
7. Rule 11.5 addresses sealing all or part of an evidentiary record.
8. By D.06-06-066, D.08-04-023, and D.14-10-033, we set forth guidelines for confidential information, as it applies to the confidentiality of electric procurement and GHG data (that may be market sensitive) submitted to the Commission.
9. GO 66-C addresses access to records in the Commission's possession.
10. Pub. Util. Code §§ 454.5(g) and 583 addresses the Commission processes regarding confidential documents in general.

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. PG&E's updated 2016 ERRRA forecast should be adopted/approved, as follows: 1) total 2016 electric procurement forecast of \$4,772.0 million, consisting of PG&E's 2016 ERRRA revenue requirement forecast of \$4,277.7 million, Ongoing CTC revenue requirement forecast of \$187.3 million, PCIA revenue requirement of \$118.7 million, and \$188.3 million for CAM; 2) PG&E's 2016 electric sales forecast and rate proposals associated with its electric procurement related revenue requirements to be effective in rates January 1, 2016; 3) 2016 GHG-related forecasts of \$0.8 million for administrative and outreach expenses pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return, \$311.1 million net forecast revenue return amount, and PG&E's proposal to return the revenue to customers

in rates in 2016; 4) 2016 semi-annual residential California Climate Credit of \$20.94; and 5) Adopt PG&E's 2014 recorded administrative and outreach expenses of \$1.05 million pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return, as reasonable.

2. A workshop should be held, outside of any proceeding, by the Commission's Energy Division, within the first half of 2016, to address the methodologies and inputs used for calculating the PCIA. Notice of this workshop shall be provided to the service lists of all currently open ERRA proceedings, both forecast and compliance.

3. The scope of the PCIA workshop should address:

- a. The methodology for calculating the PCIA;
- b. Whether the calculation of the PCIA should be different for DA and CCA entities, and if so, what those different methodologies should be;
- c. The inputs to the calculation of the PCIA; and
- d. Ensuring that all proposals are in compliance with existing Public Utilities Code Sections, including but not limited to ensuring no bias or harm to DA, CCA, or bundled customers.

4. PG&E should request authority for its disposition/retirement of the negative indifference amounts associated with pre-2009 DA customers, in its next ERRA forecast application.

5. The exhibits of PG&E, MCE, SCP, and CLECA, should be identified and received into evidence.

6. PG&E's request to seal the confidential version of its testimony should be granted, as detailed herein.

7. This decision should be effective immediately so that it may be reflected in rates effective January 1, 2016.

**O R D E R****IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) requests in Application 15-06-001 are adopted as follows: 1) Total 2016 electric procurement forecast of \$4,772.0 million, consisting of PG&E's 2016 Energy Resource Recovery Account revenue requirement forecast of \$4,277.7 million, Ongoing Competition Transition Charge revenue requirement forecast of \$187.3 million, Power Charge Indifference Amount revenue requirement of \$118.7 million, and \$188.3 million Cost Allocation Mechanism; 2) PG&E's 2016 electric sales forecast and rate proposals associated with its electric procurement related revenue requirements shall be effective in rates January 1, 2016; 3) PG&E's 2016 Greenhouse Gas (GHG)-related forecasts of \$0.8 million for administrative and outreach expenses pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return, \$311.1 million net forecast revenue return amount, and PG&E's proposal to return the revenue to customers in rates in 2016; 4) PG&E's 2016 semi-annual residential California Climate Credit of \$20.94; and 5) PG&E's 2014 recorded administrative and outreach expenses of \$1.05 million pertaining to implementation of GHG revenue return.

2. Pacific Gas and Electric Company's requested 2016 forecast of electric sales and associated rates are adopted, subject to the Annual Electric True-up process.

3. A workshop shall be held, outside of this proceeding, by the Commission's Energy Division, within the first half of 2016, to address the methodologies and inputs used for calculating the Power Charge Indifference Amount. Notice of this workshop shall be provided to the service lists of all currently open Energy Resource Recovery Account proceedings, both forecast and compliance.

4. The scope of the Power Charge Indifference Amount (PCIA) workshop shall address:
  - a. The methodology for calculating the PCIA;
  - b. Whether the calculation of the PCIA should be different for Direct Access (DA) and Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) entities, and if so, what those different methodologies should be;
  - c. The inputs to the calculation of the PCIA; and
  - d. Ensuring that all proposals are in compliance with existing Public Utilities Code Sections, including but not limited to ensuring no bias or harm to DA, CCA, or bundled customers.
5. Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall request authority for the disposition/retirement of the negative indifference amounts associated with pre-2009 Direct Access customers, in its next Energy Resource Recovery Account forecast application.
6. Pacific Gas and Electric Company's request for receipt of the public and confidential versions of its Exhibits PGE-1 and -1C into the record is approved.
7. Marin Clean Energy's request for receipt of the public versions of its Exhibits MCE-1 through -7 into the record is approved.
8. Sonoma Clean Power's request for receipt of the public version of its Exhibit SCP-1 into the record is approved.
9. California Large Energy Consumers Association's (CLECAs) request for receipt of the public versions of its Exhibit CLECA-1 into the record is approved.
10. Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) request to treat as confidential, its Exhibit PG&E-1C, is granted. This exhibit shall remain sealed and confidential for a period of three years after the date of this order, and shall not be made accessible or disclosed to anyone other than the Commission staff or on

further order or ruling of the Commission, the assigned Commissioner, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), the Law and Motion Judge, the Chief ALJ, or the Assistant Chief ALJ, or as ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction. If PG&E believes that it is necessary for this information to remain under seal for longer than three years, PG&E may file a new motion stating the justification of further withholding of the information from public inspection. This motion shall be filed at least 30 days before the expiration of this limited protective order.

11. Application 15-06-001 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.