



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

**FILED**  
6-09-16  
04:59 PM

Application of Southern California Edison  
Company (U338-E) for authority to Implement  
and Recover in Rates the Cost of its Proposed  
Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Program

Application 08-03-015  
(Filed March 27, 2008)

**OPENING COMMENTS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY**  
**(U 338-E) ON PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ EBKE**

JANET S. COMBS  
CAROL SCHMID-FRAZEE

Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770  
Telephone: (626) 302-1337  
Facsimile: (626) 302-1935  
E-mail: Carol.SchmidFrazee@sce.com

Dated: **June 9, 2016**

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

Application of Southern California Edison  
Company (U338-E) for authority to Implement  
and Recover in Rates the Cost of its Proposed  
Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Program

Application 08-03-015  
(Filed March 27, 2008)

**OPENING COMMENTS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY**  
**(U 338-E) ON PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ EBKE**

Pursuant to Rule 14.3(a) of the California Public Utilities Commission's ("Commission's") Rules of Practice and Procedure, Southern California Edison Company ("SCE") hereby submits its opening comments on the Proposed Decision of Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") Ebke, dated May 20, 2016 ("PD"). SCE strongly supports the PD that grants SCE's Petition for Modification of Decision No. ("D.") 14-06-048 ("PFM") to terminate the Solar Photovoltaic Program ("SPVP"). SCE submits these brief opening comments only to point out a likely typographical error in the PD at Appendix 1, Adopted Modifications to Specified Conclusions of Law and Ordering Paragraphs in D. 14-06-048, Conclusion of Law No. 4.<sup>1</sup>

SCE noticed a difference between its proposed revised language for Conclusion of Law No. 4 in the "Proposed Modifications to Conclusions of Law and Ordering Paragraphs in D.14-06-048" section of its PFM<sup>2</sup> and the revised language in Conclusion of Law No. 4 in Appendix 1 to the PD.<sup>3</sup> In its PFM, SCE proposed the following revision to Conclusion of Law 4:

---

<sup>1</sup> PD, Appendix 1, p.1.

<sup>2</sup> PFM, Appendix C, at page C-1.

<sup>3</sup> PD, May 20, 2016, Appendix 1 at page 1.

4. SCE's authority, granted in D.12-02-035, to develop less than 115 MW, ~~or to seek other relief such as extending the deadline for procurement of IPP MW, by Tier 2 Advice Letter 180 days before the end of SPVP,~~ should no longer be rescinded.

However, Conclusion of Law No. 4 in Appendix 1 to the PD did not include SCE's proposed addition of the words "no longer."

The words "no longer" are necessary to release SCE from the requirement to develop at least 115 Megawatts ("MW") through the procurement of Independent Power Producer ("IPP") MW. In order to terminate the SPVP as the PD orders, the Commission must restore to SCE the authority to develop less than 115 MW of IPP MW. Since SCE has yet to procure at least 115 MW of IPP MW after holding five SPVP solicitations, inclusion of the words "no longer" in Conclusion of Law No. 4 is necessary to be consistent with the PD's conclusion that SCE's SPVP program should be terminated now with less than 115 MW of IPP MW.<sup>4</sup>

For the reasons discussed above, SCE respectfully requests that the Commission modify the PD as it recommends.

Respectfully submitted,

JANET S. COMBS  
CAROL SCHMID-FRAZEE

*/s/ Carol Schmid-Frazee*

By: Carol Schmid-Frazee

Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770  
Telephone: (626) 302-1337  
Facsimile: (626) 302-1935  
E-mail: Carol.SchmidFrazee@sce.com

June 9, 2016

---

<sup>4</sup> PD, Conclusion of Law 2 at page 13