



**FILED**

04-22-11  
09:51 AM

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

Rulemaking regarding whether, or subject to what Conditions, the suspension of Direct Access may be lifted consistent with Assembly Bill 1X and Decision 01-09-060.

Rulemaking 07-05-025  
(Filed May 24, 2007)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING AMENDING PRIOR RULING**

This ruling amends the April 14, 2011 ruling previously issued in this proceeding. By electronic mail dated April 19, 2011, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) communicated to the assigned ALJ (with concurrent service on parties) calling attention to a potential inconsistency in the April 14, 2011 ruling, and seeking clarification of the ruling.

SCE reads the body of the ruling to require that SCE and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) implement their 2011 Power Charge Indifference Amount (PCIA) rate based on the existing approved method upon the issuance of each utility's Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) decisions (scheduled for June 1 for SCE), subject to refund. Once a Phase III decision in this proceeding is issued, SCE understands that it is to calculate what the 2011 PCIA would have been under the Phase III decision between the effective date of the 2011 PCIA under the ERRA decisions and the effective date of the Phase III decision, and to refund any difference to Direct Access customers.

SCE notes that Ordering Paragraph (OP) 3 is consistent with the body of the Ruling in directing that "upon issuance of the Phase III decision in this

proceeding, SCE and SDG&E shall calculate the difference in the 2011 PCIA to be collected based on the current methodology versus the revised methodology to be adopted in Phase III of this proceeding, to be applied beginning from the effective date of the 2011 rate change as adopted in their respective ERRA decisions."

However, OP 2 of the ruling states that "the 2010 PCIA rate shall continue in effect for SCE and SDG&E until the Phase III decision is issued in this proceeding subject to the adjustments..." SCE states that OP 2 appears inconsistent with OP 3 and the discussion in the body of the Ruling. SCE thus requests clarification, as SCE is filing an advice letter in early May to implement its June 1 rates, and seeks to ensure that its new rates comply with the ruling.

This ruling affirms that SCE correctly describes the manner in which the April 14 ruling is to be implemented by SCE and SDG&E. In the interests of clarity, the previous April 14 ruling is amended to delete OP 2. In all other aspects, the previous ruling is unchanged.

**IT IS RULED** that the ruling previously issued on April 14, 2011, is hereby amended to delete Ordering Paragraph 2 of that ruling. In all other aspects the April 14, 2011 ruling remains unchanged.

Date April 22, 2011, in San Francisco, California.

/s/ THOMAS R. PULSIFER

Thomas R. Pulsifer  
Administrative Law Judge