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Decision (D.) 21-03-056 at 54, issued in this rulemaking on March 26, 2021, discussed additional activity that may occur in this proceeding.

Based on comments to the Proposed Decision, we have determined that it is prudent to leave this proceeding open to potentially evaluate and consider the adoption of party proposals, or elements of the party proposals, in an additional phase of this proceeding. Proposals like those...
that the California Environmental Justice Alliance included in its testimony that was admitted to the record and the PG&E proposed Residential Rewards program could provide significant load reduction during peak and net peak periods beginning in 2022. In a second phase to this proceeding, we may consider proposals like these and others that have been posed in the evidentiary record of this proceeding.

This e-mail ruling outlines the process to address these two party proposals that have been put forth in this proceeding.

1. **Just Flex Rewards**
   In its opening testimony, served on January 11, 2021, the California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) proposed a Just Flex Rewards (JFR) program that would pay certain customers, specifically those in disadvantaged communities and low-income households, to reduce energy during specific hours on Flex Alert days using a text alert notification and self-verification process (Exhibit CEJA-1 at 7). The program would be voluntary with automatic enrollment of eligible households, and it would leverage existing investor owned utility (IOU) text platforms developed for outages and wildfire de-energization (i.e., Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS)) events.

2. **Residential Rewards Pilot Program**
   In its opening testimony, served on January 11, 2021, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) proposed a new Residential Rewards Pilot Program that could directly dispatch the smart thermostats of enrolled residential customers (Exhibit PGE-1 at 4-11). The pilot, as described by PG&E, would offer customers a choice to enroll a range of additional smart technologies over time that could be dispatched to provide maximum load reduction contribution.

3. **Resubmission of proposals**
   This ruling invites CEJA and PG&E to resubmit testimony that would outline any updated positions or information that these organizations have regarding their proposals.

   In CEJA’s refresh of its proposal, we request that the party include its position on general program design, program trigger, eligibility and enrollment, dual participation issues, text notification procedures, outreach and education, measurement and verification, compensation, implementation budget and schedule, load impact, cost recovery, and any additional information the party believes is necessary for Commission consideration.

   In PG&E’s refresh of its Residential Rewards Pilot Program proposal, we request that the party include its position on program elements (eligible customers, market integration, dual participation, availability throughout the year, and event triggers), eligible technologies, customer compensation, measurement and verification,
communications and outreach, implementation budget and schedule, cost recovery, and any additional information the party believes is necessary for Commission consideration.

4. Process for record development

Testimony that reflects any refreshing of the party proposals shall be served by CEJA and PG&E no later than July 7, 2021. All parties are granted the opportunity to serve reply testimony, no later than July 21, 2021, that responds to the CEJA Just Flex Rewards and PG&E Residential Rewards Pilot Program proposal refreshes.

Parties shall not address issues beyond the scope of the two proposals by CEJA and PG&E.

It is so ruled.

The Commission’s Docket Office shall formally file this ruling.
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